

MINUTES OF THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1980 REGULAR MEETING

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

City of Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, was held on Thursday, April 10, 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 by the PRESIDENT, SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, at 9:15 P.M., after both parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: City Representative Audrey Maihock gave the Invocation.

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

ROLL CALL: CLERK OF-THE BOARD ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE Called the Roll.

There were 35 present and 5 absent until 11:30 p.m., at which time there were 36 present and 4 absent, as Rep. Paul Esposito came in then. The four absent members were Reps. Darer, Pollard, Stork, and Loomis. (Mr. Guglielmo resigned and was replaced by Mary Lou Rinaldi.)

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PAGES: Stacey Wiederlight, 9th Grade, Rippowam High School
Ginny Skrivan, 9th Grade, Rippowam High School

Miss Wiederlight is the daughter of Representative Michael Wiederlight.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE:

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a check of the voting machine, stating it had been worked on all week. It was found that Mr. Conti's voting relay was not working properly, and while it registered on the sheet, it did not light up. Mr. Conti, therefore, moved to Mr. Loomis' seat and would use that seat and that voting apparatus for this evening; that is voting position #18.

It was not recording on the total vote on the first trial, but did on the second. Mrs. Goldstein asked that members watch their own voting numbers to see that the lights registered properly, and that if it became necessary, they would vote by voice, show of hands, etc.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said several members wished to present Moments of Silence and she would recognize Mrs. Guroian at this time.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:65th ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN MARTYRS' DAY - APRIL 24, 1980

MRS. GUROIAN: Many of you are aware that the week of April 13th is Holocaust Memorial Week. Many of you may not know that April 24th is also the 65th Anniversary of Armenian Martyrs' Day. In 1915, the Turkish Government in a calculated, planned program of genocide, determined to rid itself of all of its Armenian subjects once and for all.

Uprooted from their ancestral homeland and force-marched into the Desert of Del El Zor, upwards of one and a half million Armenians were sent. Most of the men were killed outright. The women and children were left to suffer all the inhuman indignities and atrocities then known to man. The more fortunate died of disease within a few weeks. Many of the remainder either threw themselves into rivers already glutted and dammed with decaying bodies, or died of starvation and/or wounds.

Almost three-quarters of the total population of all Armenians throughout the world were thus eliminated within one year. There was not an Armenian anywhere in the world who did not lose most or all of his family, and many families did not even have one survivor.

In a few villages, notably Van or Mousadagh, the latter being immortalized by Franz Werfel in his book "Forty Days of Mousadagh", Armenians refused to give up their arms, obey the Turkish Government's edict and leave their homeland, to face certain torture and death. They fought bitterly against overwhelming odds and either perished fighting, or were saved by foreign warships. Some others were able to flee into neighboring Arab, Russian, or Persian territories.

The ramifications of this genocidal perfidy have been many. Although the surviving Armenians have managed to live with the memory of the soul-shattering horrors inflicted on their personal and national beings, other peoples of the world have since witnessed the rise of Hitler, who once said "Who now remembers the Armenians", as justification of the Jewish Holocaust.

Even today we bear witness to the mass extermination of the people of Cambodia, sanctioned by governmental decision. Therefore, not only in memory of all those peoples of the world who, not because of any act of their own, but because they belonged to a nation of peoples, or a race of peoples, or because of religious conviction, were eliminated by governmental order, but also because we are members of a governmental body and sometimes we need to be reminded of the excesses of power. I ask that we observe one minute of silent prayer.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Mrs. Guroian. Before we have that Moment of Silent Prayer, we have several others also.

MR. BLUM: This evening I ask this Board to stand for a Moment of Silence for a man born and educated in this City, who gave of himself so that others might enjoy life with freedom and enjoyment in their love of good music.

FRANK LIVOLSI, SR. was a member of the Board of Education, and then President of Local 626 Musicians' Union of Stamford. Project Music was born,

MOMENTS OF SILENCE (continued)

Our band members in the high schools had the opportunities of getting professional musicians to teach our aspiring musicians how to play their instruments the proper way. We have been left with a legacy of having musical organizations such as the Rippowam Stage Band and the Stamford High School Marching Band that were recognized in music circles around our country and abroad. As a result of FRANK LiVOLSI, Sr.'s efforts, we now enjoy free music concerts at the Scalzi Park, and occasionally at other parks, courtesy of the Musicians' Trust Fund.

FRANK LiVOLSI, Sr., a member of this Board of Representatives for two terms, including being President for one term; a member of the Board of Education, also served as a member of the Connecticut General Assembly. Frank LiVolsi served his community as a Director of the Italian Center, President of the first Hart School P.T.A.; and for 30 years, President of the Musicians' Union Local 626. He was known in the music world as a dedicated piano player, playing locally and in Westchester with some of our top orchestras of those days. Mr. Frank LiVolsi in his latter years, devoted his life to raising funds for the United Way so others in need might also see a shining light; therefore, let us stand a moment and honor a noble man! Thank you.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would also like to ask my colleagues for a Moment of Silence to also remember PATRICK J. HOGAN, former Finance Board Chairman, and member of our First Board of Representatives. Also for LAWRENCE J. COHEN, young son of David and Andrea Cohen. Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I would just like to have a Moment of Silence and ask our colleagues here tonight to join me in prayers for a speedy recovery to our colleague, REPRESENTATIVE ALFRED PERILLO, who will be undergoing an operation next week in a Boston hospital. We wish him well and hope that he joins us soon again.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I, too, would like to add the name of DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR who died April 4th. In his memory, as we all know, when he died he was working and participating to upgrade the lives of garbage collectors; and Madam Chairman, we recognize that Dr. King, a great American, a great patriot, and forever may we remember him.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Ladies and Gentlemen, let us rise for a Moment of Silence.

RESIGNATION OF CITY REP. DOMINICK GUGLIELMO (D-5)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: As the first Order of Business, I'd like to bring to the Board's attention, a letter I received from Mr. Dom Guglielmo.

"Dear Mrs. Goldstein:

"This letter will serve as notice of my decision to resign from my seat on the 16th Board of Representatives. A business opportunity and a most trying personal set-back have combined to lead me to this most difficult decision. I would like at this time to thank the people of the 5th District for giving me the opportunity and privilege of serving them on the Board. I would also like to thank the members of this Board for

RESIGNATION OF CITY REP. DOMINICK GUGLIELMO (D-5) (continued)

"providing the setting for a wonderful and most memorable experience. I believe the 39 members of this Board that I've come to know, are some of Stamford's most outstanding citizens. The City is most fortunate to have such a high caliber of individuals volunteering their time serving its needs. It has been my pleasure to serve with this distinguished Body and I hope I may be of service to the City of Stamford in the future." (Signed Dominick Guglielmo)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It is with deep regret that I accept this letter of resignation. Mr. Guglielmo has been an outstanding Representative on this Board and has done a beautiful job for his constituents and for the City. We will miss you, Dom.

ELECTION OF MS. MARY LOU RINALDI (Dem.) TO THE 5th DISTRICT VACANCY:

MR. LIVINGSTON: Madam President, Mr. Guglielmo, during a conversation with me said "Jerry, my participation on the Board of Representatives, for the first time in my life, I felt that I was doing something extremely important that was affecting the lives of my neighbors and the people of the City of Stamford", and it was with that kind of participation that the people of the 5th District and the people of Stamford enjoyed his efforts.

It is my pleasure to introduce to this Board, a life-long resident of the City and of the West Side, as my nomination for the replacement of Dom in the 5th District: MARY LOU RINALDI, 46 Wilson Street. And I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Seconded by many. Are there any other nominations? If not, we will move that nominations be closed and that the Clerk of the Board cast one ballot for Miss Rinaldi. She does so. Miss Rinaldi, please come up here to be sworn in.

MISS RINALDI is sworn in.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report. Seconded. Carried.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, March 24, 1980, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called for 7:30 P.M., and was Called to Order at 7:50 when a QUORUM was declared by CHAIRWOMAN SANDRA GOLDSTEIN.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman	Mildred Perillo
John J. Boccuzzi	Paul Dziezyc
Annie M. Summerville	Anthony Conti
Handy Dixon	John J. Hogan, Jr.
David I. Blum	Donald Donahue
Dominick Guglielmo	Everett Pollard
Michael Wiederlight	Fiorenzo Corbo
Lathon Wider, Sr.	Patrick Joyce (8:15)
Jeremiah Livingston (8:15)	WSTC
Barbara McInerney	Stamford Advocate
Jeanne-Lois Santy	
Robert DeLuca	
Robert Fauteux	
Audrey Maihock	

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE for next month were Robert K. Jones and Joseph Rinaldi for the Sewer Commission; Peter Canzano and Frank Arturi for the Patriotic and Special Events Commission; Charles Griffith for the Building Board of Appeals; Robert Harris for the Human Rights Commission; and Joseph Martin for the Zoning Board. The Mayor withdrew the name of Diane Raymond for the Transit District which had been Held in Committee at his request previously.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the 26 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also Ordered on the Agenda was an item for approval of \$23,883,137.93 for a Bond Resolution.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 23 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was moved to "Resolutions", being Rep. Dziezyc's proposal re penalty for conviction of rape-murder crimes. One item was removed from the agenda, being tax abatement request of personal property tax on van pool vehicle. Five items were ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE (one for June): (a) Ordinance re excavation, filling and grading; (b) Appointment of Charter Revision Committee/Commission (held for June); (c) Rep. Roos' suggestion re using Citation method to control roaming dogs; (d) Tax abatement for Division St. property (Tot-Lot) from Connecticut newspapers, Inc.; (e) Sale of City-owned property..

