

MINUTES OF MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1980 REGULAR MEETING

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Monday, February 4, 1980, 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 9:00 P.M. by the President, Sandra Goldstein, after both parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Rabbi Joseph H. Ehrenkranz, Congregation Agudath Sholom, 31 Strawberry Hill Avenue, Stamford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by the President, Sandra Goldstein.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie Summerville called the Roll. There were 38 members present (Mr. Esposito came in at 9:45) and 2 absent. The absent members were Representatives Ralph Loomis and Moira Lyons.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PAGES: Lisa Coffield, 109 Tresser Blvd., Student, Rippowam High School.  
Inez Alvarez, 133 Tresser Blvd., Student, Rippowam High School.

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

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let's please check the voting machine. Up for yes; down for no. The machine is in good working order. I would just like to remind everyone of the notice I sent around. There was a problem last month with the machine. It has been corrected and we are looking into correcting it on a permanent basis.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I have an announcement before we begin our meeting. The Mayor's office has need for business telephone numbers so that if they have to contact anyone during the day, they can. Now, although the office has the numbers, we really do not know who on the Board would like to have their numbers given to any other Office in the City; therefore, Ms. Summerville is going to send around a sheet. If you wish to have your business number put into the Mayor's Office, please sign and give your day-time number.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report. Seconded and Approved Unanimously.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

MEETING HELD MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1980

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, January 21, 1980, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic St., Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order by the Chairwoman, Sandra Goldstein, at 7:45 P.M., at which time a QUORUM was present.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein	Patrick J. Joyce
Marie Hawe	Dominick Guglielmo
Michael Wiederlight	Audrey Maihock
Richard Fasanelli	Stanley Darer
Handy Dixon	Barbara McInerney
Lathon Wider, Sr.	Robert Fauteux
David I. Blum	Paul Esposito
John J. Hogan, Jr.	Maira Lyons
Annie M. Summerville	Fiorenzo Corbo (in at 8:00 pm)
Donald Donahue	Jeremiah Livingston (in at 8:00 pm)
Jeanne-Lois Santy	Alfred Perillo (in at 8:10 pm)
Robert Gabe DeLuca	John Zelinski (in at 8:10 pm)
John J. Boccuzzi	Media
<u>CARMELLA TERENCE, Office Staff</u>	

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the six names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the three names sent down from the Mayor's Office on 1/18/80 and 1/21/80: DPW Commissioner Bruce Spaulding; Personnel Commission, Mildred Ritchie; and Melville Young, Planning Board.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

The fifteen items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Also item #21 from L&R, BEING A RESOLUTION for a State Dept. of Transportation \$3,300 grant to relocate fire hydrant facilities along Rte. I-95.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the following items from the Tentative Steering Agenda: Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14. Ordered HELD IN COMMITTEE and off the agenda were the following items from the Tentative Steering Agenda: Nos. 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. No. 21 was transferred to Fiscal.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

The first four items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. No. 5 was moved to Education, Welfare and Government, being the matter re hiring procedures of the Stamford Education System. No. 6 was ordered Held in Committee, re Rep. DeLuca request to upgrade Code of Ethics re City employees' professional services hired out privately.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the eight items appearing on the Tentative Agenda.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

The item re Martha Hoyt School being transferred from the jurisdiction of the Board of Education to the City's Public Works Dept. was ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Ordered Held in Committee was the other item to transfer maintenance of buildings and playgrounds from Board of Education to City's Bldgs. & Grounds Dept.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

The first two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA. Item #3 was moved to Parks and Recreation, re Chestnut Hill Park. Also items #4 and #5 were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA.

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

Ordered Held in Committee was the matter of consolidating the two golf commissions ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were items 2 and 3; also the third item from Health & Protection.

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item transferred from Personnel re personnel policies of the Stamford Education System.

(10) SEWER MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item to approve sewer extension agreement.

(11) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item re meeting with the Housing Authority. The other item was ordered off the agenda, letter relating to Division St. Park.

(12) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item re Parcels 8 & 9 - change in URC contract.

(13) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item re proposed flood plain regulations

(14) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were Items 1 and 3 on the Tentative Steering Agenda; also added on were the matter of helicopter sites and the problem at South Pacific Street traffic. Ordered off the agenda was the letter from Mr. Swallen re commuter parking problem at railroad station.

(15) RESOLUTIONS

MOVED to the Environmental Protection Committee and ORDERED Held in Committee there was the one item appearing on the Tentative Agenda, a resolution recommending investigation of EPB as per October, 1979 minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, seconded, and carried, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 10:30 P.M.

CMT/HMM

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman  
Steering Committee

---



APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon, Chairman

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met on Thursday, January 31st, and again on Friday night, February 1st. Each meeting was called for 7:00 P.M. and was held in the Democratic Caucus Room. Committee members present at the January meeting were: Reps. Mildred Perillo, Annie Summerville, Barbara McInerney, Stanley Darer, John Boccuzzi, Gabe DeLuca and myself, Handy Dixon. Present and voting at the February meeting were: Vincent DeNicola, Gabe DeLuca, Annie Summerville, Mary Jane Signore, Stanley Darer and myself, Handy Dixon. I would like to place on the Consent Agenda Items #3, 4, 9.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVE. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PLANNING BOARD ALTERNATETerm Expires:

- (1) Stuart Robbins (D)  
28 Shelter Rock Road

Replacing Phyllis Sinrich  
who became a regular member

Dec. 1, 1984

MR. DIXON: Mr. Robbins was interviewed and his response to the many questions demonstrated a very wide range of knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Board. The Appointments Committee by a vote of 5 in favor and 4 against. I would therefore MOVE his confirmation.

MR. BLUM: I intend to abstain from voting for Mr. Robbins for the simple reason I feel this particular item has not been placed before this Board properly and before the Mayor properly because the reasons were that the Mayor would like, or is as always asking for 3 names to a particular Commission or Board.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd just like to assure this Board that Stu Robbins' name is legally before us. I thought in Caucus we had a discussion on this. I thought it was straightened out. I can only say, as far as I'm concerned, and the people in that Caucus, that Stu Robbins' name is indeed before this Board legally. He has gone through the Democratic City Committee, sent down by the Mayor and, his name was approved by the Appointments Committee on a 5-4 vote; therefore, I would ask this Board to approve Stu Robbins to the Planning Board as an alternate.

MRS. MCINERNEY: As one of the minority voters on the Appointments Committee, I would like to state my reasons, my main reason, for disapproving Mr. Robbins for the Planning Board. I found that Mr. Robbins was extremely well-versed and had a wide variety of background, especially in the Finance field. I questioned him at length and my final conclusion was that although I found Mr. Robbins to be an extremely qualified person to sit on any City Board and found that he was extremely interested in Government per se, I felt that serving on a Land Use Board for the City of Stamford with residency of three and a half years, too strategic and too in-depth for somebody with such a short knowledge in the City. I certainly feel he should be on a board, but I am not of the opinion that Mr. Robbins should sit on the Planning Board.

MR. WIDER: Having worked with Mr. Robbins over the past 4 years, I find he's indeed a dedicated person to the City of Stamford and when it comes to the question of land use and so forth, none of us is really expert at that. Mr. Robbins



APPOINTMENTS (cont.)

MR. WIDER: (continuing)...has put forth efforts to learn about the City Government and its operation and this is the kind of person that the City of Stamford needs. I would certainly feel that the City would gain by having a man of Stu Robbins' quality on the Planning Board, and I would ask this Board to vote for him

MR. JOYCE: As a matter of course, I am abstaining, being an Attorney, on all of the voting on Planning & Zoning Board appointees.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by use of the machine. Mr Robbins has been CONFIRMED by a vote of 22 in favor; 13 opposed; 2 abstentions.

FAIR RENT COMMISSION - ALTERNATE

		<u>Term Expires</u>
(2)	<u>Craig L. Koester</u> (R) 75 Plymouth Road	Replacing Estelle Hane whose term expired Dec. 1, 1980

MR. DIXON: This is merely to correct an error in the time of the appointment. The Appointment was approved 1/14/80 with the time expiration date of 12/1/84. That is the point that is in error. I would like to MOVE TO AMEND the term to expire December 1, 1980.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMISSION ON AGING

(3)	<u>Harry Selin</u> (R) 65 Prospect St.	Re-appointment Dec. 1, 1982
-----	---	--------------------------------

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

(4)	<u>Pat Rooney (J.Patrick)</u> R. 93 Old Colony Road	Replacing Rev. Cyril Peters whose term expired Dec. 1, 1981
-----	--	---

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.PARK COMMISSION

(5)	<u>Janet Vanderwaart</u> (R) 29 Friar Tuck Lane	Replacing Anton Rice whose term expired Dec. 1, 1982
-----	--	--

MR. DIXON: The interview with Mrs. Vanderwaart was geared strictly to the position to which she was appointed. Her presentation to the Appointments Committee was satisfactory and assuring of integrity and competence. Mrs. Vanderwaart will be the first woman to serve on that Commission. The Committee voted 4 in favor and 2 against and I now MOVE for this Board's confirmation.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. SIGNORE: I'm pleased to second the nomination of Janet Vanderwaart for the Park Commission. Her enthusiasm and sincerity when she appeared before our Committee were very much in evidence. I feel she'll be a valuable member of the Commission.

MR. DARER: I, too, would like to second the name of Mrs. Vanderwaart. I felt that the candidate appearing before our Appointments Committee, who had taken the trouble to attend something like 15 or 16 meetings of the Parks Commission, and had gotten deeply involved in the affairs of the Park Commission, probably knew as much about the business of the Parks Commission as some of the sitting Commissioners, really is deserving of a place, and I think she'll serve very admirably in that capacity.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I know there were 2 objections. Are we to be informed of the reasons for those objections?

MR. DIXON: Well, those who objected are certainly present; if they want to state their reasons for objecting, they may do so.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote by use of the machine. Mrs. Vanderwaart has been CONFIRMED by a vote of 33 in favor; 2 opposed; 2 abstentions.

(6) James Calka (R)  
985 Shippan Avenue

Replacing Robert Lavach  
who resigned

Dec. 1, 1981

MR. DIXON: Mr. Calka has been appointed to fill an unexpired term on the Park Commission. Mr. Calka has had much experience in the field of accounting, sales and management. He takes pride in the fact that he worked 5 years for the Stamford Board of Education in the capacity of Personnel Management. Mr. Calka admitted having little knowledge of City Government, but he is confident of his ability to take on this responsibility and serve in the best interest of the City and the taxpayers of Stamford. The Committee voted 4 in favor and 2 against and I would now so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. DARER: I will voluntarily state my reasons in the Appointments Committee for voting against Mr. Calka, and those are basically of principle in regard to the preparation that people who are coming before the Appointments Committee to serve on Boards and Commissions either have or don't have. I think that we could give a little presentation to people applying to Boards and Commissions that they ought to do more homework. There's a question on the Appointments Committee sheet that's given to them "have you read the provisions of the Charter that pertain to your position". I really think that's the least we can expect of people who appear before our Committee. I would think that those people who are desirous of serving on a Board or Commission ought to really do a little work insofar as what the role of that Commission is and what they are responsible for to the City and to the other members on the Commission and I do feel Mr. Calka is a sincere man and perhaps tonight I will vote for him, but, I felt at the

APPOINTMENTS (cont.)

MR. DARER: (continuing)...Appointments Committee, and once I've made this statement, I don't think there's anything more to be said, but I do feel that people who are coming up before our Appointments Committee ought to really do their homework before they get to see us.

MR. DeNICOLA: I'd like to speak on behalf of Mr. Calka. I think at the time being on the Appointments Committee that he wasn't aware of what was going on but I think he is a very sincere man and I think that any appointment that comes to this Board should be interviewed by the Mayor, which he was not.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to speak on behalf of Mr. Calka. Granted, maybe they should do a little homework, but sometimes things prevail where possibly you cannot get to meetings, but the fellow enjoyed a terrific reputation when he was associated with the Board of Education as a dedicated employee, someone interested in his work. He expressed a desire, the fact that he is willing to get involved in civic affairs, activities; to vote against someone because he may inadvertently, didn't do a little homework, I don't think we can hold it against him. Also, sometimes the Town Committee people that are doing the interviewing don't make these requirements known to the person. Once again, this should not be held against a person coming before our Committee. I believe he is sincere and will do a fantastic job for the City as a member of the Park Commission and I feel that a vote of confidence is warranted.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 29 in favor; 6 opposed; 2 abstentions. Mr. Calka is CONFIRMED.

COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS (MAYOR'S CABINET):

(7) Bruce W. Spaulding (R)  
126 Cedarwood Road

Term runs concurrent  
with Mayor - expirin  
November 30, 1981

MR. DIXON: Item #7, is the appointment of Mr. Bruce W. Spaulding to the position of Commission/of Public Works. The Appointments Committee spent at least an hour and a half with the interview with Mr. Spaulding, and I must say that the Committee felt that he came through very well in the interview. He answered all the questions that we put to him to our satisfaction and he just appeared to be a man full of knowledge and expertise, the kind of thing that we always look for in filling such positions. Mr. Spaulding seems to be very aware of what is happening in our Public Works Department and he seems to feel that he himself is quite capable of bringing about some needed changes. He recognizes some changes that are very much needed and he feels quite capable of making the changes and bringing the Department up to what he thinks that it ought to be and I believe his thought and concepts of what happens in our Public Works Department concur with the Appointments Committee of the Board of Representatives, and apparently with those of the Community at large. Our vote on Mr. Spaulding was UNANIMOUS and it is the hope of the Appointments Committee, after spending so much time with Mr. Spaulding, that this Board will confirm the appointment, and I would so MOVE.



APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (cont.)

MR. POLLARD: I understand that Mr. Spaulding during his interview by the Appointments Committee, made a statement that he would more or less guarantee returning phone calls, responding to letters. I think that this Board might be interested that I've had since 1973, promises by various and appropriate former Public Works Commissioners to take action on a few projects. I took it upon myself last Monday and Wednesday to call Mr. Spaulding and I can assure you tonight that his promise wasn't worth the words. He did not return those phones calls. I fully intend not to vote in favor of Mr. Spaulding.

MRS. SANTY: After reading of his appointment in the paper, Mrs. Signore and I put several letters describing long existing problems in our District on his desk and we received an immediate reply even though he was not confirmed by this Board. Since that day, he has followed up on these problems and I've gotten more correspondence. I think this is an outstanding beginning. I did not telephone him as Mr. Pollard did. I suggest that he write a letter. But Bruce was born in Stamford. He grew up in Stamford and he went to school in Stamford. He remained here because he loves Stamford and is concerned for its future. His wife, Marie, is a native of Stamford and she's accepted the fact that he is assuming a 24-hour-a-day job. We are fortunate to have the Spaulding serving Stamford, and I am positive with Bruce's qualifications, education and sincerity, he will be one of the most outstanding Public Works Commissioners this City has ever had.

MR. DARER: I'm absolutely astonished at the replies that I received from the Commissioner within days, actually hours. Letters, copies of letters which he promised that he would do everything; he writes to a constituent, which in a sense is something that I've never seen before frankly, copies to the Members of the Board. I received three of them this week. Two of the letters assured the constituent that the matter would be looked into rather quickly and taken care of and the third gave an explanation as to a time-table as to when certain repaving of streets would take place and I thought that was remarkable and well appreciated by me. There is one thing that I would like to say and I'm totally in favor of Bruce Spaulding as Commissioner of Public Works. At the Appointments Committee I raised a point with the Commissioner regarding his views and as to the taking of gifts, the giving and receiving of gifts by members of his Department. He, I believe, assured us that one of his early acts would be to re-enforce by letter from him to his employees, the Charter provisions as to the taking or receiving of gifts in any way, shape or form and I would hope, and that's why I'm doing this publicly tonight, that he will do this within the earliest hour and see to it that it's well understood, that the full intent and ramifications of receiving gifts by members of his department are well understood so that in the event someone partakes of this or receives gifts, he will realize the full severity of the force of the Commissioner's Office that can be brought against him. I think that is a step in the right direction.

MRS. GUROLIAN: I believe I hold second place to nobody in this room in past differences with Mayors and his cabinet members. However, I have a strong belief that except in extreme circumstances, a Mayor is entitled to have his choice

APPOINTMENTS (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: (continuing)....of Cabinet Members so that he can be held responsible for their duty, their performances, etc. and so I heartily endorse this candidacy.