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were two items: (a) Employees working in acting capacities; (b) proposed changes to Merit Rules System. Ordered removed from the agenda was the item re medicare coverage.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(5) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item on the Tentative Steering Agenda, a letter from Mr. Appel.

(6) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item relating to neighborhood watch groups.

(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items: (a) ordinance dissolving golf authority; (b) Fees for greens and lockers at Gaynor Brennan Golf Course; and a new item not appearing on the Tentative Agenda, being Fidelity Trust's request to hang banner re Youth Olympics at West Hill High School. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the matter of Chestnut Hill Park and Little League teams.

(8) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

Ordered Held in Committee was the one item re looking into hiring procedures of the Stamford School System.

(9) SEWER MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item for proposed sewer extension agreement between Morton Kahn and City of Stamford for Country Diner property.

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items: (a) Demonstration Live-in Superintendent Program at Housing Authority; (b) Re-location housing submitted by Community Development 3/21. Ordered Held in Committee was resolution re Neighborhood Preservation Program.

(11) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item relating to proposed changes in Urban Renewal Parcels 8 and 9.

(12) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item on proposed flood-prone regulations.

(13) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item of ordinance for easement for one-way traffic. Ordered Held in Committee was one item relating to helicopter landings. Ordered off the agenda was the matter of ConRail Yard being used as interim bus storage sites.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(14) SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEE: "ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION"

Ordered Held in Committee was the Progress Report.

(15) MOMENTS OF SILENCE

Proposals were made to mention Patrick Hogan and Frank LiVolsi, Sr., and it was determined that these would not appear on the agenda but would be brought up on the floor of the Board the night of the meeting and would therefore appear in the Minutes.

(16) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three proposed resolutions: (a) Congratulating Michael Sabia being elected President of NFP; (b) Mr. Dziezyc's resolution. (c) Congratulating Coleman Towers' tenants on their excellent efforts.

(17) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA is NAACP Pres. Betty Saunders' letter 3/7/80 re hiring practices of Board of Education; also Mr. Sternlicht's request that week of April 13th be proclaimed Holocaust Memorial Week. Ordered off the agenda were: (a) Invitation to Annual Dance Marathon of Catholic High; (b) Advisory of Joint public budget meeting of Finance Board and this Board's Fiscal Committee.

(18) OLD BUSINESS

Ordered Held in Committee for next month was the matter of Rep. Stork's request for opinion re impeachment of elected officials.

(Note: The next regular monthly meeting of the Board is schedule for Thursday, April 10, 1980, as resolved at the Special Meeting of March 27, 1980.)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, seconded, and carried, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 10:12 P.M., with most of the members leaving by 10:30 P.M.

HMM:MS

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, Chairwoman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon, Chairman

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met Monday at 7:30 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present and participating were Representatives Mildred Perillo, Ann Summerville, Mary Jane Signore, Barbara McInerney, John Boccuzzi, Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Vincent DeNicola, and Handy Dixon. All the Committee members who have just been mentioned were not present throughout the entire meeting which will account for some of the abstentions recorded in the vote.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON: With the Board's permission, I would like to place on the CONSENT AGENDA, items #6 and #7, being Mr. Paul Pacter and Mr. Alvin Wellington. MOVED SECONDED.

APPOINTMENT TO THE MAYOR'S CABINETCORPORATION COUNSEL

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| (1) <u>LEONARD E. COOKNEY, ESQ.</u> (R) | Term runs concurrently with the |
| 266 High Ridge Road | Mayor - expiring Nov. 30, 1981. |

MR. DIXON said the Appointments Committee was somewhat impressed with Mr. Cookney's presentation although, by now, they have sat in interviews with many high caliber people such as Mr. Cookney. The Committee voted 5 in favor, 3 abstentions, and he so MOVED for confirmation. SECONDED by many.

MR. DeLUCA said he is honored and pleased to second Mr. Cookney's appointment. He hopes Mr. Cookney continues with the fast responses as he has been with the legal opinions that have been requested; and that the 14th District must be doing something right because they have two good Representatives, and now they also have an excellent Corporation Counsel from the 14th District. He wished him well and success.

MR. BLUM said he hoped Mr. Cookney would have a long and successful stay as Corporation Counsel at least for the two years. He hoped Mr. Cookney would not follow Mr. Sherman's practice on channeling opinions, as previously it was the practice for Chairpeople of Standing Committees request opinions directly from the Law Department. There will not be 15 Chairpersons waiting on line for opinions.

MRS. McINERNEY wished Mr. Cookney good luck and found it very refreshing to hear him say he was looking forward to the legal challenge which the City offered. She feels his background in business and corporate law will be benefit to the City.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote and Mr. Cookney was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY with one abstention, Mrs. Mildred Perillo.

SEWER COMMISSIONTerm Expires

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| (2) <u>LOUIS J. CASALE, JR.</u> (R) | Replacing Irving Slifkin | Dec. 1, 1982 |
| 155 Frederick Street | whose term expired | |

MR. DIXON said the Committee voted 3 in favor, 2 against, and 3 abstentions, and he MOVED for his approval. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWK seconded Mr. Casale's appointment and said he has given much time and energy to the City, and if approved, will be a great asset to the Sewer Commission.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said Mr. Casale was APPROVED with 23 Yes votes; 10 No, and 2 Abstentions, one being Mr. Flounders, having asked to be recorded as such.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - ALTERNATETerm Expires

- | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--------------|
| (3) | <u>MS. SALLY LEVENE</u> (R)
72 West Hill Circle | Replacing D. O'Toole
whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1984 |
|-----|--|--|--------------|

MR. DIXON: Although Ms. Levene has only lived in Stamford for three years, she expressed much hope of utilizing her knowledge and talents in the best interests of Stamford which is now her home. She feels she can best do this by serving as an Alternate member of the Zoning Board of Appeals. After a lengthy discussion, giving due consideration to the matter, the Appointments Committee voted for denial of the appointment, with 2 in favor, 4 against, and 2 abstentions. In keeping with the Board's practice of making positive motions, he MOVED for approval. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY said Ms. Levene's experience in land use and zoning is very important, and her knowledge of the pertinent law is excellent. She urged approval of Ms. Levene's appointment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote, reminding the members of the Committee's negative recommendation. Ms. Levene was DENIED by a vote of 15 Yes, 18 No, 2 abstentions, and Mr. Flounders wished to be changed from NO to YES.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

- | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--------------|
| (4) | <u>MS. MARY WILLIAMS</u> (D)
109 Tresser Blvd., Apt. 12-D | Replacing David Jetter
who resigned | Dec. 1, 1980 |
| (5) | <u>ROBERT OWENS</u> (D)
49 Cedar Street | Replacing Frances Adams
who resigned | Dec. 1, 1980 |

Note: #4 and #5 above HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------|--------------|
| (6) | <u>PAUL PACTER</u> (D)
247 Chestnut Hill Road | Re-appointment | Dec. 1, 1982 |
|-----|--|----------------|--------------|

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DIXON said Items #4 and #5 (Ms. Williams and Mr. Owens) are being HELD IN COMMITTEE for the reason that they were not able to attend the meeting for the interview.

MR. DIXON said Items #6 and #7 (Mr. Pacter and Mr. Wellington) have been placed on the CONSENT AGENDA, having passed the Appointments Committee's interview with unanimous votes and he MOVED for their confirmation. SECONDED. CARRIED. UNANIMOUSLY.

ZONING BOARD

- | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--------------|
| (7) | <u>ALVIN WELLINGTON</u> (D)
729 Hope Street | Replacing Peter Ferraris
whose term expired | Dec. 1, 1983 |
|-----|--|--|--------------|

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MOTION FOR SUSPENSION OF RULES by Mr. Fasanelli to move up URC Item #1 - SECONDED CARRIED.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Richard Fasanelli, Chairman

MR. FASANELLI: Item #1 on the Urban Renewal Committee's Agenda is "Proposed Changes in Urban Renewal Contract - Parcels 8 and 9", and on this item, the Committee has no report, Madam Chairman.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will now proceed to our regularly-scheduled agenda, the Fiscal Committee.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Marie Hawe, Co-Chairperson

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, April 2nd. Present were Representatives Betty Conti, Fauteux, Flounders, Hogan, Lyons, Rybnick, Esposito and Hawe. On the Agenda this evening is \$555,793.42 in Additional Appropriations; \$15,744.00 in Reimbursable Grants; \$98,050.00 in Capital Transfers, and \$77,548.00 in Capital Requests.

Fiscal voted to put the following items on the CONSENT AGENDA: Nos. 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24. (On those items where the secondary committee did not have a report, the proper motions were made, seconded and carried.)

- (1) \$ 1,200.00 - E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COURSE - Code 670.2610 MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT - Board of Finance approved 2/7/80.

MRS. HAWE said this is to repair an F-10 Tractor Fairway Mower and a Turf King Tee-Cutter, with \$800 for the mower and \$400 for the Tee-Cutter. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed, and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote, and the motion was APPROVED with the majority voting YES, 1 No vote (Mrs. Betty Conti); with a few members off the floor.

- (2) \$ 37,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - INCINERATOR - Code 343.2730 - WATER - Board of Finance approved 2/7/80.

MRS. HAWE said this was held last month due to concerns expressed by some Board members about a possible water leak causing the fluctuation in water usage. Commissioner Spaulding has advised as of now they do not yet have a definite explanation for the fluctuation, but they definitely know it is not due to leakage. They are continuing their investigation. Some variation is normal throughout the year. However, total cost compared to last year is normal, being \$112,000 spent last fiscal year, and \$117,000 projected for this year, taking into account the 9% increase in rate effective last July. Fiscal voted 8-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to waive the secondary committee's report. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. This was the Public Works Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the \$37,000 on Item #2. CARRIED with 1 No vote (Mr. Blum); rest voting yes. A few off the floor.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) \$211,111.20 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - To fund 1979-1980 portion of Labor Contract with Administrative Unit, retroactive to 7/1/79. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

Salaries	\$189,115.20
Medical Benefits	21,996.00
	<u>\$211,111.20</u>

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA. Mrs. McInerney voted NO, and Mr. Donahue ABSTAINED.

- (4) \$ 5,847.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

561.1110 Salaries	\$5,509.00
561.1310 Social Security	338.00
	<u>\$5,847.00</u>

(To fund additional Clerk-Typist I (step 2) as well as other salary adjustments. Fully reimbursable by grant.)

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA. Mrs. Signore ABSTAINED.

- (5) \$ 9,897.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

573.1110 Salaries	\$9,022.00
573.1310 F.I.C.A.	585.00
573.2650 New Equipment	290.00
	<u>\$9,897.00</u>

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. HAWE said Fiscal voted 8-0 to HOLD this item pending clarification of the use of \$2,325.00 that was not accounted for on page 2 of the material they received. When the increments that employees were to receive were added up, it totalled \$6,697.00, or \$2,325.00 less than the \$9,022.00 requested. Before passing the appropriation, the Committee wants to find out exactly what this money would be used for, so the vote was 8-0 to HOLD.

- (6) \$ 11,904.22 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

530.1170 Personnel Appeal Awards (State Mediation Award)	\$ 6,255.00
530.1130 Part-Time Salaries	3,500.00
530.1201 Over-Time Pay (Reduced from \$8,400.00)	2,149.22
	<u>\$11,904.22</u>

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (7) \$ 50,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - 510.3601 CASH RELIEF - Board of Finance approved at Special Meeting 3/19/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (8) \$ 3,066.00 - GLENBROOK VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT - 472.4340. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (9) \$ 8,598.00 - SPRINGDALE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT - Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.
- | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| 475.1310 | Workmen's Compensation | \$ 5,598.00 |
| 475.2720 | Gas and Electric | 1,500.00 |
| 475.2750 | Gasoline | 1,000.00 |
| 475.5120 | Professional Auditing Service | 500.00 |
| | | <u>\$ 8,598.00</u> |

MRS. HAWE said this is a request from the Springdale Fire Department. The Workmen's Comp. rates are set by the State Insurance Board and they have been going up all over the State. The Gas and Electric funding also includes fuel oil and its price increase. The gasoline funding is due to price increase as well as greater useage due to making more back-up runs for City ambulances when they break down. Also the auditing services increased its rate some. Fiscal voted 8-0 in favor and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM said Personnel concurred except that they had a question as to whether the volunteer fire services could consolidate their workmen's compensation coverage and save money.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said they are separate corporations and since there is no common financial ownership, under the State rules, they are non-combinable financial entities.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote and the motion was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY, with a few members off the floor.

- (10) \$ 9,520.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - Code 281.2310 MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (11) \$ 25,000.00 - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - Code 290.1350 WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION - LEGAL. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (12) \$ 3,050.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - RESOLUTION TO AMEND CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1979-1980 - Project #650.383 VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT (1½-ton Low Body Truck with a Hydraulic Lift Attachment for Snow Plow. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.
(Transfer)
Transfer FROM #650.180 Youth Center-Sterling Farms.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (13) \$ 75,000.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE 1979-1980 CAPITAL
(Transfer) PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING #610.0818 General Park Lighting
Improvements. To be funded by closing out Project #610.0313
New Lights/Cummings Park Ballfield. Board of Finance approved
3/13/80.

New Parking Lighting Improvements for:

Scalzi Park	\$48,500.00
Cummings Park	24,000.00
Kiwanis Park	2,500.00
	<u>\$75,000.00</u>

MRS. HAWE said the money is now in an account to pay for lighting of a new ballfield in the West Beach area. However, due to neighborhood opposition to the lighted field which would have aggravated an already bad traffic situation, the Parks Department has deferred the proposed lighting project. If the transfer is approved, the money will be used for park lighting improvements at Scalzi, Cummings and Kiwanis Parks. The Committee voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed, and she MOVED for approval. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA said Parks and Recreation Committee concurred 3-0.

MRS. CONTI said she voted No in Fiscal because of the over-all condition of the fiscal situation as we'll all see when we get to Item #27 on Fiscal. If this item is already bonded, she would prefer it being transferred to some projects in progress because we are in bad shape in regard to our bonding situation.

MR. WIDER asked if some of the lights could be put in Kosciuszko Park also, as they are needed there.

MR. DeLUCA said he didn't have an opportunity to look at that park recently but that the Parks Department is exerting every effort to take care of all the parks, and will assign priorities. He said come with the July 1st budget and chances are there may be funds to do something at Kosciuszko Park and other parks in that area.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Item #13. It was APPROVED with a majority of YES votes, 2 NO votes (Mrs. McInerney and Mrs. Betty Conti); with a few members off the floor.

- (14) \$ 4,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - HIGHWAYS - Code 310.2170 FALL
LEAF PICK-UP. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (15) \$ 20,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - RESOLUTION TO AMEND 1978-1979 and
(Transfer) 1977-1978 CAPITL PROJECT BUDGETS TO EFFECT A TRANSFER.
Board of Finance approved 3/13/80. From #341.4391 Liquid
Waste-Passenger Hoist to #341.8041 Sludge De-Watering System.

MRS. HAWE said this would have gone on the Consent Agenda but there was a typographical they wished to correct. The account number is 341 not 451.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWK said the Public Works Dept. is not building the Passenger Hoist. The OSHA laws have changed since the original appropriation was approved and installation of such a hoist under present rules would require an appropriation in excess of \$100,000, and the money is being transferred into the Sludge De-watering account to pay for some modifications and other charges which were estimated too low. Fiscal voted 8-0 in favor, none opposed, and she MOVED for approval. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED to Waive the secondary committee report. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Item #15. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY, with a few members off the floor.

(16) \$-48,250.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 320.2710 FUEL OIL. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.
47,000.00

MRS. HAWK said this is due to inflationary cost of fuel oil. In February, 1979, No. 2 Fuel Oil was 41.25¢, and a year later it was 96.9¢ per gallon. A similar increase is evident in No. 4 Fuel Oil. February, 1979 it was 33.79¢, and in February, 1980, it was 85.74¢. Included in this appropriation is \$1,250 for the fuel oil for the Railroad Station, which it is anticipated the City will be responsible for shortly. Committee voted 8-0 to delete the \$1,250 since it is very uncertain when the State will be acquiring the Railroad Station. Fiscal reduced the request to \$47,000.00 and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a Motion to Waive the secondary committee report. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. DeLUCA asked from whom did the City buy their fuel oil at 96¢ because he was paying 90¢ just two weeks ago and he is a small user.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the main motion for \$47,000, item #16. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, with a few off the floor.

(17) \$ 50,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 321.2750 GASOLINE. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(18) \$ 22,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 323.2620 REPAIRS - EQUIPMENT -
Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(19) \$ 35,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 343.1201 OVERTIME - Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (20) \$ 37,548.00 - PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - 310.0810 - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE 1979-1980 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS TO CATOONA LANE. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

MRS. HAWK said this is to up-grade Catoona Lane. On Sept. 5, 1979 this Board approved \$107,452 for this project, but when the bids were opened in October, the low bid came in at \$131,000. This was held up until now and not been submitted as no extra funds could have been passed prior to the closing of the asphalt plants for the winter. Asphalt costs have risen dramatically. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed, and she MOVED for approval. SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO said it took eight years to get this on behalf of the Perillos and the people of Catoona Lane. She would like to thank the Board and especially Dr. Hoffman for all the research he put into it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote, and the item was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY except for 1 NO vote (Betty Conti), and a few members off the floor.

- (21) \$ 40,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1979-1980 FOR PROJECT #280.8195 RAILROAD STATION. To be funded by taxation. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

MRS. HAWK said the City expects to assume operational responsibility in the near future once the State has acquired the property from TPA. This is for installation of better lighting in the parking areas and their approaches in order to improve security at the Railroad Station. \$25,000 is for the lights and equipment, and \$15,000 is for the installation costs. The lights will be high-pressure sodium vapor lights which are the most cost efficient for our needs according to the Traffic Department. Fiscal voted 7 in favor, 1 opposed and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK said Transportation concurred.