MR. BLUM: This will be the third time that I will be voting on a Commissioner of Public Works, and we get the same promise. I do hope that Mrs. Santy's cul-de-sac will be properly taken care of because that was voted in the 14th Board of Representatives, and I do hope that Ardsley Road will also be taken care of. I do hope that we do not have the same responses that we had with the two previous men who were also excellent candidates for the Public Works Commissioner. Came highly recommended from where they came from. One of them came from Westport, and one came from the American Cyanamid. I read in the paper that he, Mr. Spaulding, will be doing a lot of things, I hope that you will give that person who does respond to our calls, that person that takes care of the complaints, she's a wonderful person and she's the only person that we really have to call. Whether the complaints are taken care of, that's up to you, Mr. Spaulding. You have quite a chore in your personnel I do hope that you will make changes for if you do, we will all be for you the next time around.

MRS. PERILLO: I was going to say an awful lot, but after Dave, who could follow him. I would just like to say that Mr. Spaulding said if he didn't feel he could do the job, he would resign, and I told him if he didn't do the job, I would ask for his resignation.

MRS. McINERNEY: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Remaining to speak are Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Wider and Mr. Perillo.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will vote by use of the machine on the main motion which is to approve Mr. Spaulding. Mr. Spaulding has been CONFIRMED by a vote of 36 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstention.

PERSONNEL COMMISSION

(8) Mildred Ritchie (R)  
221 Hubbard Avenue

Replacing John T.D. Rich  
who resigned  
(term expired 12/1/78)

Dec. 1, 1983

MR. DIXON: Item #8 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE without prejudice.

MR. DIXON: I would now MOVE for CONFIRMATION Consent Items #3, 4, 9.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice) (Mr. Joyce Abstainson #9)  
(Mrs. Perillo abstains #3 & #4, did not interview them)

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to ask that we Suspend our Rules to take up Item #2 under the Personnel Committee, which is the Labor Contract between the Board of Education, Stamford Education Administrators Unit. This is the third time we're discussing this particular item. There are members in the audience and this is their third meeting. I think it would be a good gesture on our part to Suspend the Rules and either vote in favor or against it and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MRS. GUROIAN: Everytime I'm at a hearing, they're always pushed up.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there anyone else who is opposed, I would like and Mr. Fauteux. The MOTION to SUSPEND the RULES has been PASSED.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - David I. Blum, Chairman

MR. BLUM: The Personnel Committee met January 29, 1980, at 7:30 P.M. Present: Moira Lyons Vice Chairperson, Michael Wiederlight, John Hogan, Philip Stork, Paul Dziezyc, David Blum, Chairman. Absent: Doris Bowlby. The Proposed Labor Contract between the Board of Education and the Stamford Administrators Unit was accepted 6-0 with all the corrections and a new Contract ratified by both parties signed January 24, 1980, by Edward Mathews, the Administrator and Richard Weber for the Board of Education. I therefore make a MOTION for this Board to accept this Contract.

- (2) PROPOSED LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION AND STAMFORD EDUCATION ASSN. ADMINISTRATION UNIT. A ratified, signed contract is to be submitted for the February 4, 1980 meeting. (This item rejected 1/14/80).

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MRS. HAWK: The Fiscal Committee did not have a Quorum at the Personnel Meeting and didn't vote on this.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I'd like to start by commending the Board of Education for combining some of our Coordinators. I note that in the past, we had a Coordinator for Math, a Coordinator for Science, they've been combined. Same with Art and Music. I find that I have difficulties with this Contract when I consider that the school enrollment has dropped by 9% and our Staff continues to climb. This problem is not unique to Stamford. All systems in the State and in the Country are facing the same type of problem. In accordance with the figures received from the Board of Education, we know that by 1985, the school enrollment will decrease by another 20 to 25 percent. There must be changes made within our School System. I think that we are all beginning to understand that we must realistically try to deal with the enrollment figures and try to make cuts where cuts are necessary. I am upset that the backbone of our educational system, our teachers, are grossly underpaid. I think that an increase such as this would be extremely demoralizing to people that been working in the System, trying to teach our children. They're the true backbone. They're the true spirit. They're the molders of these children. In calling today I note that with the increases, our figures have ranges for our High School Principals, Step 1, \$37,652.00, Step 4, \$40,813.00. We presently have 3 High School Principals. They are all at Step 4. Our Vice-Principals, which there are 6, all within our High School Systems, are also at Step 4. Their increase bring their salaries up to \$36,283 and in some of our schools, we have positions known as Administrative Assistants or Assistant Principals. We have many of those in our Public High Schools. I would say, for the sake of argument, at least 2 and they are at Step 4, which brings the salary to \$31,802 with this contract. I would then place an example of a potential High School



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. MCINERNEY: (continuing)...Administrative Staff in front of you. One Principal at \$40,818 ; 2 Vice-Principals at \$36,283, each; 2 Assistant Principals or Administrative Assistants at \$31,802 each. Potentially in those 5 people in the Public School System you have in salaries, if this new increase goes through, \$176,988. for one High School. This is not taking into consideration that most of these people are receiving fringe benefits. These are just salaries and I'm not taking into consideration pensions and I'm not taking into consideration that the majority of these people may have secretaries in their offices. Another example would be one Elementary school with one Principal at the 4th Step with this Contract receiving \$36,450, and one Assistant Principal at the 4th Step RECEIVING \$31,802; Two people in an Elementary School involving a total of \$68,252. Again without pension, without fringe benefits and not considering secretaries. 80 People sounds like a few people, but when you look in terms of the total package, 2-year period is \$65,333 and when you look at our declining enrollment, and when you look at the salaries we are offering our teachers, our young people, people we are counting on to come to this Community, you will find that they're extremely out of whack and I certainly don't plan to vote for this Contract tonight.

MR. WIDER: I become a little concerned when we began to compare people, and, of course, I'm aware, well aware, after 25 years working with the students, teachers and principals who mold children, and I'm also aware who molds the teachers. Whether we know it or not, without good Administrators, we have bad teachers, and I have seen poor Administrators who did some fantastic jobs on causing our Children to be neglected. So, while enrollment is decreasing, I talked with Superintendent of Schools three different times and so far, he has eliminated, refused to fill 16 Administrative vacancies, so here again, we don't have to fill some future vacancies that will become available. This isn't a must, but what I do feel is that if we want to keep good, sincere, dedicated school administrators, we have to pay them. And while I feel they are paid pretty well, I do not feel that they are paid on a par that industry is paying its Administrators, so, I would, therefore, feel that after 2 years they have been waiting for a contract, I really wonder how we feel sometimes when we demand so much and want to give so little, and want to be so inconsiderate of others. I would feel tonight we have a good opportunity to let our Administrators know that we really feel about them by approving their Contract and I ask this Board, let's get it off the Agenda and get it in the hands of our Administrators.

MR. BLUM: One of the reasons why this Contract has been with us for such a long period is because of the language. We have now before us a Contract that is beautiful. One that has an index, one that tells us word for word what each person is entitled to. You could really say this is a truly well-written contract and I do hope in the future, that the Board of Education will recognize that when they're sending a Contract to the Board of Representatives, we will scrutinize their Contract to the point that we want a Contract that's written right. Does not have typographical errors, that has the language that belongs in the Contract. To Mrs. McInerney, I'm saying you're aware today our President has come out saying that people who demand wages should be entitled to a 9½ increase because of the cost of living adjustments. Our cost of living has gone up 13% last year. This contract is only calling for 9%. That Administrator has to live per his needs for the way he has lived, and 9%, if he continues,

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. BLUM: (continuing)...will put him behind at 4%. Everyone is entitled to a raise, may he be the Administrator or the employee or the teacher. Yes, Mrs. McInerney, give him not his raise and we have many who will call upon those Administrators right out here being built is Champion and believe me, that is where our teachers are going because they are under-paid and I agree with you, they are entitled to more money, but let us not because these are Administrators, say they are entitled to nothing. They are entitled for their work performed, a raise and I shall vote yes.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT. I would like to echo the sentiments of my colleague, Mr. Wider. The Contract that we scrutinized, and I might say as a member of the Personnel Committee, we looked at it very carefully, does not provide for the highest income level in the community for Administrators, so in theory, these Administrators can go to any one of the surrounding communities that offer more money and get a job; and education is like any other business, you get what you pay for and if we want to pay poorly, we are going to get poor Administrators and poor educators so I urge you to pass the Contract. It's a fair contract, it's an equitable contract and much thought has been put into it on both sides.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will be voting by use of the machine.

MR. DONAHUE: Let the record show I will not be voting on this matter.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The CONTRACT has been APPROVED by a vote of 32 in favor; 2 opposed; and 4 abstentions.

MR. DIXON: I would like to retract and have stricken from the record my statement that Mrs. Vanderwaart will be the first woman to serve on the Park Commission as I have been informed that there have been others.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito

MRS. HAWE: On our Agenda this evening is pending \$503,801.69 in additional operating expenditures. If these are approved, there will remain approximately \$2,600,000 in the contingency fund. Also, there is a \$880,000 addition to the 79/80 Capital Projects Budget. If this is approved, there will remain approximately \$585,255 within the safe debt limit. There's also 2 items in additional appropriations which will be reimbursed by Grants which would come to \$207,647. The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, January 30, 1980. Present were Committee members: Mrs. Conti, Mr. Fauteux, Mr. Flounders, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Livingston, Mrs. Lyons, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Esposito and Mrs. Hawe as well as several other members of the Board of Representatives.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing).....MRS. HAWE said Fiscal recommends that the following items be placed on the CONSENT AGENDA. Items # 4, 6, 9, 10, 12. 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) RESOLUTION REQUIRED PER CHARTER SECTION 484.1 "Duties of Purchasing Agent" which provides that the Purchasing Agent shall put out for bid the supplies and/or services sought which are above a sum, which amount shall be arrived at by resolutions of the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives; and if they adopt differing amounts for a given year, then the lower sum shall apply. (The current figure is \$1,000.00) The Board of Finance, on 12/13/79, adopted a resolution, unanimously setting their figure at THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$3,000.00), as follows:

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Board of Finance, subject to the concurrence of the Board of Representatives, directs the Purchasing Agent of the City of Stamford to observe proper bid procedures, as outlined in the Charter and by Ordinance, for all contracts for supplies, materials or equipment which shall exceed the sum of Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000.00)."

MRS. HAWE: Purchases for items costing less than the bid threshold, do not require formal sealed bids. Formerly, the bid threshold was fixed by Charter. At the present time, it is \$1,000.00 and it has been since 1969. November 1979, Charter Revision changed this. Bid thresholds will now be established annually by the Boards of Finance and Representatives. This year, the Purchasing Agent has recommended a limit of \$3,000.00.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to amend the Motion on the floor by \$1,500.00 to \$1,500.00

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI: My reason for reducing the figure was as follows: I read over very carefully the information from the Mayor pertaining to why the Purchasing Agent requested the raising of the present \$1,000.00 to \$3,000.00 and I see that back in 1947, our predecessors on this Board had originally put in \$500.00 and back in 1969, 22 years later, it was raised by another \$500.00 to \$1,000.00. Now, here we are 11 years later asking for a \$3,000.00 change rather than just another \$500.00 which I would propose. My thinking on this is very simply I see that 1977-78 Fiscal year, there were approximately 36 bids under \$3,000. and I feel that, I know one particular situation, back last year where this Board was asked to vote for additional funds for the West Side Fire House because of the problems in the bidding procedures. I think the taxpayers of Stamford have a right to limit and limit the figure to as low as possible so that there would be nothing ever to come up of the City of Stamford pertaining to the bidding process. I see that if we do eliminate this, all it simply requires as far as the getting a bid without having to go out in the newspaper, would be simply telephone calls now. I, personally, don't see that as a very good business



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing)...way of doing it and I feel that we should increase it; there's no doubt about it, and inflation has eroded it and there is additional cost in keeping it under, or keeping at the \$1,000.00 figure, but I feel that by raising it by \$500.00 is adequate at this time and we'll see what happens and if it's necessary, next year we could raise it possibly another \$500.00 but I feel that right now we should approve only \$1,500.00. Now, the Resolution reads that "if there is a discrepancy between the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives that the lower figure shall prevail," and I certainly would encourage my colleagues to vote to approve the amendment which would be to keep it at \$1,500.00.

MRS. HAWK: I'd like to respond to Mr. Zelinski's points which he raised. The first one is that granted from 1949 to 1969 was 20 years and we raised the limit only \$500.00; however, the 10 year since 1969 has certainly been a period of inflation that has been unequalled in the history of our Country and I don't think really you can compare the two periods in time. Second of all, not that this really should determine what we do, but just as a reference point, there are several other cities in Connecticut, namely, Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven who have these limits and those 3 cities have limits of \$2,500.00 and they are in the process of trying to raise them to either \$3,500.00 or \$4,000.00. Third, each item that goes out to bid cost \$225.00 per bid and this was a figure that was worked up about a year ago by Mr. Canino so it probably costs even more now for each item that's put out to bid. By raising the bid threshold to \$3,000.00, will save not only on the bidding process but will save on manpower, legal advertising, postage and a lot of other miscellaneous costs. Mr. Canino has told us that he's in the process of writing a purchasing manual for the City in which the whole process of purchasing will be tightened up. Finally, I just want to say that this \$3,000.00 limit is the recommendation of our Purchasing Agent who is involved with this on a day-to-day basis. He lives with it day by day and this is his best judgement as to what this should be, and I urge the Board Members to go along with this and leave it at 3,000.00

MR. BLUM: I'd like to speak for those people who deal with the Purchasing Agent, namely, some small vendors. I had a few calls here this week from some of our small vendors who deal with our City, who deal with the small little bids. Now they have feelings that if it goes to \$3,000.00, the bid process, that they would be sort of pushed out of the whole line of bidding process and now the bigger vendor would sort of take over. These small little vendors are people who live in Stamford, who have small businesses, who are even retired and still hold on to a certain little income that they get from this City by putting their small bids in for certain things. I, for one, was going to make an amendment of \$2,000.00. I will support \$1,500.00 and I do hope my colleagues will think of those small vendors, those small business people who still do business with the City of Stamford that cannot compete with the big vendors.

MR. DARER: I believe very strongly that we hire good professionals to do their job, we examine what the professionals recommend, we also look into what other cities of our size do in the State and then we look not only to our vendors but to our taxpayers, and we say to ourselves, how are they served first and foremost. I find that as I listen to some of the discussions on our Board,

FISCAL COMMITTEE : (cont.)

MR. DARER: (continuing)....I never know who I'm working for. Is it the citizens of this community, or is it special interest groups. My interest is my constituents and the constituents of us all, and my interest is to see they get for their tax money the best management and the best services for the dollars they pay in taxes. I think that for the few bids below \$3,000.00 as outlined that what we are doing is saving money in the bidding process, getting the most advantageous costs, and I believe it is incorrect of us to accept anything but the \$3,000.00 figures. This is a professional judgement. It's been gone over by our Board of Finance, by our Fiscal Committee, and I think that we should approve it.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would just speak against Mr. Zelinski's amendment. I feel that \$1,500.00 would be counter-productive to what we are trying to do which is to save money.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to ask Mr. Zelinski a question. Mr. Zelinski, do you know, or could you tell me what the inflation rate was between 1947 and 1969?

MR. ZELINSKI: I don't think that's the question we're discussing now.

MR. ESPOSITO: That was the premise on which you based your reduction of the original motion, and I just want to point out the reduction was done without considering what the inflation rate was between 1947 and 1969, and the difference between that in 1969 and 1980. Your motion, I think is very arbitrary and it cuts across one of the most important things we should be trying to do in this City, in terms of the City government; and that is, generate efficient management. The purpose of raising the bid limitation is not to put the small people out of business, if those small vendors are going to offer the City the lowest price on any item, Mr. Canino will accept that. He has indicated to us that if the bid reduction is increased, that doesn't mean that he's not going to call around and ask what the prices are for a particular item; and so, if anyone, any vendor, wants to offer the City and item whether it cost \$2,000.00, \$1,000.00 or over \$3,000.00, if they offer it to us at the lowest price, they will still be considered. But the point is to increase the efficiency. Bidding does not necessarily increase Government efficiency, might even hinder Government efficiency. We've all seen in the Police Department how we're stuck with a number of cars that are lemons because of the bidding process. I can go on and on about that issue, and the garage, and a number of other things. The point is bidding, especially bidding for items under \$3,000.00 really deters the purchasing agent from conducting an efficient department and I think we should go along with this and defeat Mr. Zelinski's motion, which I feel is very arbitrary and based on no basic reality of fact.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I by no means wish to cut debate or limit debate but I would like to remind the Assembly that it's 10:20 P.M. and we're on item #1 of Fiscal so that if your point of view has already been expressed, can you please keep your remarks very short and to the point.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like to MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will now go on to a vote on the amendment to the main motion on the floor, which is that the proper bid limit be set to \$1,500.00. We will vote by use of the machine. The amendment to the MOTION has been DEFEATED by a vote of 31 to 6.

MR. BLUM: I would like to make an amendment that it be \$2,000.00 instead of \$3,000.00.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. POLLARD: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. GUROIAN: I meant to vote yes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Can you please change that. The amendment has been DEFEATED (voiced) by a vote of 29 opposed; 8 in favor. We will proceed to a vote on the Main Motion which is that the proper limit be set at \$3,000.00. Mrs. Maihock, did you want to change your vote? In what direction? Mrs. Maihock would like to change her vote to yes. The MOTION has been APPROVED by a vote of 30 in favor; 6 opposed; 2 abstentions.

- (2) \$25,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 PROFESSIONAL LEGAL SERVICES-  
Additional Appropriation requested by Deputy Counsel Boodman 12/26/79, and Mayor Clapes 12/28/79. Original request was for \$50,000 and Board of Finance approved \$25,000.00 on 1/10/80

MRS. HAWK: This is for money that will be paid to outside Counsel for cases that the City Corporation Counsel's Office cannot handle due to the nature of the case or the special expertise required in certain cases. Fiscal voted 9 in favor and none opposed and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mrs. Hawk, on item #2, \$25,000.00. Do you have a breakdown what they've spent already and to whom and for whom are they going to spend the \$25,000.00?

MRS. HAWK: So far the bulk of the money was spent for the Sewage Treatment litigation including \$14,872.00 to Tyler Cooper law firm and \$16,056.00 to York Research Corporation. There has also been \$10,000.00 encumbered for Mr. Austern to represent Chief Cizanckas.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Isn't that the lawyer who's supposed to take the case for nothing?

MRS. HAWK: We didn't hear anything about that. There is an additional bill on hand to be paid to Tyler Cooper for \$17,565.00 that will come out of this \$25,000.00.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd like to make a MOTION we reduce that amount to \$15,000.00.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DARER: I'd like to ask that the members of this Board vote against that amendment. We're in the process now of bringing litigation in connection with the Sewage Treatment Plant and the funds that are being asked for are necessary in context of that litigation. It would seem to me that there's a great deal at stake here. The defense against the law suit against the City and the City's law suit against the builder of the plant. So that we might be doing is creating a difficulty in those actions. The funds which are already in the Budget are either encumbered or spent. This is required for on-going actions of which I've been talking, so I think a vote against that amendment would be in order.

MR. ZELINSKI: I just wanted to make sure I'm clear on this. The \$25,000.00 additional request, what was the breakdown for the \$25,000.00 What is it going to be going for?

MRS. HAWE: Approximately \$17,000.00 will go for the last 3 months bill for the Sewage Treatment Plant litigation. In addition, and I'm sorry I didn't mention it before, Mr. Boccuzzi, but I just see it here in my notes. In addition, there is \$5,000.00 which will go for a Police brutality claim in which the Corporation Counsel Office represents the City, but they are also hiring the outside Counsel to defend the police officer in question. This will bring it up, that's \$22,000.00

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF INFORMATION. I read your figures. You had some money left from the original appropriation didn't you?

MRS. HAWE: There's \$733.00 left in the account that is either unspent or unencumbered.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Then I'm to assume that the Law Department is still going to come in for more money.

MRS. HAWE: I would assume so. They said that they will have to because they had requested \$50,000.00 and this request originally was cut to \$25,000. by the Board of Finance. They feel the \$50,000.00 could carry them through to the end of the year.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I am still going to stick to the \$10,000.00. Let them come in.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to speak in favor of the amendment to reduce it by \$10,000.00 or \$15,000.00 because I feel that just recently our Board approved a permanent Deputy Corporation Counsel to add to the Corporation Counsel's Office and I'm sorry I just can't see us having to continually hire outside counsel. I can see it with exceptions, rare exceptions, such as the Sewage Treatment Plant, but pertaining to other items, which I'd rather not go into, I feel that we have a fine legal staff in the Corporation Counsel's Office.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing)...Hopefully, very soon, we will be putting on a Corporation Counsel when the Mayor presents that name to us and I just feel that we've got to put a stop to this. I think the taxpayers have had it, and to have to go out to get other professional lawyers to defend the City for items that I think should be handled in-house is entirely unnecessary and I think this is the year that it must be stopped.

MR. POLLARD: I'm going to vote against any appropriation at all. I think those of us who served on the last Board and most particularly those who served on the Sewage Treatment Investigation Committee will recall that despite all the funds that were spent for outside legal fees and also despite promises and assurances of reports from York and the other Attorney, that in fact, this Board was never told specifically what those monies were for. We never did get a copy of York's report. The Law Department seems to just look upon us a puddle of money and seem to encumber certain funds that were earmarked for other purposes. I'm not going to vote for anything until we get a clear definition from the Law Department of what they're doing with the money and get some reports on the Sewage Treatment Plant's case progress and a report from York.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm just going to re-echo Mr. Pollard's comments because I could swear about 2 years ago, we appropriated \$75,000.00 for legal fees for this Sewage Treatment litigation. Ye. we have no breakdown on how the money was spent and I would also mention the fact that, they encumbered \$10,000.00 for Mr. Austern, which I believe we should just encumber those funds and use it for whatever the Law Department is looking for and as someone else mentioned, we keep going on the outside for all this legal expertise and yet we keep hiring permanent Deputy Counsels. I don't feel we are getting our money's worth out of our Law Department and, therefore, like Mr. Pollard, I would recommend denial of the whole \$25,000.

MR. DeNICOLA: I would like to direct the question to Mrs. Hawe. That \$10,000. is for Attorney David Austern?

MRS. HAWE: That's right.

MR. DeNICOLA: And Mr. Austern is from where, do you know?

MRS. HAWE: I'm not sure, Mr. DeNicola.

MR. DeNICOLA: And that is for Chief Cizanckas?

MRS. HAWE: That's right.

MR. DeNICOLA: And if I'm correct, it stated in the paper that he would do it for nothing, right?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know, you know, I'm telling you what we ascertained at our Fiscal Committee Meeting not what I've read in the paper so I can't comment on the veracity of that.

MR. DeNICOLA: I would like to make a MOTION we deny the whole \$25,000.00.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That motion is out of order. If you are not in favor of the amendment, vote against it, then you will have the opportunity to vote against the entire motion also, if you so choose.

MR. WIDER: I remember very well a few years ago, we voted our, as Mr. DeLuca says, \$75,000. for legal fees for the Sewage Treatment Plant and I would like to see this go back to Committee so that we can get some account of what has happened with that \$75,000. before we give then any more money for anything because it seems to be a lack of reporting to this Board what is happening to the taxpayers' money and I can't see myself voting continuously, voting out, without knowing what it's going for and especially knowing outside attorneys for our Chief, and so forth. I don't think this is right. I think that our public, our Corporation Counsel is qualified to represent all these people so I am against even the amendment.

MRS. CONTI: I wish to speak against the amendment because there are already bills on hand over and above the amount that this amendment would provide. There's a bill for \$17,400.00 and the Law Department did give us an adequate breakdown. The majority of this is going for the suit against Wyncote over the incinerator and we're paying \$90.00 an hour for the highest member of the firm and we're paying \$45.00 for a lesser member of the firm which as far as legal fees go, that is a very reasonable price and that's what the bill is for, so we really do need the whole \$25,000.

MR. JOYCE: On this of litigation, I'd like some information as to how, do we have a breakdown as to the attorneys' fees and the expert fees? In other words, do they separately report their billings as disbursements or experts in these cases or are they....

MRS. HAWK: We have of the money spent so far this year for the Sewage Treatment Plant, \$14,872.00 was to the Tyler Cooper Grant Bowerman Law Firm and \$16,056.00.

MR. JOYCE: Is that the law firm in New Haven Chever Tyler?

MRS. HAWK: I think it was, Mr. Joyce, and \$16,056. was to York Research.

MR. JOYCE: That's the expert that's been retained? Do we get hourly breakdowns on the legal, the time spent, and do we keep a running total on this litigation?

MRS. HAWK: We don't have the hours that that included, but we do have the price per hour as Mrs. Conti stated.

MR. JOYCE: May I recommend as a point of procedure that all of these bills, that every bill that's rendered that there be a rate per hour and the number of hours broken down into quarter hours required on all of these bills. Secondly, I think the question of negotiation, of you do have, if your've gone over your Budget, lawyers are not without possibilities of negotiation fees. If you feel a fee is improper for any reason, don't feel that it's cast in granite.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ESPOSITO: I share with my fellow Board Members the feeling that lawyers are grossly overpaid.

MR. JOYCE: POINT OF ORDER, YOUR HONOR, I didn't mean to say that.

MR. ESPOSITO: And unfortunately, though the realities of the facts of life we have to pay them because they're the only ones that can interpret the rules they write, but I would wonder Mrs. Chairman, if it is in order to make a motion to return this to Committee right now?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: - That motion would be in order.

MR. ESPOSITO: I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED. Now, that would be returning if we are going to move to return the amendment, we return the entire appropriation.

MR. ESPOSITO: That is the intention of my motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is a proper motion.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would rather vote on the amendment and vote to, if that would pass, vote to delete the \$10,000 and send back the \$15,000. I think that would be the proper way to handle it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry, a motion to refer to Committee takes precedence over a motion to amend, therefore, we will be voting on the motion to return to Committee, which is to re-commit, has been MOVED. SECONDED. We will take a machine vote on the motion. The MOTION has PASSED by a vote of 20 in favor; 18 opposed.

- (3) \$2,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5210 STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES - Addition  
Appropriation requested by Deputy Counsel Barry Boodman 12/26/79 and Mayor Clapes 12/28/79. For depositions and transcripts. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWK: This is to cover the cost of taking depositions of witnesses. The cost per page of these depositions has gone up from \$1.50 to \$2.75 per page, and the use of depositions has also gone up in such things as negligence suits and tax appeals. The Committee voted 9-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: The Secondary Committee concurs with Fiscal 5-0.

MR. DeLUCA: The only hang-up I have with this item is not the fact that they need the money, but if I understand the Charter properly, we can make transfers from one operating account to the other; like from a salary account to the Stenographer account, or travel?

MRS. HAWK: That's right. The Board of Finance does.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: Just for a point of information. We haven't had a Corporation Counsel for 2 months now and if memory serves me correctly, say, using the figure \$30,000.00 a year, that's \$2,500.00 a month, so there should be a surplus provided there haven't been any raises given out unbeknown to us, of \$5,000. Why can't we at this time recommend that they transfer some money from the salary account to cover the expense here, therefore, I would like to make a MOTION that we recommend denial of this and ask the Law Department to transfer some money from this pending surplus in the salary account to cover this item.

MRS. HAWK: Mr. DeLuca has a good point, in fact we asked the Deputy Corporation Counsel at our meeting this very question, why couldn't they transfer some salary money out? They said that, in answer to that question, they have already transferred some money out of the salary account due to the fact that there is no Corporation Counsel and they have transferred it into the overtime account because of the work-load and the lack of a Corporation Counsel, the others have been working overtime to some extent and the money has been transferred there.

MR. ESPOSITO: Just to clarify that, overtime account is not to pay other attorney. It's also been used to pay secretarial staff. They have been short-staffed; one person has been out due to illness and it's been used to fund overtime for the secretarial staff.

MR. DeLUCA: That's the secretarial staff that's getting the overtime because I understood Mrs. Hawk to say that the attorneys were getting the overtime pay. I thought they were salaried.

MRS. HAWK: It's the overtime account but it does pay the secretarial staff.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd just like to once again make a point which could eliminate question of this nature being asked. I can remember going back maybe it's not irrelevant to the question at hand, that we have requested from the Commissioner of Finance give us a breakdown on a monthly basis of what items were being transferred to different accounts, therefore, we could know at a moment's notice or instantly where the transfers have been made, therefore, we wouldn't have to ask questions of this nature, if we knew that money in the salary account was being transferred to different places.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote on #3. The Motion is to approve \$2,000.00 for Stenographic Services for the Law Dept. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been APPROVED by a vote of 27 in favor; 8 opposed; 3 abstentions.

- (4) \$50,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - CODE 230.5901 SETTLEMENT OF NON-CONTRACT CLAIM  
Additional Appropriation requested by Deputy Corporation Counsel  
B. Boodman 12/26/79, and Mayor Clapes 12/28/79. Bd. of Finance  
approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWK: ITEM #4 APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (5) \$130,000.00 - TRAFFIC AND PARKING DEPARTMENT - Resolution to amend the 1979/80 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET by adding a new project "#280.0658 STATE-ASSISTED PROJECTS - COMPUTER FEASIBILITY STUDY" - to be reimbursed by a 100% reimbursable grant from the Federal Government. Government reimburses City as we incur expenses. Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Calpes 12/28/79. Mr. Winkel's 12/4/79 letter plus data. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80. Planning Board approved unanimously 1/9/80.

MRS. HAWE: This item was approved unanimously by the Committee; however, we did not put it on the Consent Agenda because there is a typographical error on our Agenda. Where on our Agenda, it reads Code #280.0659, it should read #280.0658 and the Committee voted 9-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. JOYCE: Transportation concurs.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION is CARRIED. (voice vote)

- (6) \$1,182.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655.4183 MISCELLANEOUS SELF-SUSTAINING PROGRAMS - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 12/19/79 and Supt. Giordano 12/17/79. Fees collected to date are \$6,182.00 which is \$1,182.00 over the \$5,000.00 appropriated. Fees are collected from Exercise-Acting Class-Modern Dance. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

- (7) \$45,662.98 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 650.1170 PERSONNEL APPEALS AWARDS

Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 12/28/79 and Supt. Giordano 12/11/79 for Connecticut State Labor Board decision for awards made to Recreation employees Iacovo, DelMazzio, Veal, Ritchie, Franchina and McMahon. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: This is to pay for State Labor Relations Board award to 6 Recreation Supervisors. The money will go to the 6 Supervisors in amounts ranging from \$2,238.00 to \$11,548.00. The City had argued that as Supervisors, they were not entitled to overtime differential, etc. The State Labor Relations Board ruled they were entitled to these things and the City now has to pay. Fiscal voted 9-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Personnel Committee approved it unanimously.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote)



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (8) \$ 77,647.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - CODE ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE - Code 551.7559 - WINTER ENERGY PROGRAM - Additional Appropriation per request of Mayor Clapes and Dr. Gofstein 12/28/79. To be received as a State Grant for fuel assistance, emergency repairs and senior outreach per Public Act 79-11, to be used by 6/30/80. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: This is a Grant given by the State to Communities to enable them to address the following problems: a) Housing abandonment due to lack of fuel, b) Capital expenditures for energy conservation, c) Senior outreach program. The Grant will, if approved, be administered by the Health Department since they already have a mechanism functioning there in the Emergency Repair Program of the Code Enforcement Task Force. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 2 opposed and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY: Health & Protection Committee met and approved unanimously.

MRS. CONTI: I would just like to say I voted against this in Fiscal because with the present state of the State of Connecticut, as far as money goes, they probably will not give us this Grant again next year and if we get people accustomed to receiving this kind of assistance this year, then the taxpayers of Stamford will have to pick it up and take care of it next year. So I urge everyone to vote against it.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm going to urge everyone to vote for this. If we do not receive this next year, so be it. The facts are if we don't receive it this year, some other Community will have it. Who is to say what's to happen in Hartford next year. This is money earmarked to served people. The State is going to spend this money regardless of what we may decide to do. This is our share of that money and by all means, I feel we should accept it.

MRS. SIGNORE: I wish to abstain due to a possible conflict.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN. We will note that. The MOTION HAS BEEN PASSED, by a vote of 26 in favor; 5 opposed.

- (9) \$8,026.09 - REGISTRARS, OF VOTERS - Code 101.31.50 ELECTION EXPENSES - Additional Appropriation per Mayor's request and Registrars' request 12/6/79, for 11/6/79 municipal election expenses. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

ITEM #9 APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

- (10) \$1,130.62 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3121 - ELECTION RE-CANVASS Additional Appropriation per Mayor's and Registrars request 12/28/79 for recount of election returns. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

ITEM #10 APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (11) \$880,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE 1979/80 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING TO "PROJECT #320.365 PUBLIC WORKS MAINTENANCE COMPLEX" an additional amount to complete construction as original contractor went into bankruptcy. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80. Requested by Mayor Clapes 1/8/80 unanimously approved this request.