MRS. PERILLO asked what makes the lighting at the Railroad Station more important than the rest of the City where they have been hollering for better light?

MR. DeNICOLA asked who is actually taking over the Station?

MRS. HAWK said the State supposedly is going to take it over within a month but no one really knows when. Then the City will assume responsibility for maintenance of it, but the State will own it. It has not been taken over yet which is why we deleted the funds in one of the previous requests because we didn't want to approve funds for oil, etc. until we actually had to.

MR. WIDER said this was an important item, that Thom Serrani and SACIA along with the local committee had been working to see if they could have a short-range program up-grading the train station in Stamford. They also have a long-range goal, but right now the lights are inadequate, and it is so dark that you can go by there and run into a person because you can't see them. It's been a problem for ten years.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI said Mildred Perillo brought out some very interesting points. He understands the Special Policemen are patrolling almost around the clock at the Station. This is certainly a greater deterrent to crime than lights. \$40,000 is a lot of money and perhaps we have our priorities mixed up a bit.

MRS. LYONS said the lighting is to be installed at four places in the Station. Two are under the Thruway and we already rent those from the State. The second lot is at McCullough Street, part of which the City currently owns, and the other part of the lot is rented from the State. The other two lots are owned by TPA. Under the contract we have with TPA, we have the authority to install the lights right now. The Stamford Station is one of the prime targets of muggers and of car thieves. Anything we can do to deter crime, we should do, and lights would certainly be a deterrent. And lights would be a help to the Special Police.

MR. FASANELLI said this is a focal point in town and important to all, nearby residents, commuters, pedestrians, everyone. It would be beneficial to all to approve this lighting.

MR. JOYCE said this was discussed at their committee meeting the other night, with Commissioner Spaulding, the Police Chief, and Mr. Winkel. The Traffic Dept. will supervise the operation. The safety aspects will be provided by the Police Department, particularly the Special Police that have been mentioned. And the maintenance will be taken care of by the Public Works Department.

He is not satisfied with the reports he has been getting from these various individuals regarding the lack of cooperation from the TPA, who are the private developers presently owning the station. They are not permitting some of the City employees to get into the place. He twice had to call police to rescue women who were being attacked right in the station. Lights are just the beginning. Please consider commuters or visitors using the station at night. It is not safe. Would you want your wife or daughter there under those conditions? No one wants to go into the bathrooms down there. He thinks they may send a robot there. At any rate, to those people who hang around there for nefarious purposes, he advises them to get lost!

MRS. CONTI said she voted against this in Fiscal. She does not believe in spending money for lights for places which we do not own. She suggests her colleagues read the editorial in the ADVOCATE of April 7th captioned "Railroad Station Quandry". Once the State takes over the property, we still don't know whether the Federal Government will appropriate money to building a new station. A sectional struggle is developing in Congress over the Northeast Corridor Rail Belt which includes money for railroad stations. It would seem better to have private interests do it.

MR. JOYCE asked for a Point of Personal Privilege.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said that would be fine, if that is what it is; but if it is just an answer to Mrs. Conti, then it would be out-of-order, but she would put Mr. Joyce at the end of the list.

MR. JOYCE said he'll defer to it a little bit later but would like to make a comment of clarification.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK: What other city comparable to Stamford in size and prestige has a railroad station as antiquated, dilapidated and crime-ridden as Stamford? This lighting is most essential for public safety and it should definitely be approved. We cannot procrastinate many more years to do something constructive at the railroad station. It has been the premise that Stamford would maintain the railroad station. I don't understand why it seems to be a surprise to some of us now.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he agrees with Mr. Fasanelli. The station is a point of focus and we are spending a lot of money in Stamford trying to improve our image. He hoped that people would not go around knocking it down.

MS. SUMMERVILLE MOVED THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Moving the Question. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Item #21, \$40,000, APPROVED with 2 NO votes, being Mrs. Perillo and Mrs. Conti.

- (22) \$ 8,150.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - DIVISION OF BUILDINGS & GROUNDS -
for three months' operation of the railroad station. Approved
by Board of Finance 3/13/80. (Gas, electric, water, contracts
and general insurance.)

MRS. HAWE said the Committee voted 8-0 to HOLD pending actual take-over by the State.

- (23) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO REQUEST TOWN AID FUNDS FROM
CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR \$430,205 as per Mayor's
request 3/13/80. This is annual funding from State to pave streets and
purchase asphalt.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (24) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FILING OF APPLICATION WITH U. S. DEPT.
OF TRANSPORTATION FOR GRANT PER UMTA ACT of 1964 FOR DIAL-A-RIDE; Grant
to offset 50% of the operating costs of the system, per Mayor Clapes'
letter 3/14/80. (No money amounts given.)

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (25) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE FOR GRANTS FROM ADOLESCENT
PREGNANCY PROGRAMS TO COORDINATE CITY-WIDE SERVICES AVAILABLE TO PREGNANT
ADOLESCENTS, per Mayor Clapes' request 3/14/80. (No money amounts given.)

MRS. HAWE said the Committee voted 7-0 to HOLD this item pending further information.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (26) VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND COMMISSIONS AS BELOW - MERIT INCREASES - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 2/26/80 and Personnel Commission Chairman A. Rinella 1/29/80, for 13 merit increases and 1 minimum level raise, for work performed in 1978/1979; and raises are effective July 1, 1979. (9% for outstanding and 5% for satisfactory). Finance Board approved 3/13/80.

230.1160	Law Department	Merit	\$ 6,474.00
243.1160	Purchasing Department	Merit	2,236.00
247.1110	Budget & Management	Salaries	1,508.00
270.1160	Personnel Department	Merit	4,604.00
271.1160	Labor Negotiator	Merit	3,016.00
280.1160	Traffic and Parking	Merit	2,548.00
520.1160	Smith House S.N.F.	Merit	2,652.00
550.1160	Health Department	Merit	4,056.00
610.1160	Parks Department	Merit	2,600.00
650.1160	Board of Recreation	Merit	1,300.00
			<u>\$30,994.00</u>

(Note: Detail and breakdown not available at time of typing Agenda.)

MRS. HAWE said this is to grant merit increases to 13 of 17 eligible non-unionized administrative personnel retroactive to July 1, 1979.

The merit increases range from 5% for satisfactory service to 9% for outstanding service. These managers do not receive across-the-board raises. The only raises they get are those based on merit.

Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 1 opposed, and she so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM said Personnel Committee concurred 3 in favor and 1 against.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to make a Motion to amend this by \$4,064 (\$4,604), to delete the portion applicable to the Personnel Department.

My reason for doing so is the fact that during our caucus, I asked a question if the Assistant Personnel Director received, who was recently promoted, went in this evaluation period; if he received an increase of 12%, which, according to the guidelines for performance appraisal, states that persons promoted within the evaluation period who receive a 12% increase, will not be eligible for a merit until at least one year from the date of such promotion, which, if memory serves me correctly, this position was knocked out of our 1979-1980 budget in May, 1979; and I think, after several attempts, it was finally put back into the budget sometime around October, November, at which time the person was promoted. Therefore, it would be in the realm of the evaluation period. Therefore, I make a Motion to delete this portion at this time until the question is answered.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You are moving, Mr. DeLuca, that \$4,604 be deleted? This is an amendment to the Motion on the floor. That would bring the request down to \$26,390.00. SECONDED. Mr. Blum, you wish to speak to the amendment?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)(26) MERIT INCREASES FOR NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS (continued)

MR. BLUM: I would like to speak in the sense on the amendment that it be held also in Committee, as well as the entire package to be Held in Committee, inasmuch as the fact that we don't have sufficient information from the Personnel Department in regard to the evaluations of each of those receiving a raise. As per the Management Plan, I would like to see the evaluations that I am entitled, as well as everyone in my Committee, before we can really vote on this completely and truly, by which this Plan was adopted.

I sent a letter to the Personnel Department. I don't know if you all received it. I believe you did, and I can honestly tell you, I did not receive any information per line items as, in other words, what each particular job was received at the present time

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, I'm sorry to interrupt you, and I did allow you to stray off the topic a good deal. If you are ...

MR. BLUM: All right, I'll come back later.

MRS. CONTI: Didn't Mr. Blum make a Motion to Hold?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have before us right now, an amendment to the Motion. The amendment is to delete \$4,604.00 from the appropriation request. I would like to limit the discussion to that amendment.

MR. BLUM: Can't you make a Motion to Hold the amendment?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Would you like to Move to Hold the amendment in Committee?

MR. BLUM: Yes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You may Move that; you may amend an amendment, and that would be a proper motion.

MR. BLUM: I would like to make a Motion to Hold in Committee for further information as Mr. DeLuca is requesting; the amendment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That's to Hold in Committee \$4,604.00?

MR. BLUM: Right.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It has been Seconded,

MR. FLOUNDERS: I would like to speak to the amendment. I don't know which amendment, but ...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let us get it straight. I don't want there to be any confusion. It is permitted to amend an amendment. That is perfectly proper and we have a Motion to amend Mr. DeLuca's amendment which is to Hold that in Committee. If you would like to withdraw it, since it's virtually the same thing, that's fine. If there is no objection, Mr. DeLuca is going to withdraw his motion if the Secunder does not mind; he will withdraw his Motion to delete, and we will now

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)(26) MERIT INCREASES FOR NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN (continuing): have before us an amendment to - it virtually does the same thing except it Holds rather than deletes.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I have a Point of Information. It certainly is true that Mr. DeLuca asked in caucus about the Assistant Personnel Director and whether or not that particular job was included in the merit increases. At the time, I could not locate in my papers the information that Mr. DeLuca was seeking. I have now located the information and the Assistant Personnel Director, plus three (3) other jobs, were excluded from this merit increase. Originally there were 17 positions involved in the merit increases. It was reduced to 13, and the Assistant Personnel Director is one of the positions which was excluded, and I apologize to Mr. DeLuca for not having provided the information earlier.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. DeLuca, does that answer your question?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, based on that added information which was not available at the time, I would like to withdraw my amendment. Now I am satisfied.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, am I correct in assuming that you still wish to have your amendment to the Motion on the floor?

MR. BLUM: Withdrawn.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You have withdrawn yours, too?

MR. BLUM: (inaudible) withhold the amendment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Then we are right now back to our original proposal which is a \$30,994 appropriation for the merit increases.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to make a Motion to Return this to Committee for further study. In Fiscal, I didn't feel that we received adequate information. I don't know where these people stand ...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like a Second to that Motion to Return to Committee. It has been Moved and Seconded.

MRS. CONTI: I didn't think we had enough information. I don't know what the salary ranges for all these individuals are. I don't even know who these individuals are. I don't know where they stand in their present salary ranges. I don't know whether they are entitled to cost-of-living adjustments in addition to these merit increases; and there are a number of other questions I would like clarification on and I would like to see the whole thing returned to Committee rather than vote against it for lack of information.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)(26) MERIT INCREASES FOR NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS (continued)

MR. BLUM: Again I say I sent a letter to the Personnel Commission, or the Director of Personnel, asking for certain information so I could present it to the Committee in regard to present salary, proposed increases, the amount of the increase, and the new salaries.

I did not receive this. I received a presentation to the Board of Representatives concerning the increase for managers; in other words, they go through a fact sheet into what the background of the Management Plan is, but no, they even gave me on the back of this, a general evaluation performance rating, but nothing.

I would also like, which I feel our Personnel Committee and this Board is entitled to have, the evaluation of each one that was entitled to a raise, for I'd like to know why he's entitled to it. That we are entitled to under Freedom of Information. It pays to do research. I think this Board ought to get a lot of other papers. Other cities are involved with administrators' pay raises. "City's legal staff readies an appeal of the FOIC ruling on evaluations", this is in Meriden, Conn. One of the councilmen requested an evaluation, being that he was on the committee, and they had a merit evaluation committee. He went to the Freedom of Information and had a hearing, and at this hearing, the Commission was in favor of the councilman at Meriden that he...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, Mr. Blum.

MR. BLUM as well as Dave Blum, Chairman of the Personnel Committee, is entitled to see the evaluations of each of these people who are, for whom they want a raise. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: With all due respect to the Chairman of the Personnel Committee and Mrs. Conti, the veritable wealth of information that you people are asking for from the Personnel Commission or from whomever you want this, to scrutinize and make judgment on these raises, is totally extraneous to the question.

What you're being asked to do is approve merit increases based on a Performance Appraisal Plan that was established in 1978. These people for whom you're being asked to approve raises, do not get automatic increases. The raises are based on their ability to perform their jobs as judged by their superiors.

Now whether it is public information or not, I will not dispute that fact. The fact is that these people are entitled to a raise as established by the Performance Appraisal Plan in 1978. The last raise given to these people was July 1, 1978 for the period from July 1, 1977 to 1978. Now, add to the fact of inflation which we have all suffered, I would not like to be one of these people sitting by waiting for a raise right now.

Their job performance was judged. There is public record of it. I don't feel what one individual got as a job performance is relevant to the question of whether or not they should get a raise. We should have confidence in the superiors, in the supervisory personnel, who rated these people, who say they deserve these raises. If we don't have confidence in these supervisory people, they

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)(26) MERIT INCREASES FOR NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT (continuing): then they shouldn't be supervisory people in the first place, and we don't need their reports, their detailed reports on job performance. We probably wouldn't understand half of them anyway, because we are not personnel experts.

MRS. HAWES: I personally agree with Mr. Wiederlight in what he just said. I do not feel it is our responsibility to decide if these managers were rated correctly, or to see their evaluations. I'm sure if we did, there would be 40 different opinions as to whether they were fairly evaluated or not. It is the responsibility of the Personnel Commission to administer the Merit System and they're doing this, and I think that the concept of merit raises is a good one for the City of Stamford and if we agree with that, I think we should vote in favor of this.

MR. DeNICOLA: I would like to MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: SECONDED. We will vote on Moving the Question. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Motion now on the floor is to refer Back to Committee Item #26. It has been MOVED and SECONDED. We will vote by machine. Mr. Blum wishes to change his vote.

MR. BLUM: I asked to have it go back to Committee,

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is precisely what the Motion on the floor is to do. I will clear the machine and please vote. Vote to RETURN TO COMMITTEE was DENIED by a vote of 9 YES, 25 NO, 1 ABSTENTION (Mrs. Signore). (The voting machine registered 41 votes on the Tally Sheet.)

MOTION to approve Fiscal #26 for \$30,994 was APPROVED with 26 YES, 6 NO, and 3 Abstentions (the tape in the cassette was found at this point to have become loosened and a very large loop of tape was outside the reel case, being Tape Side #3. We did not use Tape Side #4 but switched to a new tape, #5.)

On the vote to approve Item #26 for \$30,994, the voting machine registered 42 votes on the tally sheet. The President, upon being advised of this, said another vote would be taken after the natural sequence of the Fiscal agenda items was finished.

Upon re-vote, the item, Fiscal #26 for \$30,994 was APPROVED again, this time with 30 Yes votes and 6 Abstentions. (41 votes registered on the tally sheet.)

- (27) \$23,883,137.93 - PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD IN THE AMOUNT OF TWENTY-THREE MILLION EIGHT HUNDRED EIGHTY-THREE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED THIRTY-SEVEN DOLLARS AND NINETY-THREE CENTS (\$23,883,137.93). Requested in Mayor Clapes' letter of March 10, 1980. Board of Finance approved 3/13/80.

Section I. To finance certain Capital Projects in the Capital Projects Budgets of 1977-1978, 1978-1979, and 1979-1980:

1977-1978	\$ 352,527.93
1978-1979	11,897,922.00
1979-1980	11,632,688.00
	<u>\$23,883,137.93</u>

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

(27) continued...

Section II. Authorization to make temporary borrowings in anticipation of receipt of proceeds of any issue of said bonds. Notes evidencing such borrowings shall be designated "General Public Improvement Bond Anticipation Notes", "School Bond Anticipation Notes:", "Sanitary Sewer Bond Anticipation Notes" or "Urban Redevelopment Bond Anticipation Notes" as the case may be; maturity dates to be not more than two years from issuance date; shorter maturity notes may be renewed as provided.

The notes shall be general obligations of the City.
(See Mayor's request for full details.)

MRS. CONTI'S first point was lost in the change-over of tapes, due to defective tape side #3. She Moved to amend the resolution to include three points.

Second, the list of some \$23 Million in unbonded Capital appropriations should be re-evaluated and I am open to the majority opinion of the Board as to whether that be done by the Finance Commissioner, by the Board of Finance, or our Fiscal Committee. To set priorities on which of these projects can be deferred and which can possibly be eliminated without detriment to the entire City.

Third, these items which remain on the list must be re-costed to today's market prices.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said the Motion is to amend the Main Motion on the floor to ask the Mayor, the Board of Finance and the Fiscal Committee of this Board to approve only those items vital to the City, that this Capital Projects list be re-evaluated by a proper body instructed to do so, to set priorities of importance, and that the list must be re-costed. It has been Moved and Seconded.

MR. FAUTEUX said he is in opposition to this Motion. He wishes to remind Mrs. Conti that Commissioner Hoffman did go to some length to indicate that there would be a priority set as to how this money would be utilized in projects. This amendment, as it is phrased, casts doubt upon the management practices and policies of our Commissioner of Finance Department and general City departments. He thinks, as you can see from the length of the amendment, in its three sections, is so general that it would take an almost impossible amount of effort to identify this kind of prioritization that Mrs. Conti is proposing. It is just almost impractical to envision such an amendment being something in the real world.

MR. FLOUNDERS said he agreed with Mr. Fauteux, and while he doesn't have any great disagreement with what Mrs. Conti is recommending as an amendment, he thinks it is gratuitous because this Board is merely formalizing what the Board of Finance and the Commissioner of Finance are planning to do anyway.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

(27) continued...