MRS. HAWE: This additional amount of money to complete construction of the facility. \$2,000,690.00 in Federal Grant money has already been approved for this project. Of this \$1,223,259.00 has been spent; and on our desk tonight, was a breakdown showing where this money has gone; this portion of the Grant money. There is a balance of \$754,039.00 left of this Grant money in this account. The \$880,000.00 now being requested would be City money and would be financed by Bonds. An effort is being made to recover this money from the former building bonding company. Fiscal voted 7 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. PERILLO: Public Works voted 3 yes; 1 abstention.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like to make a motion to return this back to Committee for further report in view of the fact that if this project was properly bonded with a performance bond, then we should not be voting additional funds to pay for the project to be completed; if in fact, the contractor went bankrupt or went out of business.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWE: I would urge the Board Members to vote against this amendment. The Bond that we had signed at the time was required due to the fact that a Federal Grant was involved. Technically, the low bidder would hold to his price until the beginning of March; however, if we were to defer this for another month to hold it in Committee to our March Meeting and the deadline, the contract would have to be signed, the Company that is going to do the building would have to present documentation to the City for certain bonding requirements. It's an involved thing that the Law Department feels could not be done in that short a space of time. I'm not saying that you know this is one more instance when we have to do it this month, but I think in the judgement of the Committee, it's better if we do. If possible, if we could pass it this month. I don't think anything is going to change. The question of what kind of a Bond it is, is something that is going to have to be litigated one way or another and the sooner we get litigation started, the sooner we get this building started; the less additional cost due to inflation we will incur and the Committee feels, 7 Members of the Committee feel anyway, that this is the best way to minimize losses to the City and perhaps recoup as much of this \$880,000. as we possibly can; so I would urge my fellow Board Members to vote against this amendment and vote for the original proposal.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Let me ask Rep. Hawe pertaining to this, what you just mentioned, that we might lose some time on this. Is it true that the Purchasing Agent had told the bidders that they have a 90-day period where the bids must be held at price before they would proceed depended upon our action? Is that correct? I had gotten that information.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, there was a 90-day hold on this bid, on this price. Usually on bids there is a 45-day, but on this bid there was a 90, so the 90 days will be up the 15th of March. That's when the 90 days will be up. But, as I just said, the Committee feels that, that if we hold it we might be cutting it a little close since all this paper work and bid requirement, and bonding requirements have to be gotten in between the time we appropriate the money and the Contractor signs. If it's not signed by the 15th of March, then the price will go up.

MR. ZELINSKI: The only thing I would like to say then, I would like to speak on the motion to keep this back in Committee. I would also like to see that done. I think this is an extremely large appropriation \$880,000.00 and because of all the things that have happened since this garage was first planned, and how the price has been creeping up and up, I think that we do have to proceed at a little bit slower pace now and I think that if we wait even until our next meeting, which will be before the deadline of March 15th of the 90 days, that this way all of us will have time to research this and then we could vote more intelligently on it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: We're being asked to appropriate \$880,000.00 and I regret to say that the Fiscal Committee hasn't found out all the facts to bring forth to the Board of Representatives as to why and what happened, and as a result, I feel that if we're going to be asked to appropriate such a large sum of money, we be given an opportunity to look at all the facts before we vote on it and that is the reason for my motion.

MR. LIVINGSTON: If we're going to decide to hold this in Committee, I think we should be careful about what we're doing. We're all complaining about this \$880,000.00 figure, if we do hold this in Committee and for some reason or another, our 90-day period is over with, then it's only going to cost us more money than perhaps what it's costing us now. If we decide to hold this in Committee, I think a responsible action on our part would be that this Board meets again this month on this particular item, but to hold this in Committee just for the sake of holding it, seeking additional information and then to jeopardize this whole bid, I don't think we're doing the kind of service that we should be providing the people of Stamford.

MR. DeNICOLA: We're talking on an item of \$880,000.00. It is not \$5,000 or \$10,000. This is a large sum of money for the City. If we lose the money to the bonding company, which is possible, very possible, they will come back to the City after we appropriate \$880,000.00, they will come back for more money. Who's to say they are not going to come back, what happens then? I feel at this point it should go back to Committee and be re-studied.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Through you to Mr. Wiederlight, I'm concerned as to what question Mr. Wiederlight and the rest of the Board want Fiscal to ask. We felt we've done the research on this and maybe I could have an answer to that, maybe Mrs. Hawe and myself could try to answer any questions that come up. I don't really think to go back to something that Mr. Zelinski said before, these figures aren't going to change between now and next month and if you have questions, we'll try to answer them. First prove that we can't answer the questions.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: First of all, what happened to the bond that was put up by the contractor who originally went out of business? What type of bond was it and why is it not collectible?

MR. ESPOSITO: This is the core of the whole issue. The City of Stamford feels, first of all, there are two types of bonds. There's a performance bond which is a bond that when the contractor goes out of business, the bonding company assumes the continuation of the project to completion. We, in the City of Stamford, felt that we had this kind of bond. There is also another type of bond called an indemnity bond and that type of bond is one in which when a contractor goes out of business, the City completes the project and if at the end of the project, the City can prove that it has sustained a loss, it can make a claim to the Bonding Company, and the Bonding Company can evaluate that claim and pay it if they so desire upon the evaluation. The Bonding Company at this point is arguing that they have an indemnity bond. We are arguing we have a performance bond. There's no way of resolving that unless we take it to litigation. The only way the City can proceed to litigation is by showing we sustained a loss. The only way we can show we sustained a loss, is if we complete the project, therefore, to wait another month to re-evaluate this, solves nothing. We've got to appropriate the money, we've got to complete the project, we've got to proceed with the litigation and then we can hope to win the case in court.

MR. DARER: Fiscal responsibility begins with issues like this. For example, if we put this in very simple terms, and we take an average homeowner who has a policy on his house and that house burns down, there's no guarantee the insurance company is going to pay him the full face value of that policy. He'll get an adjuster, the insurance company will get an adjuster, and they'll come to some conclusion as to what they should pay on the loss. I don't think we should be shocked to find out that a Bonding Company has some dispute as to a claim. There's no granted right when you pay a premium for something that you're going to collect. That item can be litigated and at some point judicial process will decide who is correct and who is not. In the interim period here, we as legislators, have a responsibility to see that this garage gets completed. I think Mr. Esposito gave a very lucid clear explanation of the bonding process; the situation that the City finds itself in now. We have only one course of action and that is to get this garage completed. We have actions on 2 bases against the bonding company (1) as to whether it's a performance bond or indemnity bond and (2) when we complete it, if they will pay us on indemnification. In any event, standing still and delaying this serves the City in no way and we should get on with this and get it completed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. FAUTEUX: I'd like to add one further observation to Mr. Darer's. If we persist in delaying this and it does finally end up in the court, which it will, because of the insurance company's position, we may be found at fault for missing the cost escalation that's going to continue to go on and so we may even weaken our case by delaying this further. It should be kept in mind that this \$880,000.00 will probably be recovered in the long run; so to delay is to jeopardize our case even further. We need that garage and addition.

MRS. CONTI: My concern at Fiscal was and it still is, is whether it is necessary to litigate to get the payment on an indemnity bond and since we have, well that's the contention. The insurance company contends an indemnity bond and we contend it's a performance bond. However, if the insurance company contends it is an indemnity bond, I'm convinced it is because the insurance companies have the best lawyers in the world. They never lose a penny, but since we have one legal mind on the Board, I wonder if we might ask Mr. Joyce through the Chair, is it necessary to litigate to collect on an indemnity bond because I'm concerned about putting the taxpayers through this additional expense plus litigation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm afraid Mrs. Conti, we're going to proceed to the next speaker and we will put Mr. Joyce on the list if he so chooses to speak.

MRS. MAIHOCK: None of us like the \$880,000.00 but on the advice of Mr. Frattaroli Mrs. Hawe stated we should proceed. There is also the possibility that we haven't considered that this figure could be higher yet because of change orders should they occur.

MR. WIDER: Well, I hate to look at \$880,000.00. That's a big figure in my book, being a poor man, but I hate to look at that unfinished City garage in my district and while I kind of understand what's happening here, we are going to have to come up with some cost and some loss in order for the lawyers to have something to fight with. You see, you can't fight it if you haven't lost anything; you can't get up there and tell the jury you lost something because you didn't lose anything. We're going to have to complete that garage. That will be a loss, then we can fight for it.

MR. JOYCE: Just one question before I respond. To the Fiscal Committee, the bonding company, who is the bonding company?

MRS. HAWE: North River Insurance Company.

MR. JOYCE: Are they a, I don't want to use the term. Are they a solid company?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, they are.

MR. JOYCE: So, our chances are we're not running into a situation where if we should win litigation, they would be judgment proof or evade us in any way.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: No, we questioned the representatives of the Law Department and they didn't think there was any change of that. Provided, you know, the courts determination.

MR. JOYCE: Right, in other words, if we reduce our loss to a judgment, we're not going to have a situation collecting, getting a piece of paper without being able to collect on it. In other words, your opinion from the Law Department, I assume they checked the strength of the bonding company out to the extent that we're not going to get a paper judgment. It would be a real judgment where we could collect the \$880,000.00.

MRS. HAWE: They and the purchasing department, also.

MR. JOYCE: All satisfied?

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MR. JOYCE: My feeling in view of that, then, is without having seen the opinion of the Corporation Counsel, I'd say in general, that we must proceed through the channels for recourse.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have a question to Mr. Esposito through the Chair. What did the bid specifications require as far as a bond went?

MR. ESPOSITO: I'm sorry I can't answer that Mr. Wiederlight. Mrs. Hawe, can you

MRS. CONTI: I think I can, if Marie can't.

MRS. HAWE: Go ahead, Betty.

MRS. CONTI: Actually, it was a Federal Contract and they were not specific enough so that the indemnity bond was sufficient for their Federal specs.

MR. FAUTEUX: We were told that it was a Federal Project and at the time GSA, which is General Services Administration was specifying the indemnity type of bond for such projects. Such was the bond provided, although apparently there were some conditions attached to it by the City to attribute to a performance aspect.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Yet we accept performance bonds from the contractors that do business with the City, but we accept an indemnity bond because it was a Federal Project. Is that true, Mr. Esposito?

MR. ESPOSITO: I take exception to the fact that the City has accepted an indemnity bond. That has not been established. We contend that we have accepted a performance bond. I want to make that point clear.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We are going to move to a vote. We will vote by use of the machine. The Motion is to recommit item #11 which is for \$880,000.00. for the Public Works Dept. Mr. Guglielmo, you want to change your vote from what to what? Alright, please change your vote yourself by voting up. Mr. DeNicola, you want to vote yes? You may do it. Have you changed Mr. DeNicola? Are you registering properly on the machine? We are going to count? The MOTION to RETURN to COMMITTEE DENIED, 13 yes; 25 no.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will now vote on Public Works Dept. Amendment to the Capital Project Budget.

MR. ZELINSKI: How many votes are needed for this approval?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: This motion will need 2/3 of those present and that is according to 611.7 of the Charter. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been DEFEATED by a vote of 22 in favor; 14 opposed; 2 abstains.

- (12) \$19,300.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 341 - Sewage Treatment Plant  
Additional Appropriation per Mayor's request and Deputy PW  
Commissioner John Canavan's letter 1/7/80. Bd. of Finance  
approved 1/10/80.

341.1201	Over-time	\$15,300.00
341.3711	Laboratory Supplies	4,000.00

ITEM # 12 APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

- (13) \$1,500.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 345.2610 EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE  
SANITARY PUMPING STATION - Additional Appropriation requested  
by Mayor and Deputy PW Commissioner John Canavan 1/7/80.  
Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 9-0 in favor to this and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd just like to ask the same question I did with the Law Dept. before. Have funds from the Public Works Commissioner's salary been transferred to some other account, if not, is it possible to transfer \$5,000.00 of surplus to the fact that we haven't had a Public Works Commissioner for 2 months?

MRS. HAWE: We did not question the Public Works Dept. on that but it is a good point and we could certainly bring it up next month because they're coming in for quite a few appropriations.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I am going to take a machine vote. The MOTION HAS BEEN LOST by a vote of 25 yes; 10 no; 3 abstains.

- (14) \$50,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Incinerator Maintenance of Facilities  
Code 346.2311 - Equipment and Building Maintenance - Additional  
Appropriation requested by Mayor and Deputy PW Commissioner  
1/7/80. Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: Item #14 was approved unanimously by our Committee; however, it was not put on the Consent Agenda due to the fact, that the account for which it is being approved was not clear on the Agenda. It should read Public Works Dept. Code 346.2311 Maintenance of Facilities Incinerator. Approximately \$50,000. had been budgeted for a planned preventive maintenance program; however, due to major

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...emergency work on the incinerator, this money has been spent. This appropriation will replace the money for the Preventive Maintenance Program. Fiscal voted 9-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. PERILLO: Public Works concurs.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask a question as to when this money was used on the incinerator, when this was supposed to be for preventive maintenance?

MRS. HAWE: On the emergency work that was not anticipated, that has occurred, since the beginning of the Fiscal year was listed on the form that we received from the Public Works Dept. It included a major breakdown of the truck scale in July, major breakdown of the fly ash conveyor chain, emergency repairs to the furnace roof, the sidewall, four ash tub repairs and water cooler hopper and brick for disintegrated wall section and that added up to \$50,860.00 and therefore, the money that had been planned for preventive maintenance was no longer there and this is what they want to replace.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED. (voice) (Mr. Joyce voted no).

(15)    \$300 000.00    PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - LANDFILL AND REFUSE REMOVAL  
Code 351.5520 CONTRACT HAYLAWAY    Additional Appropriation  
requested by Mayor and Deputy PW Commissioner 1/7/80.  
Bd. of Finance approved 1/10/80.

MRS. HAWE: We have a paper on our desk tonight showing what has been spent each month for the haulaway program. Depending on how much sludge can be burned in the future, the Public Works Department has told us that they may have to come in for additional funds, and I see that in our packet tonight, there is a request for additional funds for next month. Fiscal voted 8-0 in favor and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. PERILLO: Public Works concurs.

MR. BLUM: As long as we have a truck sitting for \$65,000.00 that was supposed to start a pilot program in the haulaway program and as yet as far as I know, there's still no driver been found, and isn't that a shame we got many people who know how to drive trucks, right here in our City employees, but as yet, I haven't heard any driver. Yet this pilot program has not yet started and with the figures that I saw for this evening on the haulaway, close to \$900,000. for 6 months of hauling landfill and refuse away, I'm going to vote against this \$300,000. until the Mayor and his Deputy Public Works Commissioner starts this program up.

MRS. CONTI: I just want to say I abstained on this Fiscal because I felt that Public Works provided insufficient information for anyone to really make an intelligent vote on this, so I will abstain.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. GUGLIELMO: I would just like to echo Representative Blum's feelings on this matter. I feel that we are being hostage by the Public Works Department in their refusal to get this haulaway project underway, and on that basis I will vote against this appropriation.

MRS. HAWK: I'd just like to say three things in response to some things that a few Representatives have said. First of all, Mrs. Conti was right. The information from the Public Works Department was appalling; however, tonight we did have this breakdown on our desk which I think is something that is very useful for us to see where the money has gone each month. Second, this account is going to be approaching what we spent last year which was, it appears anyway, which was \$1,841,000 and the main problem is the fact that the magnum presses at the incinerator which we were told at budget time last year, people who are members of the Fiscal Committee will remember, that they hope to have them on line in the beginning of September and drying out the sludge and, therefore, able to burn a lot of it so we would not have to truck it all away; however, as these things happen, that was not the case. The date was moved up to the middle of November and it turns out that just now they are starting to dry the sludge to a sufficient dryness to enable them to burn some of it, and this is why this appropriation is needed. The third thing I want to mention is we did question Mr. Spaulding who was on his second day on the job and who came to our Fiscal Committee meeting and we did question him as to what he might be doing in the future concerning the proposed haulaway by the City and the truck that stands in the lot and he said that at that time, last Wednesday, he had a stack of papers and reports on his desk concerning that and he was going to get to it and that was his response to us, which I think was all we could expect since he only been on the job for two days .

MR. DZIEZYC: When I see that truck moving the debris to the transfer site, then we should vote on this appropriation; otherwise no.

MR. WIDER: Again, that smell is in my district and I did a little checking out to find out some qualifications. Since Mr. Blum ask the Mayor per Steering Committee Meeting last week about the truck, and I come out to find that we have a registered heavy equipment truck driver working for the City of Stamford with the Sewage Department and we're being told that we can't find a driver. So, the question in my mind is whether it's more profitable not to get a driver and we appropriate this money than it is to go and hire a driver. To be honest with you I have voted out so much money for this Sewage Treatment Plant and Haulaway Program that I'm ashamed to meet the people in the streets because the smell is still there.