MR. FLOUNDERS (continuing): He wished to comment on a couple of things Mrs. Conti said which he feels might be misleading. First that we do not have a dismal financial situation in Stamford. He would not like the outside world to think that we do. What we have is an unprecedentedly high interest rate which is prevalent throughout the country. The only thing that is being requested here is the authority to go to short-term notes, which does not indicate financial difficulty. This is prudent, as future interest rates are uncertain, and we should not go out too far more than two years in our commitments. This does not have anything to do with bond ratings.

MRS. HAWE agrees with much of what Mr. Fauteux and Mr. Flounders have said. However she thinks there is much merit to what Mrs. Conti says. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for Mrs. Conti to submit a resolution for next month's Steering, dealing with what she is discussing and not to tack it on to this one that we are looking at tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Conti, did you hear Mrs. Hawe's suggestion?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, but where would it logically come in Steering?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to say that in reality, even if this Board passed this, there is no way of our imposing this will, except through the Charter, on the Board of Finance. Perhaps it would be more in order to present a resolution next month as the will of the Board, as a recommendation. I leave this up to you certainly, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: Where would it logically come as a resolution "out of the blue"?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I think that it would be properly placed under the column "Resolution", or under "Fiscal" as a resolution. It could be either of those two places. As a matter of fact, if you choose to proceed along that course, we could discuss where you think it should be properly placed and ask Fiscal, or Steering, to take that into account.

MRS. CONTI: O.K., let me think about it.

MRS. GUROIAN: Mr. Fauteux said that the Commissioner said he would do an order of priority. As I have been given to understand, all he said was that he had not done one yet; then he turned around and said that it's an impossible task. Well, either the Commissioner has promised to do an impossible task, or I misunderstood what Mr. Fauteux said.

Mr. Flounders said that all we're being asked to do is to approve a resolution, pass a resolution in order to enable the Commissioner to go for short-term notes, but that is not so. We are also being asked to approve a dollar amount, unless I'm reading it incorrectly, because it says \$23,883,137.93 explicitly, in the proposed resolution; so it is not only to empower him, it is to empower him to bond that amount, so that any discussion about the amount is certainly pertinent to the question before us.

MR. FAUTEUX: Mrs. Guroian, I can't remember, were you at the meeting when the Commissioner was there?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

(27) continued...

MRS. GUROIAN: No, I just commented on what you said right now. I can only believe what you said, not what was (inaudible - not speaking into microphone).

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Guroian stated that she was not at the meeting, Mr. Fauteux

MR. FAUTEUX: Mrs. Guroian, you attributed to the Commissioner, some statements that he made, supposedly made at the meeting at which you were not there. I was there.

MRS. GUROIAN: Personal Privilege, please. All I said was I was given to understand. I neither indicated that I was there to hear, nor that I knew positively. I said I was given to understand. Now, I listened to what Mr. Fauteux said and tried to interpret what he said. He is misinterpreting what I said!

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I think, Mrs. Guroian, I think we do understand what you said and what you ...

MR. FAUTEUX: My statement stands.

MR. DeNICOLA: I would just like to MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Motion to Move the Question. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said now the question is on the amendment to the Main Motion. The amendment is to ask the Mayor and the Board of Finance and the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives to approve only capital projects vital to the City; that the list be re-evaluated by the proper Body; that priorities be set, and that the list of capital projects be re-costed.

We will vote by voice. The CHAIR is in doubt. We will use the machine. I would like everyone to look very carefully at the machine at how they are being recorded because the machine that was fixed is giving us some problems. The vote is 12 YES and 22 NO. The Motion to amend has been DEFEATED. The machine is not recording it properly. We will vote by use of the machine and the Clerk will record the names as listed on the machine so that we don't have to go through a Roll Call, but our automatic recorder is not functioning properly at this time. This is really very unfortunate. It is very difficult for us to function this way.

We will now proceed to the main question which is on \$23,883,137.93, which is a resolution for General Obligation Bonds of the City. We will vote by voice. The Motion is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. HAWE: That concludes the Fiscal Report. I MOVE the CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before we vote on that Motion, Mrs. Hawe, we are going to vote again on an item that, unfortunately, was totally misrepresented on our machine. As soon as Mrs. Summerville has recorded the votes that we're recording right now from the previous vote, we will be voting on #26 which is the merit increase. The machine had recorded 26 yes and 6 no, with 3 abstentions. We will just take a re-vote on that momentarily. In the meantime, while we are still doing this, let us take care of the CONSENT AGENDA. Mrs. Hawe, when you mention the items on CONSENT, please read out the items so that our listening audience knows what we are discussing.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

(27) continued...

MRS. HAWE read the item numbers, the dollar amounts, and the department and the description, all of which are already listed in these Minutes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called a vote on the Motion to approve the CONSENT AGENDA, which was SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, with the following exceptions: Mrs. McInerney voting NO on Item #23; Mrs. Signore Abstaining on #4 School Health Program; Mr. Donahue Abstaining on #3.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a re-vote on the \$30,994. Item #26. She said this is not because of any question of substance, but because the machine did not record properly. We will vote by machine, and also the Clerk will write down who voted which way on her sheet.

The vote on the machine is 30 Yes, 1 No, with 5 Abstentions, as we now have 36 members present. Mr. Esposito has just joined the meeting. We have one NO vote recorded. Did anyone on the floor vote NO? The vote is 31 YES and 5 Abstentions. Will the Abstentions please raise their hands so that we know who they are? They are Mrs. Signore, Mrs. Conti, Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Corbo, Mrs. Perillo, and Mr. Blum. Those are 6 Abstentions. The vote is 30 YES with 6 Abstentions.

MR. BLUM: Point of Personal Privilege. When is our machine finally going to be fixed? We just voted on monies to have it repaired.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Thomsen and his company have been here all week changing the relays. He was here tonight and the machine was functioning while he was here. It's like the doctor who comes and you're well until he leaves. I don't know what is causing the problem, but it is a very disturbing problem and if it cannot be corrected by the next meeting so that we don't have to go through this again, we are going to have to look into the purchase of a new machine for this Board. We cannot function this way. It's incredible.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - John Zelinski, Jr., Co-Chairman

MR. ZELINSKI said Legislative and Rules Committee met on Wednesday, April 9th, in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present were Representatives Donahue, Conti, Wiederlight, Fasanelli, Corbo, and Zelinski. Absent was Rep. Blum because of illness, and also absent were Reps. Pollard and Loomis. Also present at the meeting were Attorneys Badger, Kveskin, Shapero, Ivey, and Goldberg.

(1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE PRIVATE GARBAGE COLLECTORS.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Committee voted unanimously to defeat this because the ordinance to be amended has been repealed for want of administration and enforcement. In keeping with our practice to make positive Motions, I Move for publication. SECONDED.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I don't know whether you checked the Minutes at the November, 1979 meeting in which we repealed some of the ordinances, Mr. Zelinski. However, it was slated...

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Was that a question to me?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let Mrs. McInerney finish. If it turns out to be a question, we'll allow you to answer.

MRS. McINERNEY: I am sure that Mr. Boodman slated this for depletion. However, as I recall in November, we did actually repeal this particular ordinance, and I would ask you: (1) to reconsider your defeat and I would make a motion to hold it until you can confirm the Minutes in which we enacted these removals.

MR. ZELINSKI: I have in front of me correspondence from Corporation Counsel's Office pertaining to all the items under our Committee. It is dated April 7th signed Barry Boodman. Pertaining to item #1, as I said: "the ordinance to be amended has been repealed for want of administration and enforcement." I don't know how much clearer I can make it to you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Zelinski, as I just indicated, Mr. Boodman was under the assumption that it was deleted. I am not, and in my mind I would not have proposed it. As I remember from the last Board, this is one that was slated and then it never did get removed; and I am, therefore, going to make a Motion that the item be Held in Committee until such time as the Minutes are checked and you can absolutely confirm that this item was removed from the Book of Ordinances. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would call to Rep. McInerney's attention other correspondence dated April 7th from Mr. Boodman addressed to her, stating this and other comments on that proposed ordinance. I would ask has she been in contact with the Law Department to answer her question?

MRS. McINERNEY: I have called Mr. Boodman. He has returned my call. I have called again and I am waiting to hear from him again.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Motion is to Return to Committee Item #1 for further study. The Motion is CARRIED by 33 yes, 2 opposed (Mr. Zelinski and Mr. Corbo), and 1 abstention (Mr. Rybnick).

Will you please, Mr. Zelinski, before we proceed, tell us which of the items under L&R had unanimous approval so that they can be put on the CONSENT AGENDA?

MR. ZELINSKI said there were none. He said that to finalize #1, he would ask Mrs. McInerney to get in contact with the Law Department and that way he would be more than happy to assist, but based on the information he has received, that was it.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE "MORATORIUM ON CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS, per letter 12/31/79 from Rep. John Zelinski. Held since 1/14/80.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor, with 1 Abstention to WAIVE PUBLICATION. Only one word was changed from the ordinance that was mailed to all Board members on Feb. 21st, and that is on page 2, #2, last sentence would add one word "available" before "comparable",

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) RE MORATORIUM ON CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: I just wanted to add one thing further. We also have, on our desks this evening, a one and a quarter page amendment to be incorporated in my proposed ordinance. It is nothing more than adding some more language to strengthen the ordinance in other areas. I'll be more than happy to read that if the members would like me to. If not, we can proceed. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM said he would like to oppose the first section, #1 of the amendment. He would amend this amendment so that Paragraph #1 be deleted and he can buy the rest of the package. So MOVED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said there was no SECOND to Mr. Blum's motion. She said they would proceed to a vote on the amendment that no apartment house may be converted to condominiums unless 35% of those tenants allow the conversion; that within 90 days after enactment of this ordinance....