MR. DARER: I think the question of the truck is on all our minds; however, and I'm not trying to apologize for the Public Works Department at all. I do feel though that the question of the truck involves just more than a driver. It involves insurance, breakdown and repair services, a loader for the truck. Many things which are not available if that truck break down on a delivery site someplace far out of the City, we can end up costing a lot more than the current haulaway program, whose cost per ton, I understand, is relatively good and we



FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont,)

MR. DARER: (continuing)...still have another year to go on the Contract. Now, the point is that what we're trying to do now is reduce the cost, reduce the high expense in trucking, to lower expense by drying it. Now, I think you know, if someone wanted to vote against this \$3000,000.00, I could understand that because the only way, I think, we are going to really encourage that Public Works Department to finally get this thing in order is maybe to start reducing the funding for the haulaway program. If they feel we're just not going to come forward every time they ask for money, maybe someone will finally get this thing together. I think the Commissioner is trying and I think he understands the problem and will address it and attack it quickly, but I think the only answer at some point is stop the funding.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I seem to recall, Mr. Darer, you've got the right idea about stopping the funding, but I recall last time we stopped the funding, the Mayor closed down the transfer site and the only people that suffered were the people bringing the stuff down to Hanover Street. So, I don't know turning the money down would actually do the job. I'm a little bit uptight about this truck myself but at this point in time, I don't think we have many alternatives but to appropriate the \$300,000.00. My personal opinion is we're never going to see that truck on the road. It's going to take another \$100,000.00 just to put it on the road.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We're going to proceed to a vote. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been DEFEATED by a vote of 22 in favor; 12 opposed; 2 abstentions. This needed a 2/3 vote of those present.

- (16) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT WITH STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO RECEIVE \$3,300. FOR RELOCATION OF FIRE HYDRANT FACILITIES NECESSITATED BY CONSTRUCTION ALONG ROUTE I-95 AT EXIT 8.  
Mayor Clapes' letter 1/17/80

MRS. HAWES: Fiscal approved this unanimously. However, it was not put on the Consent Agenda due to the fact that the Resolution should read \$3,300. instead of just the \$3,000.00 that is on our Agenda. This grant will cover three fire hydrants that must be moved due to the construction. The State will assume all cost and the Walter Company will do the work. Fiscal voted 9-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. JOYCE: Transportation concurs.

MR. ESPOSITO: Just so there's no confusion here and this doesn't create a problem later on, Transportation did not meet on this item and I think we should move to waive the Secondary Committee report. Also that is true of Item #5. I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. JOYCE: I disagree with Mr. Esposito. I believe we discussed this at our meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Did you take a vote on it Mr. Joyce, that's really what is necessary.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Mrs. Maihock and I are both on the Committee and we don't remember it.

MR. JOYCE: We may not have taken a vote. We discussed it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let's just go on to waiving the Secondary Committee Report. It's been MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. I would like to do the same just for the record for #5.

MR. ESPOSITO: So MOVED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. #16 is the motion that we are discussing and it is on the floor. It has been duly seconded. The MOTION is CARRIED. (voice vote)

MRS. HAWE: I'd like to MOVE the followings items on the Consent Agenda: Item #4, #6, #9, #12.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Ralph Loomis and John Zelinski

MR. ZELINSKI: Legislative and Rules Committee met on Monday, January 28th in the Republican Caucus Room at 7:30. Those Representatives present were Mr. Loomis, Mr. Wiederlight, Mr. Donahue, Mr. Franselli, Mr. Corbo, Mr. Conti, Mr. Pollard, and Mr. Zelinski.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR EXEMPTION TO HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PAYMENT OF FEES FOR DUMPING AT SOLID WASTE TRANSFER SITE. Letter of 12/11/79 from Atty. Sydney Kweskin. Held in Committee 1/14/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE because the Attorney did not attend that meeting to explain that particular abatement.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT TO SALVATION ARMY, INC., for clergyman's residence at 36 Pepper Ridge Road property purchased. Submitted by Atty. W.J. Murray 12/7/79. Approved for publication 1/14/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: This originally was a two-step abatement; one, dealing with the abatement for the clergy residence itself; and the other was dealing with the Sewer assessment. There was a slight change which I'd like to read into the Record pertaining to that first part which is the one dealing with the clergy residence.

Proposed Ordinance Supplemental Property Tax Exemption for the Salvation Army Inc., under the Connecticut General Statutes Title 12-8-1 Subsection 715,: Be it ordained by the City of Stamford that pursuant to the Connecticut General Statutes Assessment of Taxes Title 12-8-1, Subsection 7 and 15 of said General Statutes, the Commissioner of Finance be and is hereby

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing)...authorized and directed to reimburse the Salvation Army Inc., Charitable and Religious Institution in the amount of \$90.24 paid by said Salvation Army Inc., for Real Estate taxes for the first half list of October 1, 1978 on property purchased.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry to interrupt you, but before we..what is your motion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Well, I was going to make a motion that our Committee voted to approve one part of the Ordinance, which I was reading with the correction.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It wasn't clear. You are moving for the adoption of the following Ordinance, is that it Mr. Zelinski?

MR. ZELINSKI: For final adoption, yes. As I said earlier, there are two parts; one we're holding which I'll get into after we pass the first one which I was reading. If I may continue then?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, please, this is on our table. It was put there tonight? Is that what you're saying?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, it was given to us before. The only change was the subsections were different and I do have the correction. That's what I was reading into the Record. List of October 1, 1978 on Property purchased by it for purposes of a residence of its officiating Stamford Clergyman from Alicia Stevenson at 36 Pepper Ridge Road in the City of Stamford, Connecticut on December 5, 1979 and further to exempt said Salvation Army for the payment of Real Estate Property Taxes on the List of October 1, 1978 for the second half due and payable in January 1980 and further to exempt said Salvation Army for Real Estate Tax on List of October 1, 1979 due and payable one-half on July 1, 1980 and one-half on January 1, 1981. This Ordinance shall take effect on the date of its enactment and our Committee so MOVED unanimously and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (One opposed Mrs. McInerney) (voice)

MR. ZELINSKI: There was a second part of that which we're going to be HOLDING that dealt with the exemption and abatement pertaining to the Sewer Assessment on which a question has been raised that has never been done before and the Corporation Counsel is exploring that, so we're HOLDING that second part.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR CITY TO CHARGE FEES FOR COST OF PUBLISHING LEGAL NOTICES, NOTICES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS (when necessary), ETC., FOR APPLICANTS REQUESTING TAX ABATEMENT, TAX EXEMPTION, EASEMENTS GRANTED FOR \$1.00, ETC.  
Submitted by Board Clerk Annie Summerville. Held 1/14/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: ITEM #3 IS BEING HELD IN COMMITTEE.



LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY AT TRESSER BOULEVARD TO CONNECTICUT NEWSPAPERS, INC. in the sum of \$230,000.00 LESS \$25,900.00 (cost of relocating recreational facilities), for a net of \$204,100.00. Bd. of Finance approved 11/8/79. Planning Board approved also. Mayor's re-submission 12/17/79. Held 1/14/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee did move for Publication, however, there is an amendment which again I would like to read into the Record.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski, if we have the amendment on our desk, and I believe most of us have received it in the mail, there's no reason to read it in the Record. The Administrative Assistant will make it part of the Record.

MR. ZELINSKI: I just wanted to make sure that everyone knew what they were voting on.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have to first move our motion. Go ahead, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee met and moved unanimously for publication again with the Amendment which, if you say they all have it, fine.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: On this item here, we're voting for Publication of it tonight and next month we're going to be voting to finalize the Ordinance for the sale of this land. And, to me, it represents a case of double standards. Granted, we went out and got two appraisals for it. The first one was a rip-off to the City; the second one is beneficial to the City. I remember going back at our August Meeting where we had various parcels of City land available for sale, many small contractors were interested in putting in bids for this here, but L&R Committee voted to reject the publication, reject the Ordinance in its entirety because it was felt that with the re-appraisal and re-assessment coming out, it would be beneficial for the City to wait two more years until re-assessment was over and then put this land out for sale. But, yet tonight, because big business is involved, we go out and get two different appraisals. We don't say let's wait for the re-assessment to be completed; therefore, if we're here to represent all the people in the City of Stamford, big business and the small contractor, I think it would be our duty to resubmit the item that we rejected at our August Meeting, or March Meeting, that we would go and get two appraisals for the various parcels that we rejected so the small contractor can go out and bid and develop this here rather than wait two years from now.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The Motion is for Publication of ~~the~~ Proposed Ordinance for the Sale of City owned Property. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION IS CARRIED, 36 yes; 2 abstentions; none opposed.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO CONTROL AND REGULATE EXCAVATION, FILLING AND GRADING. Re-submitted by City Rep. McInerney. Held in Steering 1/2/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: This is being HELD FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE PRIVATE GARBAGE COLLECTORS.  
Re-submitted by City Rep. B. McInerney.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #6 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (7) REQUEST FROM MAYOR FOR THIS BOARD TO FORMALLY ACCEPT THE STATE FUEL ASSISTANCE LOAN PROGRAM - per Mayor Clapes' letter 12/28/79. Stamford may receive up to \$75,021 to provide loans to residents to help pay their fuel bills, per Public Act 79-13. These to be loans which City would collect and pay back to State by Nov. 1, 1980; interest at 5%; in case of default, State bears loss. (No action required by Bd. of Finance on this; they did discuss it.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 6 in favor with 2 abstentions. I would MOVE FOR APPROVAL.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI: There was some questions raised and I have a letter from Susan Brewster the Grants Officer. One question was asked and she replied "the money we will receive may be invested by the City until needed and the interest earned may be kept by the City".

MRS. CONTI: I just want to say I object to the City going into the loan business.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd just like to point out that it's a no-risk loan business, that we cannot lose on this one.

MR. CONTI: I believe that a dis-service would be done to whoever would become involved in this. There is 5% interest that would be paid. Now this interest is due by October 1st, to be repaid to the State by the City by November 1st, and if you count on your fingers, there's a number of months that if anyone borrows any money, they can borrow up to an amount of \$360.00. If they had been purchasing oil from any oil company for any length of time, this \$360.00 is not an over-bearing burden which could be carried by the oil company with no interest rate whatsoever. If there is an interest rate, it would be 1% per month and if any payment is made on that, you will find it comes out less than 5% so I think anybody and, the way this may be done, is anyone earning three times over poverty level may borrow up to \$360.00. Now the poverty level at this time for four people would be \$6,700. or a person can be making up to \$20,000.00 a year and they are eligible to borrow \$360.00.; to me, it just doesn't make sense. I would vote against it.

MR. GUGLIELMO: Just a correction on that interest computation that Mr. Conti just went over. 1% or as far as I can determine, I believe most oil companies are now charging 1½% per month, and on an annualized basis that is 18% or 12% even if its 1% per month, versus the 5% annualized interest rate in this program.

MR. CONTI: I believe in Connecticut 1% is the greatest amount they can possibly be charged; and also, if I may continue on this, there also is a 10% that would be spent for Administrative expenses so we would be spending \$7,500.00 for no gain whatsoever.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. ZELINSKI: Just to finalize this, I'd just like to say this, that this would be a help to homeowners even if it helped one or two people in the City, I think it would be worthwhile and I would certainly hope that this does pass.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION IS CARRIED by a vote of 21 yes; 15 no; 2 abstentions.

- (8) PROPOSED CHANGE TO RULES OF ORDER OF THE 16th BOARD - by Rep. Corbo 1/16/80, as follows:

Page 4, under "Committees", ADD another STANDING COMMITTEE under Item #1:

Transportation Committee.....5 members

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor; and 3 against and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask this Board to vote in favor of this Standing Committee for the Transportation Committee. I feel with all the items and what's happening in this City, that we need this particular Committee to be a Standing Committee as well as any other Committee that is now what we call Standing, namely, Public Works, EWG, Personnel and so on. We've got a new Committee called Transportation and we are going to have many, many problems. I think it's necessary that a Transportation Committee be a oversight Committee over this Traffic and parking Commission and I so MOVE.

MRS. PERILLO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I would like to know if my fellow Board Members being this was part of a package that we did consider at our last Board Meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry that is not a Point of Personal Privilege.

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF INFORMATION. If this, in fact, were passed, would it not entail amending one of the other Rules of Order with regard to the member of people on Steering?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is something that will have to be discussed in Steering at the next meeting. Please vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been DEFEATED by a vote of 18 yes; 20 no.

- (9) REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION TO APPOINT A CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE/COMMISSION AS SUGGESTED BY SACIA to Mayor Clapes to upgrade City Government. Said Committee to study and bring back recommendation whether whole Charter should be re-written. Plenty of time to be given them to perform this task. Submitted 1/16/80 by Rep. G. Rybnick.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #9 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - David I. Blum, Chairman

- (1) LETTER OF DEC. 29, 1979 FROM CITY REP. ROBERT GABE DeLUCA REQUESTING POLICY OF "HIRES AND FIRES" BE CLARIFIED FOR ALL HIRING AUTHORITIES BY THE PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT AND COMMISSION. Held in Committee 1/14/80.

MR. BLUM: As to Item #1, Personnel Committee met with the Personnel Commission and the Personnel Director of the City of Stamford, Thursday, January 24th at 8:00 P.M. to discuss item #1 on the Personnel Committee's Agenda pertaining to the letter from Rep. DeLuca. Those in attendance of the Personnel Committee: Moira Lyons, Vice Chairman, Michael Wiederlight, John Hogan, Philip Stork, John Dziezyc, David Blum, Chairman. Absent; Doris Bowlby. A fruitful dialogue was had between the Commission and our Committee in regard to all Personnel matters pertaining to personnel relations between management and employees under their direction. The Committee and the Commission also discussed bringing all City employees under the Civil Service System and its regulation. As a result of these discussions, Mr. Rinella and myself, as Chairman of the Personnel Committee, suggested a special committee and agreed on by all present to be made up of our committee; a sub-committee from the Personnel Commission, Board of Finance, possibly a representative from the Mayor's office and other interested organizations, namely, labor, to come up with solutions of training of Management Personnel and the question of bringing all City employees under the Civil Service Systems.

MR. DeLUCA: That wasn't the intent of my letter to bring all personnel under the Civil Service System. All I was interested in was the "Hiring and Firing" of people. I don't know why we're going into something that I did not request.

MR. BLUM: May I answer that, because of other items that were on our Agenda, we not only discussed your particular item, and may I also say this, our Committee at the very inception when we took up the Bosilevas Case, had discussed about the firing and hiring policy but we continued to bring up your letter because that was the particular item that was on our Agenda.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Can you direct your remarks just to the Hires and Fires portion of that meeting with Personnel Commission.

MR. BLUM: Tuesday, January 29th, our Committee elected the following members to this Special Committee: Moira Lyons, Chairman, Michael Wiederlight and Philip Stork. That's my report on Item #1.

- (2) PROPOSED LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION AND STAMFORD EDUCATION ASSN., ADMINISTRATION UNIT.

ITEM #2 CONSIDERED RIGHT AFTER "APPOINTMENTS" - APPROVED.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (cont.)

- (3) RESOLUTION GRANTING MEDICAL BENEFITS OF FAIR RENT COMMISSION'S FULL-TIME INVESTIGATOR (FORMERLY A PART-TIME EMPLOYEE). Held in Steering 1/2/80.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to make a MOTION that this Board adopt Proposed Resolution #986-A Supplemental authorizing insurance coverage for certain officers, agents and employees of the Fair Rent Commission. Everyone has a copy of this Resolution.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: The Fair Rent Commission had its representative Rev. Lorenzo Robinson make a presentation for its full-time investigator for health, life and dental benefits, that are part of all other City employees that are being denied these employees because of his status as a Classified employee in the City. It was brought out that as long as they are considered un-classified employees, they will always be looking into this Board of Representatives for these benefits. Also, in order to keep good employees, we must give them these benefits or face the chances of losing them to other departments or outside industries. As a result, our Committee voted 6-0 in favor of Resolution 986-A Supplemental.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been PASSED by a vote of 20 in favor and 12 opposed; 5 abstentions. This Resolution needs a simple majority.

- (4) RESOLUTION GRANTING FRINGE BENEFITS TO COMMISSION ON AGING EMPLOYEES AS LISTED IN THEIR LETTER. 12/28/79. Held in Committee at Steering 1/2/80.

MR. BLUM: I would like to make a MOTION that we adopt Proposed Resolution #985-A Supplemental authorizing insurance coverages for certain officers, agents and employees of the Commission on Aging.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: Mr. Cacace, Chairman of the Commission on Aging presented the Committee the necessity of having these benefits. To lose employees who deal with Seniors is trauma to senior citizens. They look forward to seeing their driver, the outreach worker who gives encouragements to our seniors. The Commission on Aging would like very much to have a permanent solution to this problem which is placing their employees under the Civil Service System. Our Committee voted 6-0 in favor of this resolution.

MRS. PERILLO: I'd like to know how this Board could vote to give benefits to people that are not Civil Service? Why can't they take the Civil Service test and also take the medical exams? It's benefiting the City and the people that they are catering to, and then if they clear this, then let them come in for the benefits.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: I'd like to second what Millie Perillo said, and I'd also like to ask the Chairman if in their discussion, a dollar amount was put to this? How much will it cost for each of the five?

MR. BLUM: On January 25, 1980, Mrs. Kilgrow, the Benefits Officer, sent this to Mrs. Wahl. The Municipal Agent who receives \$12,943 single, his marital status is single, his medical benefits will cost the City \$37.91. His life insurance will be \$7.90. That's a month. An outreach coordinator, his salary is \$12,480.00 his marital status is single per month will be \$37.91, his life insurance and so on. The dispatcher who gets \$11,571.00. he's a family man so it would cost us or the City \$111.78; his life insurance is still \$7.90. A Dial-A-Ride driver who earns \$10,580 and mind you, without benefits, it will cost us \$11.78 and that's the same as any other employee that is now working here. We pay that out for them. \$7.90 a month for his life insurance. Those figures that came down from Mrs. Kilgrow.

MR. DeNICOLA: Are these parties permanent workers?

MR. BLUM: They are permanent workers.

MR. DeNICOLA: How long have they been with the City?

MR. BLUM: I believe that the Dial-A-Ride driver has been with them around 4 years. The Municipal Agent just came onboard and I believe the outreach worker, who left them just recently, (They'll looking for an outreach coordinator or they might have one now) and the dispatcher is also working for quite some time 5 or 6 years.

MRS. McINERNEY: I agree with Mrs. Perillo, that #1, we cannot just grant privileges and benefits to people at random and accept them into the Civil Service System without also making them comply with the other status of the other Civil Service, i.e., testing, medical check and if you're talking in terms of money that you just stated, I also want to know if you have a figure on a possible, I'm assuming your intent is make these people Civil Servants, if you have a possible pension included?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The answer is no. There's no pension included in this.

MRS. McINERNEY: Am I to assume that the intent of your Committee was to make these people Civil Servants?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: No, that was not our intent. We recognized in the Personnel Committee when we discussed this, there were two problems and two questions that had to be answered. The first was the immediate question on Resolution #3, which we already passed and on #4 that is granting the fringe benefits to these employees. That was the first question we had to answer; recognizing, of course, they're not true "Civil Service". In other words, they didn't take examinations as we know it, go through medical exams, etc. You know, through the Civil Service Process. The second problem, which is the bigger problem, is how to bring employees such as these under the umbrella of Civil Service; proper testing, proper admissions to this system. To that end, as Mr. Blum, the Chairman of our Committee, brought out, we have established a Committee, Members of the Personnel Commission, Members of the Personnel Committee, the Legal Department, and the Finance Board are going to meet and within 60 days as Mr. Blum indicated, come up with some report. Is it legally possible, and



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing)...is it economically feasible to bring employees such as these, under the umbrella of Civil Service and then we will be able to solve that problem, but right now, we're faced with these employees that are asking for benefits; the same benefits that are accrued to any other Civil Servant of the City. These people are performing the functions of these Civil Servants the City performs. We're not asking for pension benefits and we're afraid, quite frankly, as indicated by the Chairman of the various Commissions of losing these employees and we're not talking about transient employees or part-time employees.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would just like to echo what Mr. Wiederlight said. I think that sometimes when we make decisions on the Board, that we really don't think and vote from our conscience and our hearts. As he said, these people are only asking for benefits what affects their daily living. You take Dial-A-Ride; I see them every day. They go far and beyond their duties when they're carrying these elderly patients and I have had more than one call from them just saying "can't we at least have insurance if something should happen to us?" They're not afraid of Civil Service. That's something we haven't settled as City Representatives. We have to solve that problem. They're not questioning whether they become Civil Service or not. They have no problems with the test so I want everybody to understand that, and I hope that my fellow Board Members will at least go in depth in their heart and vote conscientiously especially for the Commission on Aging. I am, really this is a real turkey situation with me because I know what they do for the Senior Citizens in Stamford.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been CARRIED by a vote of 25 in favor; 6 opposed; 6 abstentions.

MR. DARER: Before we leave Personnel, I wonder if it would be in order here, through you to Mr. Blum, to ask him if by the next meeting, he could obtain for us information as to how many employees in the last few years have actually left City employ? We constantly hear about people threatening to leave because of other benefits that they're not getting or not enough wages, I'd be very interested in the statistics as to how many people left City employ in the last 5 years?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Darer, I don't want to go into any discussion on that, but if you will speak to Mr. Blum about it afterwards, I'm sure that can be arranged.

MR. BLUM: This concludes my report.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We'll proceed to the next Committee, which is the Planning and Zoning Committee. Mr. Stork will report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Dominick Guglielmo, Chairman

MR. STORK: The Planning and Zoning Committee met on Tuesday, January 29th, and again tonight prior to caucus. Committee members present were: Representatives Fasanelli, Guroian, Wider, and Stork. Others present were Reps. Blum, Betty Conti, Dziezyc, Lyons, and Summerville. Attorney E. Gaynor Brennan was also present to speak on behalf of the sale of City-owned property as described in Items #1 and #2. Items for the CONSENT AGENDA, Mrs. President, would be Items #3 and #4.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there any opposition? Items 3 and 4 will be placed on the CONSENT AGENDA. Will you please go on to #1 now?

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - PER 12/26/79 REQUEST FROM ATTY. BOB WECHSLER (TELEPHONE) TO APPROVE SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY TO THOMAS J. McDONALD, SAMUEL W. SCALZI, THE ESTATE OF JOHN SCALZI AND THE ESTATE OF LEONARD SCALZI - TWO PARCELS, per Mayor's letter 8/9/79 and Corp. Counsel's 7/27. Board of Finance approved 9/13/79. Held in Committee.

TRACT I Premises abutting Broad St. consisting of 8,456 sq. ft.

TRACT II Premises formerly known as Pleasant Street 8,952 sq. ft.

MR. STORK: Yes, Item #1 is for publication of proposed ordinance to sell two parcels at a total cost of \$37,850.00 broken down for Tract I at a cost of \$10,994.00; and for Tract II \$26,856.00. The Committee voted 4 in favor, none against, and I would so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GUROIAN: As the only person on the Committee who abstained on the first vote that the Committee took, I'd like to explain my change of vote; and I want to thank Mr. Guglielmo for putting time and effort into this and upping the price that the City will get substantially. He was able to more than double it even though his Committee had previously voted for the lower figure over my objection; and I want to thank you at this time for doing the City a service far and beyond his call of duty.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no further discussion, we'll bring the Motion to a vote. We are voting on publication of the ordinance and the price will be \$37,850.00, being duly Moved and Seconded. Those in favor, please vote by saying AYE; those opposed, No. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - COMPANION TO ITEM #1 ABOVE - CONCERNING ABANDONMENT OF (A PORTION OF) PLEASANT STREET - Part of Mayor's letter 8/9/79 re property to be sold to Scalzi, et al Held in Committee.

MR. STORK: The Committee, before voting on this, changed the wording to "abandonment of a portion of Pleasant Street. The Committee voted 4 in favor. none opposed. and I would so MOVE. SECONDED.

PLANNING AND ZONING (continued)

MR. GUGLIELMO: Just one question and that is, on the agenda, this is for publication, a proposed ordinance; however, this, this piece of legislation was submitted as a resolution to Corporation Counsel, and my question is, if, since it is a resolution, it would not really make sense to say that it is for publication, but if it is approved, it would take effect in resolution form.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Have you discussed that with Corporation Counsel, Mr. Stork?

MR. STORK: No, Mrs. President.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: All right now, go ahead, Mr. Guglielmo.

MR. GUGLIELMO: Well, the fact is that this piece of legislation was submitted in resolution form and if we, if we are to vote on this tonight, given that fact, I would just want to remind the Board members that it would, we are not voting for publication, but it will take effect tonight if we vote for it affirmatively.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Stork or Mr. Guglielmo, did the Corporation Counsel tell you that it should be a resolution rather than an ordinance?

MR. STORK: It is a resolution.

MR. GUGLIELMO: That's how, Madam President, that's how, that is how it was submitted to the Planning and Zoning, through the Corporation Counsel's Office, Mr. Sherman.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: All right, we do have an ordinance on the agenda. Is there any reason for that? I do know that Abandonment of Streets have been in ordinance form first. Yes, I think we are going to vote on the publication of this ordinance and that's the proper procedure, and we can never go wrong by publishing something; we can go wrong by not publishing, so will you withdraw that change, Mr. Stork?

MR. STORK: Yes, I will withdraw, Mrs. President.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no problem with that. would you please move that we publish a proposed ordinance as a companion to item #1 above?

MR. STORK: Yes. I would MOVE for publication.      SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote. and the item was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

- (3) TECHNICAL LANGUAGE CORRECTION - ORDINANCE FINALLY ADOPTED 1/14/80 RE CROSBY STREET - LAW DEPARTMENT OPINION THAT MANDATORY LANGUAGE "BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT...." BE INCORPORATED THEREIN.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.



PLANNING AND ZONING (continued)

- (4) HARBOR PLAZA ROAD - RESOLUTION REQUESTING MAYOR TO DIRECT PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. TO PROCEED WITH PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING WORK, COST STUDY, ETC., PER CHARTER CHAPTER 64, SECTION 640, submitted by Moira Lyons.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) ACCEPTANCE OF CAMPBELL DRIVE AS A CITY STREET - City Eng. Sabia approved on January 14, 1980 - submitted by Rep. Guglielmo.

MR. STORK: This is for the Acceptance of Campbell Drive as a City Street, and the Committee approved this 3 to 1, and I would so MOVE.

SECONDED.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd just like to ask Mr. Stork if he knows for a fact that the street was completed before October 31st?

MR. STORK: I would refer the information on that to Mr. Guglielmo.

MR. GUGLIELMO: This is on Campbell Drive? O.,.. Just bear with me a second. I have the date of the petition, September 12, 1979, and I have the assurances of the City Engineer that the road, the construction of which was completed before that date.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Yes, if I might, through you, I can explain it to Mr. Fasanelli. The petition was sent to this Board in September, 1979. At that particular time, it was held only because there had been problems with the Parks Department approving the tree plantings. The road itself was in great condition. The drainage is fine. There is nothing wrong with the surfacing of the road or the curbing or anything to do with that, and it was shortly thereafter our October meeting, I believe, that the Supt. of Parks sent a letter to Bill Sabia saying that everything according to his department was in order. So, basically it was not the road, it was a couple of trees, O.K.?

MRS. MAIHOCK: So that we don't have to ask the same question for Items 6, 7, and 8, were these also approved by that October date?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Maihock, let's just deal with #5, please.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mrs. McInerney, you said you believed; do you have the date on that?

MRS. MCINERNEY: I have it, but I don't have it with me, I mean I have.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: You've seen it then?

MRS. MCINERNEY: From Bob Cook. yes. I have.

MRS. GUROIAN: I've been given to understand that the Board is not in the habit of voting for approval of City streets during the winter months. They wait for the spring, and on that basis, I'm voting against it.

PLANNING AND ZONING (continued)

MR. WIDER: I have a copy of that ordinance and I have also inspected the street and all the streets were completed before the last of September. All pre-October 1st. Thank you.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote on Campbell Drive. The MOTION is CARRIED (voice vote), with Ms. Guroian and Ms. Conti voting NO.

- (6) ACCEPTANCE OF MEREDITH DRIVE AS A CITY STREET - City Eng. Sabia approved on January 14, 1980 - submitted by Rep. Guglielmo.

MR. STORK: The Committee voted 3 to 1 for approve and I would so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote on Meredith Drive. The MOTION is CARRIED (voice vote), with Ms. Guroian and Ms. Conti voting NO.

- (7) ACCEPTANCE OF WISHING WELL LANE AS A CITY STREET - City Eng. Sabia approved on January 14, 1980 - submitted by Rep. Guglielmo.

MR. STORK: No. 7 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (8) ACCEPTANCE OF BLACKBERRY DRIVE AS A CITY STREET - City Eng. Sabia approved on January 14, 1980 - submitted by Rep. Guglielmo.

MR. STORK: The Committee voted for approval 3 to 1, and I would so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote on Item #8, Blackberry Drive. The MOTION is CARRIED; with 2 NO votes, Ms. Guroian and Ms. Conti.

We will now proceed to vote on the items on the CONSENT AGENDA: #3 and #4. MOVED. CARRIED.

MR. STORK: One final item, Mrs. President. My apologies to Rep. Donahue. He was also present at the committee meeting.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Everett Pollard and Alfred Perillo.

- (1) BOARD OF EDUCATION RESOLUTION OF AUGUST 28, 1979 DISCONTINUING MARTHA HOYT SCHOOL AND RESOLVING TO TURN OVER TO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT AFTER BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES APPROVES SUCH ACTION. Held in Committee 1/14/80.

MR. PERILLO: Yes, thank you, Mrs. President. And the matter of Martha Hoyt School again. In summary, there seems to be a maintenance cost of \$2,000.00 per month for that building. We asked the Board of Education to transfer some \$10,000.00 to Public Works with the school and they say they don't have the money, so we don't take the school. That's all.

RECONSIDERATION OF FISCAL ITEM #15

MR. ZELINSKI: I would at this particular time like to go back to Item #15 under FISCAL. I had voted on the Prevailing Side against that particular item, and after, if I may continue, and after talking with the Co-Chairman of Fiscal on this, giving me some more information, I would like to have that, I'd like to Reconsider that particular item. And I would so MOVE. SECONDED by Mr. Esposito.

MR. ESPOSITO: May I explain why we would like to do this? I want to thank Mr. Zelinski for being kind enough to Reconsider this. If we look through our packet for next month, as I was doing, we notice that there's a \$400,000.00 request from Public Works for Contract Haulaway. That's an additional \$400,000.00 over and above the \$300,000.00 that they really were assuming they were going to get tonight.

We look at the figures. I'll just read here because I don't expect everyone to go through their packet now, but what they are saying in this latest request, which was dated January 7th, is that they had a balance of \$157,000.00 in the account; that's after our assumed appropriation of \$300,000.00 tonight. In other words, at this point in time, they have more or less committed \$143,000.00 of the \$300,000.00 we turned down.

I share the frustration with the rest of this Board about Haulaway, and if you want to hold the Public Works Department to task on this, you have the opportunity next month because they're coming back for another \$400,000.00. But they spent half of this money already. They're going to need it. If we don't approve it tonight, we'll probably be called back here in an emergency session as we were last year. There's a possibility they may have to close down the Haulaway site because of the fact that they will be \$143,000.00 in debt, and on the basis of that, I would urge my fellow Board members to Reconsider this particular issue.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Please note that we are discussing the Motion to Reconsider.

MR. RYBNICK: What Paul said there, it could happen that next month you deny these people and this debris piling up there, and these people over there and Wardwell Street watch this very, very closely, and when they see it out of hand, they call in to Hartford for the Environmental Protection Board and the State sends a representative down to check it and if they come down again we're really in deep trouble. This is one of the main things that you must look forward to.

MR. BLUM: I'd like to amend the \$300,000 to read.....I'd like to change the figures.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, we first have to vote on whether or not we will Reconsider the item. Once we vote to Reconsider, you may make an amendment to the motion.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I just wanted to say that you know I had voted against it, but because of this additional information, that they already spent the money, it's like having a gun to our heads on this because they already spent it; so I would hope that this would pass, and then next month we could consider that item.



RECONSIDERATION OF FISCAL ITEM #15 (continued)

MR. POLLARD: Point of Information, please. What vote is required to carry?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: A majority is needed to Reconsider. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 28 in favor, 7 opposed. Mr. DeNicola and Mrs. Perillo, who aren't registering in the machine, both voted YES. The MOTION is CARRIED by that vote. We will now proceed to the item that is to be Reconsidered, #15 under Fiscal which is \$300,000.00 for the Contract Haulaway Program.

MR. DARER: MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: To Move the Question requires a two-thirds vote. Mr. Blum, I believe, wants to speak. And Mr. Guglielmo. We will vote on Moving the Question. MOTION CARRIED with 29 in favor, 5 opposed.

We will now proceed to the Motion on the floor which is the Main Motion for the \$300,000.00. There can be no discussion.

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Information.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If you have a Point of Information, I will be happy to entertain it, Mr. Esposito.

MR. ESPOSITO: How many hard votes do we need for this? And how many are present?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We need two-thirds of those present, and we have currently 37 present, so we need 25 votes. You have a Point of Information Mr. Blum?

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask when we went back to the vote, aren't we supposed to get some report from the Chairman of Fiscal? It was knocked down, true. Now we are going to vote on \$300,000.00. We hear they spent \$143,000.00.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I understand your Point of Information. Mr. Blum, and I shall answer that. It is perfectly acceptable and in accordance with parliamentary procedure to Move the Question if there is a two-thirds vote to that Motion, and there was. We are, therefore, going to proceed to a vote on #15 for \$300,000.00 for the Contract Haulaway Program. Please vote up for yes, and down for no.