MR. ZELINSKI: Excuse me, I thought we moved that everybody had that; why should you be reading it again?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, there is also an obligation that the CHAIR has to state the Motion before we vote on it, Mr. Zelinski, and that is precisely what I am doing for the Board here, and for the public who is listening.

That within 90 days after enactment of this ordinance, the Mayor shall present to the Board of Representatives a plan for the development of rental housing. I am paraphrasing that during this period, the Fair Rent Commission shall make sure that no family is displaced and that the Chief Building Officer of the City shall conduct an immediate survey of all recently-announced condominium conversions.

Now, we will vote by use of the machine. We are voting on the amendment that I just outlined. Please corroborate your vote on the machine so that we know it's accurate. The vote is 10 in favor, 20 opposed, with 6 abstentions. The Motion to amend the ordinance has been LOST. We will now go to the Main Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Main Motion is Item #2, with one word change as mentioned previously. The Committee voted 5 in favor to WAIVE PUBLICATION and he so MOVES. After it is Seconded, he will discuss the matter. SECONDED.

There is a crisis situation in Stamford because of what is going on with the existing apartments available for the low, middle income, elderly and young families who live in our City. That is why the Committee recommended waiving of publication tonight. There was a public hearing on January 10th.

The Director of the Fair Rent Commission, Diane Crouse, sent us a letter dated March 31st. There are a couple of extremely important points worth mentioning. I quote: "The present situation involving condominium conversions has become so serious that urgent and immediate action is desperately needed. Landlords have been converting apartment buildings to condominiums at such an alarming rate over the past several months that we are reaching a crisis situation. Based on discussions which I had with State Legislators while I was in Hartford on March 26th, I hold very little hope that any legislation passed on the State level will do much to help this situation in Stamford. The original bill, Senate Bill 290,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversions (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI (continuing to quote Ms. Crouse's letter):

"has been so watered down as it passed through three committees that there isn't much left of it. Therefore, the only possible remedy right now is for the Board of Representatives to take immediate action to at least slow down the process and bring a level of sanity to a situation which has gotten completely out of hand."

In that correspondence, Ms. Crouse mentions and has figures which state that apartment buildings converted to condominiums in Stamford through June 30, 1978 total 1,285. Through 6/30/79, total 1,653 units; and finally, total number of conversions to April 1, 1980, now total 2,385.

Since the State law went into effect on Nov. 16, 1979, 475 units have also gone condominium. A letter dated March 24th, from ...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski, I don't want to cut you off, but please limit your remarks to the Motion to Waive Publication.

MR. ZELINSKI: I am, I am, yes, I am. Thank you. As I was stating, before interrupted, letter dated March 24, 1980 from Corporation Counsel Leonard Cookney, he mentions that the Senate bill which Ms. Crouse had mentioned and I quote: "It is my understanding that this bill should pass the House and Senate some time later this week or early next week." That was as of March 24th. Here we are two weeks and three days later and nothing has passed yet. Ironically, the bill that was passed on Nov. 16th mentioned that each apartment unit had to have a separate heating unit which shall be a part of that unit. Ironically, it does even state that the unit has to work. Thereare...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You are now out of order. You are not speaking to the Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI: I am speaking to the Motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Excuse me, Mr. Zelinski, you are not. You are not speaking to the Motion to Waive Publication. If publication is waived, you may relate all of this because then we will be discussing the main ordinance before us.

MR. ZELINSKI: We are discussing the main ordinance now.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, we are not, Mr. Zelinski. Perhaps you have misunderstood me

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, please clarify it for me.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We are discussing waiving publication of this ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI: I know that. I made the Motion. Yes.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversions (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If we have the vote to waive publication of this ordinance, then the motion to pass an ordinance regarding a moratorium on condominium conversions will be before this Board and we can discuss the ordinance.

I thought I was being very gentle in telling you before to please stick to the topic. I hope you stick to waiving publication now.

MR. ZELINSKI: In other words, what you're telling me is that after publication is waived, then we will be under discussion which I was saying at this present time? Is that what you're saying?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm saying if publication is waived, you will be able to discuss the adoption of the proposed ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI: O.K.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I will limit my remarks strictly to waiving publication. This is a very important matter before us now and to pass an ordinance tonight, in effect, is what we would be doing without giving the public recourse to come to our next meeting and express their concerns and their ideas to us would be a grave disservice. Now, Mr. Zelinski has indicated that he held a public hearing. The public hearing was in all effect a sham, I regret to say. It ran for one hour and thirty minutes. It was publicized one day before the date that it was scheduled for. I will quote from a letter sent to Mr. Zelinski from a very, very fine law firm in this City ...

MR. ZELINSKI: A Point of Personal Privilege, Madam President. Is this germane to the discussion of waiving publication?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I certainly think it is, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: All the Board members did receive a copy of this letter. To say the least, I am extremely upset with the method which has been chosen by this Committee to advise the public of a public hearing on such an emotionally-charged issue, one day's formal notice is close to railroading as I can possibly conceive. Further, to restrict a hearing from 7:00 to 8:30 p.m. gives the general public only 1½ hours to discuss this issue and this smacks of the same character as the notice. I rest my case.

MR. ZELINSKI: No. 1, it is very well known that the prominent attorney who wrote that letter does represent landlords who own apartments in the City. He is highly prejudiced in the letter he wrote. In regards to Mr. Wiederlight's comment of the public hearing being a sham, I really don't know what he means by that. It was publicized. People did come. Citizens came that represented to us that there was a problem. I'm sure that all of us here heard their pleas that there was a problem. They asked us to do something for them, the people who live in the apartments. The only ones who would possibly be against this ordinance are the owners of the apartment buildings who will be converting them....

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversions (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Zelinski, we are going to proceed to a vote. The Motion is to Waive Publication which requires two-thirds of the entire membership of the Board, or 27 votes. Please corroborate your vote on the machine. The vote is 8 in favor, 25 opposed, and 2 abstentions. Mrs. Hawe has left. We now have 35 members present. The Motion is LOST.

We will now go to the Main Motion which is for PUBLICATION of the ordinance. MOVED by Mr. Zelinski. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM: I want to thank you for recognizing me now, but I think let's live by the Rules of the Board. It says "when you wish to be recognized, you stand to be recognized" and that is what the Rules of the Board so state.

As long as you are asking me now, I ask you, have you the right to cut off debate? I don't think the Rules allow that. It has to be a Motion from the floor to cut off debate.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Blum, I had no more speakers listed and I proceeded to a vote. Once we proceed to a vote, we have to go on with the vote. If I did not see your hand, I apologize. I believe you stood up after we proceeded with the vote. We will now proceed to a vote if there is no discussion. There is discussion.

MR. ZELINSKI said the bill before the General Assembly has nothing in it to protect the middle income and young families who are living in apartments. Another argument raised by opponents of this ordinance is that the opinion of the Law Department indicates there are some problems but does not say that it is illegal. That would be up to a judge to decide. He said he attended a two-hour meeting in the Corporation Counsel's office and was told that if this Board passed an ordinance, it would be up to the Law Department to defend it if someone should challenge it, and it would be up to the judge in the court of law to either uphold or not uphold our ordinance. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he is definitely in favor of legislation to regulate conversion of apartment buildings to condominiums, but he is definitely against this particular ordinance. His reasons are simple and he will keep them succinct. In Corporation Counsel's letter of March 25th, it is true they would have to defend the ordinance if it is put to the test, but it would be very nice to have to defend an ordinance they support and that they agree with and which they feel they have a good chance of winning in court, not this particular one.

MRS. GUROIAN: If we vote against publication, is that tantamount to voting against the ordinance?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, it is, Mrs. Guroian.

MR. DeNICOLA: I would like to speak against this. I think we have enough lawsuits on our hands and I think we are spending enough money on lawyers, and I think it is unconstitutional at this point for this ordinance. I am totally against it.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversions (continued)

MR. BLUM: There are a lot of things that are unconstitutional, but they get voted on, and until someone finds out it is unconstitutional, it's still the law. I'd like to share with you the feelings that I went through myself in my reasoning as to why I traveled to Hartford to speak for Bill 290, and why I speak in favor of this ordinance tonight.

I, myself, received a letter from my landlord that within a certain length of time my apartment would go condominium. The purchase of my apartment was not even offered to me. I asked what it would cost anyway and he said \$55-60,000. And it's a walk-up apartment. He did not offer it to any of the 24 units of 77 Glenbrook Road to anyone, only that he wanted them out of the building so that he could convert them and go through an entire conversion of the inner structure, made a complete change of everything. It's a terrible feeling when you are given a dispossess notice by a sheriff that you have to leave within a certain time, otherwise you have to go to court; and what can I tell you? I moved.