MR. DARER: Point of Information. You said we need 25 votes. Now, if a member is not on the floor, then he is not counted? Is that correct?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: He is counted. We need two-thirds of those present. There are present at this meeting, now, 37 members. So if somebody is off the floor and not voting, it does not change the number present, and that hard number of 25. Please vote up for yes, down for no. The MOTION is LOST with 24 Yes, 9 No. It is too late to change the vote. The count has been verified. It is 24 Yes, 9 No.

MR. ESPOSITO: Madam Chairman, 24 lights have lit and Mr. DeNicola's is not, if I counted correctly.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: But it is counted, 24 lights are lit?

MR. ESPOSITO: Twenty-four lights are lit and Mr. DeNicola's is not.

RECONSIDERATION OF FISCAL ITEM #15 (continued)

MRS. PERILLO: Let's have a Roll Call vote here.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I will accept that, Mrs. Perillo. Ms. Summerville, we are going to clear the machine. Obviously, the same problem that was supposed to have been fixed and was fixed for most of the meeting. We will proceed to a Roll Call vote.

MR. BLUM: I'm asking you, can they, another vote asking to change the figure?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, you cannot Reconsider twice.

MS. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. (See Roll Call Vote at end of minutes with voting tally sheets.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION has been CARRIED by a vote of 25 YES; 9 No.

MR. DIXON: Madam President, I would ask a question that would probably help to clarify matters, similar matters, to just what we had to handle, in the future. What is an abstention counted for? Anything or nothing?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It really depends upon what it takes to carry that particular vote, Mr. Dixon. If it takes a vote of those present, an abstention is counted as another thing. When the rules read, whether it's Charter or Board Rules, a majority of those present, it means a majority of the total number of people who are at the meeting and if you abstain, it's really equivalent to a NO vote; but if it is just a simple majority and someone abstains, that abstention is not counted in the vote. So that if you have 20 people present at a meeting and you need a majority, a simple majority, you just need eleven (11). Some people walk out, or don't vote, and that will change the vote if you need a majority of those present. I will send a letter. I don't want to really discuss it now. I will discuss, send a letter about this straight from Robert's Rules to the members of the Board this month.

MR. DIXON: Can I carry that point just one step further, please? If the vote is taken by machine, unless they, for instance, I'm absent temporarily from my desk, what is recorded by the machine?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: An abstention.

MRS. GUROIAN: Madam Chairman, as I understand it, the difference is between whether the vote is, and it doesn't matter whether it's a majority or two-thirds; whether the vote calls for a majority or two-thirds of the people present, then the abstention is a NO vote. If it calls for a majority or two-thirds of the people present and voting, then it has no reflection.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Quite what I said, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: That's not what you said.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it is because a ...

MRS. GUROIAN: You said it was a difference between whether it was a two-thirds vote or a majority vote. The number of votes has nothing to do with it. It's whether the vote calls for voting present or present and voting. That's the differentiation.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Santy will proceed to Health and Protection.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman

- (1) MATTER OF AUXILIARY POLICE, THEIR POWERS AND USE OF THEIR PERSONNEL - submitted by City Rep. David I. Blum, letter 1/2/80. Research report received. Held 1/2/80.

MRS. SANTY: The Health and Protection Committee met January 23rd with all members present: Paul Dziezyc, Mildred Perillo, Patrick Joyce, and David Blum. Also attending were Parks and Recreation Chairman Gabe DeLuca and Public Works Committee Co-Chairman Everett Pollard.

Item #1, matter of auxiliary police, has been HELD IN COMMITTEE. We began discussion, but we are going to have more interviews the end of the month.

- (2) LETTERS OF 1/8/79, 11/30/79 and 1/3/80 FROM LEE GRAY RE HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AT EDEN ROAD, WOODBROOK DRIVE AND PARRY ROAD. Serious safety problem. Held 1/2/80.

MRS. SANTY: Item #2, Lee Gray, was HELD IN COMMITTEE. We began discussion. We will have more interviews this month.

- (3) LETTER 1/14/80 FROM SOUTHWEST CONN. HEALTH SYSTEMS AGENCY RE PRIMARY HEALTH CARE NEEDS FOR RESIDENTS OF WEST SIDE, WATERSIDE AND SOUTH END.

MRS. SANTY: Item #3. The City of Stamford has requested the Southwest Connecticut Health Systems Agency to develop a working paper addressing the Health Care needs of the medically under-served in Stamford which as designated by HEW is the South End and Waterside areas. Barbara Edinburgh, Senior Health Planner with HSA, requested to address our committee. She and Susan Brewster, our Grants Director, described the study and answered many of our questions. They provided us with the necessary information on who the HSA is and what it is doing for Stamford.

It is anticipated that their paper will be completed the end of February, and the HSA will meet with the Community Development Office to discuss the Study's finding for future activities. We will all receive a written report. The Committee was impressed with the fact that Mrs. Edinburgh took the initiative with Miss Brewster to explain their study and this Committee without a request.

MR. BOCCUZZI: West Side or Waterside? It says West Side.

MRS. SANTY: It's Waterside and South End. Well, it's West Side, Waterside, but there's a map that I will show you that I have with me, but it's mostly Waterside. It's part of your district though, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: That's what I was wondering.



HEALTH AND PROTECTION (continued)

MRS. SANTY: O.K., they may come up with the finding, though, that it is medically served. We won't know until we get their written report. I'll show you a map afterwards, Mr. Boccuzzi.

- (4) JAN. 14, 1980 LETTER FROM MR. BILL DEMPSEY. A PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEE RE HEALTH TRAINING, PREVENTIVE TREATMENT, ETC. He is at 637-2555 and 2597 or 358-4374.

MRS. SANTY: Item #4 is a letter from Bill Dempsey, who requested also to meet with our committee and he gave a detailed and documents report on preventive medicine relating to the teaching of self-help life skills. In fact every committee member received a formal written report.

MRS. McINERNEY: Excuse me, as a Point of Information, we have deferred from listening to this report. I think some members could be quiet and attentive. We've bent to them.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That's a point well-taken.

MRS. SANTY: Included in the Health Department budget this year is a Mental Health and Alcohol Coordinator, and Mr. Dempsey wanted to justify the position by citing the health needs of Stamford to our committee. It was a very interesting presentation. It was a very lively question-and-answer period, and again, the committee was impressed that Mr. Dempsey took the initiative to come before the Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We now have 35 members present. We will go on to Parks and Recreation.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

- (1) FOR APPROVAL - BOARD OF RECREATION SCHEDULE OF FEES FOR 1980 - from Supt. Giordano 1/11/80.

MR. DeLUCA: Our committee met on January 30th with members of the Park Commission and the Board of Recreation Commission. On Item #1 we recommend approval by 5-0 in favor, and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote and the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

- (2) FOR APPROVAL - PARKS DEPARTMENT FEE SCHEDULE FOR 1980 - from Supt. Cook 1/14

MR. DeLUCA: On Item #2 for the Parks Department fees, once again we voted 5-0 in favor, and I so MOVE. SECONDED.

MR. WIDER: I would like to ask Mr. DeLuca, through you, Madam President, what was the increase on the boat moorings this year?

MR. DeLUCA: On the boat moorings for yacht side mooring, it went from \$3.00 for regular fee to \$3.25, actually only a 25¢ increase in each case. And we felt that these fees were not that much out of line and they go towards defraying the deficit that we've been in for the last couple of years. We feel by the increased fees, the additional revenue that we'll make this year will offset the losses in prior years and this isn't out-of-line in comparison to other things

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

MR. WIDER: I was really looking for the rate per foot.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think you have a fee schedule there you can look at, rather than belabor the point.

MR. WIDER: Yes, we have a fee schedule, but what I'm concerned about here is that the price of gas has gone out-of-sight and we have a lot of senior citizens that this is their pleasure; this is all the pleasure that they can get; and improvements around our marinas have not warranted a \$15.00 increase on a 16-foot boat; and I'm really surprised they asked because we asked them two years ago, when they went up to \$70.00, at that increase, to please spread it over a number of years, and they haven't done that; and I feel we are not helping people. We are hurting them and believe me, the fees go into the General Fund. They do not help at all.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Wider. Can we please give Mr. Wider the courtesy of listening to his remarks.

MR. WIDER: They do not, do not go into helping defray the costs. I checked on this a couple of years ago, and I found out that we will be appropriating money to take care of those marinas regardless of whether they are rented or whether they are not rented, and I'm afraid that with the price of gas, that we are going to lose many of the boats we have in the marinas this year; so I would hope that we could keep the price of these marinas down to no more than a raise of \$5.00, and I think this would be sufficient. Thank you so much, Madam Preside

MR. DeLUCA: I feel that rather than belabor the point, we can talk about this all night about what the fees should be. I think we should just bring it up to a vote.

MRS. SANTY: I have two questions of Mr. DeLuca through you, Mrs. President, and one is the ramp fees for non-residents, is that being policed? I understand that there is no one there to police it and the people just moor their boats to the ramps every day and they're not collecting the fees and the resident have to pay their fees through a sticker. I'd like to know from Mr. DeLuca how they are going to do that.

MR. DeLUCA: Well, the answer to that, Mrs. Santy, is that on weekends the ramp fees are enforced, but during the weekdays it is not enforced because they cannot afford to pay the price for an attendant. We discussed the possibility of doing away with the ramp fees, but if we did, it would result in a \$2,600.00 per year loss; and we felt that, granted, we didn't feel that many people during the week were really getting away without paying the ramp fee, and to have an attendant there would more than offset whatever funds you can take in, and that's why we approved the fees as they were.

MRS. SANTY: And one other question. I'd like to know the position of the senior citizens regarding these fees, please. I understood that they were fixed. but...

MR. DeLUCA: No, senior citizens don't even pay a ramp fee.

MRS. SANTY: All fees for senior citizens; I'm not referring to the ramp fees. The mooring fees?

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

MR. DeLUCA: The mooring fees, let's see, senior citizens went from \$2.50 to \$2.75 per foot on outside moorings, and on off-side mooring, minimum went from \$35.00 to \$40.00, an increase of \$5.00. Once again, I think with inflation and everything, an extra \$5.00 increase isn't going to hurt anyone.

MRS. SANTY: I am very, very disappointed at this outcome and I intend to vote NO.

MR. DeLUCA: That would be your prerogative, Mrs. Santy. That's the prerogative of everyone here.

MR. DARER: MOVE THE QUESTION, Please.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is nobody else scheduled to speak, so we don't have to Move the Question. The question is on approval of the Parks Department fee schedule for 1980. It has been Seconded. The vote required is a simple majority. At this point, we have 34 members present. Mrs. Bowlby and Mr. Pollard have also left. Please cast your vote. The fee schedule is APPROVED. 24 YES. 7 NO.

- (3) MATTER OF CHESTNUT HILL PARK BEING VANDALIZED AND CLOSED BY PARKS DEPT. AS POLICE CANNOT CONSTANTLY PATROL; CONSEQUENTLY LITTLE LEAGUE CANNOT UTILIZE PARK FOR THEIR ACTIVITIES. Letter 1/14/80 from Reps. DeLuca, Santy, Signore

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, on Item #3, this is an item which has been in the limelight for the past two weeks. It's an item that has disturbed many people, myself included, and our committee. Our committee met with Rep. Maihock, former Rep. Bill Flanagan, and Mr. Cooper, one of the residents of the Chestnut Hill Park area. The consensus is that adequate police protection is needed at all of our parks. My own personal opinion on this issue is one of disappointment and disgust with the City administration.

The decision to close this park, Chestnut Hill Park, was made at a meeting held January 8th, in the Mayor's Office. Present at that meeting were State Rep. Christopher Shays, Parks Commission Chairman William Scheck, and Mr. Eager, a resident of the Chestnut Hill Park area.

A decision was made to close the park down for six months to correct the vandalism, repair the park. Two weeks ago, Reps. Lois Santy, Mary Jane Signore and I wrote a letter to the Mayor asking him to take action to see that the park was open, not only for the Little League, effective April 1st, but for all citizens of the community; but, unfortunately, the Mayor has other pressing needs, of which one of the examples we found on our desk tonight, was chastising the Board of Representatives for approving a large, big car for the Deputy Fire Chief, but reducing the funds for a big car for the Police Chief. He finds an item like this in the need to chastise the Board of Representatives more important than seeing to it that our parks are free from vandalism and rowdyism.

Vice-Chairman Don Donahue and myself prepared a resolution, which you all received a copy of, which is a part of our report. I urge the Board to recommend approval of this resolution which calls for adequate police protection, and protection provided by the Parks Commission, and to see that our parks are open and safe for all citizens.



PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing): To close down Chestnut Hill Park is not the answer because they can go right down the street to Dorothy Heroy Park and do the same thing. Our parks are here for the benefit of everyone And I MOVE for the adoption of this Resolution.      SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before we proceed to a discussion on this, it is one o'clock. We still have a portion of our agenda left. Can we please keep our remarks to a minimum?

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you. I would like to urge the Board members to support this resolution. Chestnut Hill Park has been a thorn in everyone's side for many years, and it has been promised adequate police protection going back five and six years ago. That police protection really did not come. The problems that are incurred there are not done by residents of the area, or children in the area. It is done by people from outside the area coming in.

The only thing that will happen without correction in this park, without adequate police protection so it can be used, is that this particular group and any other rowdy group, will travel from one park to the other, so it's incumbent upon us to get to the crux of the problem, and this is a combined effort to have this outside influence removed.

MR. DeNICOLA: I think that Stamford is limited to any recreation at all. We're losing it all, little by little. I think that no park or any recreation center should be closed in this City, and that something can be done. I urge that everybody pass this resolution.

MRS. MAIHOCK: We in the 19th District are very appreciative of this resolution. Occurrences at Chestnut Hill Park have been very frustrating for the residents in the neighborhood of the park, as well as for the rest of us in the 19th District who would like to have a safe park once again.

I think Mr. Scheck's memo to us dated February 1, 1980 is shocking. During the month of July alone, there were three vandalism arrests, two larceny arrests, four breach of the peace arrests, and many motor vehicle violations within the park. It was said the park is considered one of the eight major trouble areas in Stamford where K-9 Corps is used for patrol. I think it might be safe to say that there were undoubtedly more offenses occurring in the absence of police officers during this period. This gives the Board some idea of the pattern of activity in this very small park.

It is absolutely imperative that we have police coverage in this park during hours when this park is officially open, and there must also be police patrol surveillance in the neighborhood of the park at night-time and other hours to preclude unauthorized entry of this park when it is officially closed. We cannot permit this park to deteriorate further. I hope the Board will unanimously approve this resolution.

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

MR. WIDER: I sympathize with the North Country, but I had to dig deep and wide to find this resolution tonight, and I haven't been able to digest it yet, and I don't see how I can vote intelligently on it.

Certainly, we do have some problems up there and I can understand them, but I think we have to have a chance to discuss these things in Steering so that we can be able to really digest the whole thing and bring all the power that we can get to bear on keeping the park open. There is no doubt about it, there's a need for it, but in the meantime, I can see all kinds of reasons why we should really understand what we are voting on and I certainly don't understand this. I just dug it out a few minutes ago. Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm sorry, Mr. Wider, if you didn't happen to receive this last week, like most of us did. Maybe it might have gotten lost in the shuffle of your paper-work there.

MRS. PERILLO: We're all having problems in our areas with our parks and more serious problems than vandalism in our parks, but I would rather see the Parks Department utilize Special Policemen to patrol this park and not our regular police force so they can go and take care of the problems of the burglaries in other areas of Stamford.

I would suggest to the Park Department that if they don't open the park and they intend to keep it closed, I suggest we use this for senior citizen housing or low-cost housing up there, to utilize the property.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like order here, please. Mr. Zelinski, you're next. I know it's late and I know this is a very touchy issue. I also know that most of us want to get out of here sometime this morning.

MR. ZELINSKI: The only thing I'd like to say is that yes, I will be supporting this issue, and I hope that when items pertaining to other areas of the City, that the Representatives from that area would also be cognizant of the problems in the downtown area.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: This is not a North Country issue, This is not a South Country issue. This is an issue for the entire City of Stamford and to polarize it at this point is utterly ridiculous. Secondly, it's really sad that the Mayor, and whomever is responsible, is throwing down their hands and saying we cannot cope with the bad guys. Are we going to give up and walk away from the park, or are we going to fight? Now, the people in that area need the park. It is our responsibility to see that they have the park; that is simple and clear-cut. Now, the question is what are we going to do about providing the facilities for the taxpayers?

MR. DONAHUE: I think the resolution speaks for itself, and I think it affects us all equally, and I would therefore Move the Question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You c=n't, after you said what you said.

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm going to support this, and not out of selfishness am I going to support it; but I think we must recognize that we have a number of parks in this City that need the same kind of protection that the North Country is screaming for that park, and what has to happen is that we do take a first step someplace and I think this is in order.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It has been Moved and Seconded. We will vote by machine.  
The MOTION is PASSED by a vote of 28 in favor and 5 opposed.

MR. DeLUCA: That concludes our report.

MRS. CONTI: Point of Personal Privilege. I would like to say that I voted against that thing because, as memory serve me rightly, it says adequate police protection, and I don't know what anybody means by adequate police protection.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That will be noted, Mrs. Conti.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

- (1) LETTER TO DR. RICHARD WEBER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, REGARDING BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES' PARTICIPATION IN REVIEW OF IRREGULARITIES IN BOARD OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT.

MR. FAUTEUX: We receive a response to your letter to the Board of Education, Madam President, requesting participation in the deliberations concerning the progress and direction of their audit of the personnel practices, and they've replied in the affirmative, and have asked that you provide to them two names of representatives to participate. I would like to propose that myself and John Hogan from the Education, Welfare and Government Committee be so volunteered to the Board of Education.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Fauteux, tomorrow I will contact the Board of Education. Mr. Weber and I will inform him that you and Mr. Hogan, the Chairman, and Vice-Chairman of EW&G will sit in on that committee.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight

- (1) FOR APPROVAL - PROPOSED SEWER EXTENSION AGREEMENT BETWEEN BURT M. HOFFMAN, TRUSTEE, AND CITY OF STAMFORD, IN VICINITY OF REVONAH AVENUE AND URBAN ST., per 1/2/80 letter from Geo. Connors, Jr., Admin. Officer of Sewer Commission. And Mr. Wiederlight's request 1/9/80.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The Sewer Committee met on January 30th at 8:00 P.M. in the Main Meeting Room of the Board. In attendance were the following: Michael Wiederlight, Fiorenzo Corbo, and John Kunsaw. In addition, the following were also in attendance: George Connors, Jr., Alex Lichtenheim, and Attorney Burt Hoffman. This agreement was discussed. It was brought out that the Sewer Commission is in favor of this Agreement. It will also generate revenue for the City in the form of sewer hook-up charges while there will be no capital outlay from the City. It should also be pointed out that there is no neighborhood objection to the project. Rep. Corbo made a motion to approve the agreement and it was seconded by Rep. Kunsaw. Motion was carried unanimously and I MOVE approval SECONDED.



SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the Sewer Extension Agreement, and it was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Stanley Darer & Lathon Wider.

MR. DARER: The Public Housing and Community Development Committee have been meeting regularly on the funding for this year's Community Development monies. We held a meeting last week with the Housing Authority who attended with their chairman, and many members of their staff, so that we could question them and work with them in trying to resolve questions and try to develop a better understanding.

One of our problems with the Housing Authority in the past has been an inability by them to provide us with a total audit of their public housing, their low-rent housing, and moderate-rent housing projects.

The problem evolves from the fact that an audit is made on their low-rent projects by the Federal Government, and their moderate rent projects by the State Government. It was our intent to try to get them to agree to an audit that we would be able to participate in, in the sense, to get a combined audit so that we would be able to work better with the information.

They have agreed to an audit which we are trying to work out. They have had a moderate rent audit by the State which we're anticipating will arrive shortly to our offices, and the Federal Government is conducting an audit very shortly, and we're going to try to piggy-back on to that audit with the questions we have for some moderate sum of money which we believe can be funded out of Community Development monies.

The intent and the results should be beneficial, we believe, to the betterment of the Housing Authority's operations. The audit will be a management type audit; at least, our part of it, in looking at specifics relating to finance and financial controls which we think will be very helpful.

We also are trying to involve the Housing Authority in providing us with a list of where the people who are tenants in the Housing Authority, work, so that with this information, we feel that we might involve the Stamford Economic Assistance Corporation in the affairs of the Housing Authority, in some way to be of assistance, because many of the people who work for some of the leading employers in town are also members, or are involved in SEAC, and if their desire is to retain blue-collar workers, it is our belief that the first place to begin that retention is in the maintenance of the housing stock that we have in town; so that is a direction that we're also heading in. Present at our meeting were Chairmen Wider and myself, John Roos; also attending some of our meeting has been Handy Dixon. That is all of our report for tonight.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

- (1) PROPOSED CHANGES IN URBAN RENEWAL CONTRACT - PARCELS 8 and 9 - Public hearing being held in Board of Representatives main room Friday, 2/1/80 by Urban Renewal Commission.

MR. FASANELLI: On the proposed changes in the Urban Renewal Contract, we are going to have to hold them in committee because the Urban Renewal Commission did not approve the changes. The Urban Renewal Commission needs more time in order to negotiate changes with the developers, and if they don't accomplish that, then there won't be any changes; and also in response to a February 1st public hearing, the Urban Renewal Commission is trying to solve some of the problems of some of the people who are going to acquire their property on the proposed parcels and they're going to try to solve some of those problems. So, we are going to have to wait for them to complete their task. This item is being HELD IN COMMITTEE and will come up for reconsideration at the next Board meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It will be placed by Steering on the agenda.

MR. FASANELLI: Correct.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

- (1) THE MATTER OF FLOOD PLAIN REGULATIONS (PROPOSED) - ALSO DETERMINATION OF POWERS, ETC. OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD. See 15th Board of Reps. Ordinance #410 approved 11/14/79.

MRS. MAIHOCK: The members of the committee attending the January 31st meeting of the EPB, which was a work session to prepare the final ordinance on Regulations for flood prone areas of the City of Stamford. The EPB is attempting to complete their work on it as soon as possible.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Bowlby has already left.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE EASEMENT - SUMMER/BEDFORD ONE-WAY SYSTEM - for traffic signal equipment, per John Smyth's letter 12/12/79.

MR. JOYCE: The Transportation Committee met on 25 of January in the Democratic Caucus Room of the Board. Present at the meeting were myself, Mrs. Maihock, Mr. Esposito, and also present was Rep. Lathon Wider. The first item on our agenda was unanimously voted in, and this essentially relates to...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Joyce, because it was unanimously voted for publication, would you like that to go on the CONSENT AGENDA?

MR. JOYCE: Yes.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there any objection to this going on the CONSENT AGENDA? Then we'll proceed to #2, Mr. Joyce.

(2) LETTER 1/2/80 FROM STATE REP. THOM SERRANI RE USING CONRAIL'S YARD AS INTERIM BUS STORAGE SITE AND OTHER BUS MATTERS.

MR. JOYCE: Item #2 is Thom Serrani's letter. The committee discussed this and voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE, instructing the Chairman to write to Rep. Serrani and get additional information regarding a plan which he has suggested be considered.

The committee also decided to contact Mr. Stephen Lawlor who is the Planner for the Traffic Department, and get his opinion on the proposed use of the ConRail site near the railroad station to move the buses so that they can go forward with the development of that station, particularly with respect to a parking facility, so we will have a final report at a later date.

(3) THE MATTER OF HELICOPTER SITES - LETTER FROM DEPUTY CORP. COUNSEL BOODMAN.

MR. JOYCE: This has to do with the request of American Cyanamid Corporation for permission to operate a private heliport on their site which is off West Main Street.

The committee discussed the matter and I discussed the matter with Deputy Corp. Counsel Barry Boodman, who kindly provided me his file on the matter. The upshot of it was that the chairman has written to Mr. Carrier, who is the chairman of the State Bureau of Aeronautics, relative to conducting a public hearing on the matter. While the American Cyanamid Corp. has the proper zoning for the development of such a heliport, the committee felt that there is such a significant interest in the community that we felt that the holding of a public hearing would be in order. And, discussing it on the phone with Mr. Carrier, he was quite happy to do this; consequently, the State will arrange a public hearing probably to be held here in the Board's meeting room so that the community and the people concerned will have an opportunity to learn more about the plan from the officials of the corporation, and also to have their input on what this particular matter will entail. That is still on-going.

(4) LETTER 1/11/80 FROM CITY REP. WIDER TO PATRICK JOYCE RE SERIOUS TRAFFIC BOTTLENECK AT NORTH END OF SOUTH PACIFIC STREET.

MR. JOYCE: Mr. Wider was present at our meeting and discussed it with the committee. There is a projected traffic bottleneck developing on Pacific Street, especially with the announcement by the Pitney-Bowes Corporation of their construction of a large office facility in that area. Consequently, our traffic engineers are looking into this situation and will prepare a report for the committee which we will bring up at a later date. That's all I have, Madam Chairman.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - None.

PETITIONS - None.



MOMENTS OF SILENCE

MRS. McINERNEY: I know it's getting late, but I would like a Moment of Silent Prayer for the American hostages in Iran.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will rise for a MOMENT OF SILENCE, please.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

December 20, 1979 Regular (Special) Monthly Meeting.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Are there any corrections to that?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I MOVE that we accept the minutes. Seconded. Carried.

RESOLUTIONS

MR. GUGLIELMO: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to Move to Suspend the Rules to accept a proposed Sense-of-the-Board Resolution that I've written and have submitted to all the Board members concerning support for President Carter's move to boycott the Moscow Summer Olympic Games.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: As you know, to consider this resolution, since it has not been to Steering, and is not on the agenda, requires a Suspension of the Rules and that needs a two-thirds vote. Mr. Guglielmo has moved to Suspend the Rules to consider this item. It has been seconded. Please vote up for yes, down for no. With 34 members present, 23 are enough to pass. The Motion has PASSED by a vote of 25 in favor, 4 opposed.

MR. GUGLIELMO: I would then Move to accept my proposed Sense-of-the-Board Resolution endorsing President Carter's call for a boycott of the 1980 Moscow Summer Olympic Games. SECONDED.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd just like to say that I don't think this is the place for us to comment on foreign policy, or the place for us to engage in support of presidential partisan politics.

MRS. SANTY: May I just suggest that, Mr. Fasanelli, it's too bad that you weren't here a short time ago; we sent a resolution to Brezhnev, so we do have the authority to do whatever we want with resolutions. They may not pay any attention to us, but as a legislative body, we can do whatever we like.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Just for the record, I would like to show support of Mr. Guglielmo's motion of unity within the country and not as any political reason.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there is no further discussion, we will now proceed to a vote on the resolution to support Mr. Carter's Olympic stand. An up vote is for yes, and a down vote for no. CARRIED with 28 yes, 1 opposed.

MR. PERILLO: Madam President, has this meeting been adjourned?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, I would ask everyone not to leave. We are almost through, but there are still a few items on the agenda.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - None.OLD BUSINESS

MR. PERILLO: Under OLD BUSINESS, we seem to have a request from this Administration now nearing ten months old, and just can't get a clear answer that request being: Is it legal for any City employee to have a private checking account with City funds, accountable to no one? We made no charges or implications of any criminal activity, yet the Law Department has made it a specific issue, that being the Stamford Police Department!

Our concern was not that of the spending of monies, but the legality of a private checking account. Simple question, but no answer. So long as the Law Department has chosen to go this route, let us go this route, too, and see if we can get some answers to these questions:

Police Dept. Code 410 Acct. 3427 Major Investigations	\$15,910.00
Code 410 Acct. 3423 Investigation Chief of Police	4,000.00
Code 410 Acct. 3440 Internal Affairs	3,000.00
Total . . . . .	<u>\$22,910.00</u>

This total amount of monies was withdrawn from said code and accounts, were spent and charged to another code and account where no monies were allocated for code and account #410.3450 known as Identification.

This whole operation seems to be like a three-ring circus. Madam President, will you submit our request to the Law Department as to the legality of this type of an operation?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Perillo, your Motion is what?

MR. PERILLO: There were monies withdrawn from three different accounts, charged to another account where there were no monies allocated for, and spent out of that account.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Perillo, if you would write exactly the request you want, I'll be happy to make that request for an opinion from the Law Department as you stated. We'll go on to Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd just like to sympathize with Mr. Perillo. Being an intelligent human being, I read the report from Barry Boodman and I don't think I'm so intelligent any more; I didn't understand a thing he said!

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Perillo, if you give me exactly the code numbers and what you want, I will send that request to Corporation Counsel or the Deputy.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't know if this is in order, but I would like to publicly thank our administrative office for getting the Minutes to the Board with not any corrections being made. I think that's an accomplishment for us.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That's fine. Thank you.

NEW BUSINESS

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, the only thing I would like to say is, if, under NEW BUSINESS, would it be possible to start the next Board meeting as close to eight o'clock as possible?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Oh, that sounds wonderful, Mr. Zelinski. For the Steering Committee next month, our meeting will be on Tuesday, February 19th, because of the holiday.

MR. DeNICOLA: Could you explain to me COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR? We never get any, so why don't we take it off the Agenda?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Well, in case I do have; the Chair receives Communications. It is appropriate for it to be on the Agenda, Mr. DeNicola.

MR. JOYCE: A matter of housekeeping, Madam Chairman, with the thought of reducing the cost to the City in terms of mailing, I offer this suggestion: that perhaps to facilitate the distribution of correspondence, we might have a box, or something on the wall like they have where you can put slots, mail slots, with the names of the Representatives above the slot, so that if you have correspondence which you want to distribute, you can drop off and it saves mailing it, and it saves additional wear and tear.

I spoke to John Roos and he said that the people at the Wright Technical School might possibly be interested in making this for us, in other words, and donating it to the City, but it is something that would save..it's a matter of saving, quite frankly, postage, and it would give us an opportunity to drop some things off and get distribution of other things, and perhaps lighten the burden of our over-worked staff in the office.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: O.K., Mr. Joyce, I will. You sent this letter to me. I will have this mailed to the Board members; and at some point, Leadership will discuss whether it's feasible for our Board, a Board of our size, with people who commute and work full days to make these changes.

MR. JOYCE: Right, some people may not care to utilize it, but some of us who are local, could.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION made by Rep. John J. Boccuzzi, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 1:40 A.M.

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

APPROVED:

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

AN:CT:HM

Sandra Goldstein  
Sandra Goldstein, President  
16th Board of Representatives



MEETING REGULAR - Feb. 4, 1980

Changes in Seating:

## CODE:

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

VOTING SUBJECT; MOTIONS, ETC.

Seat No.	Members	Dist./ Party
1	CONTI, Betty	R - 7
2	GUROLAN, Grace	R - 7
3	FLOUNDERS, Burtis	R - 13
4	WIDER, Lathon	D - 3
5	DARER, Stanley	R - 13
6	McINERNEY, Barbara	R - 20
7	POLLARD, Everett	R - 17
8	JOYCE, Patrick	D - 10
9	ESPOSITO, Paul	D - 4
10	BOWLBY, Doris	R - 17
11	ROOS, John	R - 10
12	SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	R - 16
13	STORK, Philip	R - 15
14	CONTI, Anthony	R - 11
15	DeLUCA, Robert Gabe	R - 14
16	HOGAN, John J.	D - 12
17	MAHOCK, Audrey	R - 19
18	LOOMIS, Ralph	R - 10
19	LYONS, Moira	D - 1
20	SUMMERVILLE, Annie - CLERK	D - 6
21	LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	D - 5
22	BOCCUZZI, John J.	D - 2
23	KUNSAW, John	D - 3
24	CORBO, Florenzo	R - 14
25	DZIEZYC, Paul	R - 13
26	FAUTEUX, Robert	R - 20
27	DIXON, Randy	D - 2
28	FASANELLI, Richard	D - 6
29	PERILLO, Mildred	D - 9
30	BLUM, David I.	D - 12
31	ZELINSKI, John	D - 11
32	SIGNORE, Mary Jane	R - 18
33	PERILLO, Alfred	D - 9
34	DeNICOLA, Vincent	D - 9
35	GUGLIELMO, Dominick	D - 5
36	RYENICK, Gerald	D - 4
37	DONAHUE, Donald T., Jr.	D - 8
38	WIEDERLIGHI, Michael	D - 16
39	HAVE, Marie	R - 1
40	GOLDSTEIN, Sandra - PRESIDENT	D - 16

TESTING  
TESTING

- #1 To approve Stu Robbins Planning Bd. Alternate: APPROVED: 22 Yes; 13 No; 2 abstentions
- #2 To approve Vanderwaart to Park Commission APPROVED: 33 yes; 2 No; 2 abstentions
- #3 To approve Calka to Park Commission APPROVED: 29 Yes; 6 NO; 2 abstentions
- #4 To approve Bruce Spaulding as Public Wks. Commissioner. APPROVED: 36 Yes, 1 No; 1 Abstention.

(These are not all the votes taken; there were voice votes and one roll call vote during the evening.)