But there are still people at that apartment. One is 90 years old. But how about those who were not senior citizens? The young. They had to go. How long must we go on in this town without having rentable apartments? Why must we have every apartment taken away from us because some developer comes into Stamford and takes his profits at our expense. They want \$119,000 for the apartments at Bracewood Lane, and they're full of leaks, full of roaches, full of everything. We are in a town of mobility. If you can't afford to buy, get out! If you can afford to stay, stay, but most seem to have to get out. Where is the saturation point? I just moved into this apartment. How do you know if you're safe? I don't. No one knows. We leave in fear. Give those who do not own property, who cannot afford property, who want to live in an apartment house, give them a break. Give us this safeguard. Give us this ordinance.

MRS. PERILLO: I MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. JOYCE: Madam Chairman, Point of Order. I've had my hand up back here.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You're on the list, Mr. Joyce. I am going to read the list and the Body can determine if they wish to Move the Question.

Left to speak are Mr. Joyce, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Hogan, Mrs. Guroian, and Mr. Conti. Mrs. Perillo has withdrawn her Motion to Move the Question, and if the Seconder does not object, we will go on with the discussion.

MR. JOYCE: The particular issue involved is a very serious one, involving very serious legal import. I have read very carefully Mrs. Perry's opinion and would like to comment on that opinion. It is a conflict of rights under the Constitution and essentially involves what they call a conflict between police powers of the State, of which this Board is considered to be the State, against the substantive and procedural due process aspects of the Constitution relating to the protection of people's property. What we are talking about is the right of this Board, under its police powers, to regulate the health, safety and general welfare of the inhabitants of Stamford.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MR. JOYCE: When you consider, on the one hand, just the aspect of health, older people who are forced to move from their dwelling to another place, it puts their health in jeopardy. Public safety would be involved in moving these persons from one place to another, the safety of individuals collectively and singularly. What I am really boiling down to is the questions inherent in this particular ordinance, in this particular legislation, are constitutional by nature. They cannot be determined by this Body, by the local courts; they're matters that will have to go all the way to the United States Supreme Court, perhaps, to be determined.

But, in the meantime, it would be my recommendation that we must act and you exercise police power that we have and is granted to us under the Constitution to protect those people who cannot protect themselves, namely, the people who are recognizing at the same time that we may be violating the procedural due process and the substantive due process, the taking of the property rights of those landowners and landlords who will undoubtedly argue that we have not the right to enact such a confiscatory type of legislation.

However, I would urge you to very carefully consider the nature of this legislation, and to take a positive view toward enacting it even though we recognize there is a possibility it may be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction down the line.

Second point, on page 2 of Mrs. Perry's opinion, she speaks of the question of pre-emption by State Statutes, and while it is generally true that State Statutes in existence can pre-empt, pre-emption implies existence at the time that we take action. Therefore, we are not concerned with proposed acts; we are only concerned with acts which are presently on the books. I am of the opinion, and I see nothing in the Corporation Counsel's opinion to indicate the contrary, that any proposed municipal ordinance which we have to consider does in fact directly contravene State Statutes. If that is the case, I have not seen the specific citation of the Statute which is alleged to be dominant over the proposed ordinance.

Final point, and I don't mean to belabor these points, but they are all very significant, in the last page of Counsel's opinion and advice to us, she takes up the question of financial and administrative impact statements. This is all very nice and it is all very fine to be able to do such things, if we have an opportunity to consider the administrative problems and cost implications, but when we are faced with a situation of crisis dimensions, as we have, we may not have the time to involve in a long-term study of the administrative details and/or the cost implications to protect the citizens who are not able to protect themselves, which is the ultimate function of legislation. We may have to take inaction; we may have to run the risk of, perhaps, as many of the Board members know, I am the last person on this Board as I have been critical of some ordinance which have been enacted by the Board, and, i.e., have not been tested by the Court.

In this situation, recognizing what is happening, I change my view. I say that I urge you to recognize it with full recognition of the possibility that this may be contested. I urge you to support this legislation on behalf of the less fortunate members of our society who are affected by being dispossessed from their homes. Thank you.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: I will try to be as brief as I can. I would hope that none of us votes against this ordinance because of the way it has been presented. We must recognize that we are voting on publication. If it is published, it will give everyone a chance to be heard; it will give all of us a chance to perhaps amend this to the Corporation Counsel's liking. It's very seldom that I have the chance to support Mr. Zelinski on something that he is sponsoring, but the fact that Mr. Zelinski is sponsoring this ordinance should tell all of us how critical the need for housing is in this City, and I am not saying this to be facetious. But the people of Stamford deserve a chance and a right to be exposed to this kind of legislation, and I would hope this Board supports this for publication, and remember, we are only talking about publicating.

MR. HOGAN: I have sat here and listened very attentively to both the pros and cons of this question. It seems to me that everyone who has spoken thus far is in agreement on one point, that we have before us an ordinance which is, to say the least, questionable as far as the legality of it goes. I think there is merit on both sides of the question that have been put forth tonight. But I don't think we should go ahead and enact an ordinance which we have already said does not have the blessing of the Corporation Counsel and will not hold water, so to speak.

I am in favor of an ordinance preventing condominium conversions, but I am in favor of an ordinance that will stand the test of the courts, and one which our Corporation Counsel's Office feels will stand up in court; therefore, I would like at this time to make a Motion to Re-commit this item to Committee for further study. MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there any discussion on Mr. Hogan's Motion to Re-commit? We will have a list now only on the Motion to Re-commit.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would be against sending back to Committee. Representative Livingston mentioned some very good points. I hoped for Waiver of Publication because of the dire need, not for me, but for the people who live in apartments. I don't think we should wait any longer. We should publish and then see what happens. I've been trying to do something about this since I was re-elected in December and came back on this Board. Now there might be some underlying current that I don't know about, and there may be some people out in the community who don't want any type of ordinance passed. It seems to me if everybody is in favor of something, let's pass something and let the courts decide, if it comes to that I don't think this Body or anyone else can pass something that would be 100% infallible in any court of law. Let's be honest. It depends on the judge in the particular situation and circumstances.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN reminded everyone that the discussion is not on proposal to publish, not on the main question, but on whether to send the proposed ordinance back to committee for further study and work.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MR. DeLUCA: Here it is, we hire a Corporation Counsel to render opinions to us and right away we're willing to say he's wrong, which in past times I have also wanted to over-ride some of his opinions. Granted, in view of the fact that we do have a pending bill, No. 290 before the General Assembly, which will help alleviate the problem in our City, therefore, to return it to committee would be a good idea. We would then come up with an ordinance acceptable to the Corporation Counsel which will prevent losses. I agree that no matter what we do, it is going to make someone unhappy, but to continue in the manner we are going tonight, we talk about the public hearing being a sham, this meeting here seems to be becoming a sham for the time we are spending on it.

MR. BLUM: To send it Back to Committee is to kill it. That's the way I was always taught. Let us publish it, and it will give time for Mrs. Perry to offer some better points to make it more palatable. To return to committee will mean how many more apartments will join the list of conversions? Please do not Return to Committee.

MRS. GUROIAN: I MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said still to speak are Mr. Conti, Mr. Wider, Mr. Flounders and Mr. Boccuzzi. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to ask for a Roll Call vote because of the seriousness of this matter. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are sufficient hands for a Roll Call vote.

MS. SUMMERVILLE CALLED THE ROLL:

21 No votes:VOTING AGAINST RETURNING TO COMMITTEE

Lathon Wider	Mary Jane Signore
Patrick Joyce	Alfred Perillo
Jeanne-Lois Santy	Vincent DeNicola
Anthony Conti	Mary Lou Rinaldi
Audrey Maihock	Gerald Rybnick
Jeremiah Livingston	Donald Donahue
John Boccuzzi	M. Wiederlight
Fiorenzio Corbo	Sandra Goldstein
Handy Dixon	John Kunsaw
Richard Fasanelli	John Zelinski
David Blum	

ABSTENTIONS (2)

Paul Esposito
Annie Summerville

12 Yes votes:VOTING IN FAVOR OF RETURNING TO COMMITTEE

Betty Conti
Grace Guroian
Burtis Flounders
Barbara McInerney
Doris Bowlby
John Roos
Robert DeLuca
John J. Hogan
Moiria Lyons
Paul Dziezyc
Robert Fauteux
Mildred Perillo

ABSENT (5)

Stanley Darer	Ralph Loomis
Everett Pollard	Marie Hawe
Philip Stork	

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The Motion is DENIED, with 21 NO votes; 12 YES votes; 2 Abstentions. We will go back to the Main Motion and the old list which is still in effect for this Motion.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN asked about clarification again on voting against publication being tantamount to killing the ordinance.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said yes, it is. If you vote against publication, you are voting down the entire item. It can be re-submitted at a future meeting; but the vote to send it back to committee has just lost, so now we either vote in favor of publication, or against publication. Anybody wishing to resurrect the ordinance at Steering next month is certainly fine.

MRS. GUROIAN: At this particular time, can we make changes in the language of the body or any changes in it, after publication?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Truly, that's not so. We have the publication of an ordinance which you may amend if you choose, and if you have any amendments to this ordinance or changes of words, which would be an amendment, they are perfectly in order.

MRS. GUROIAN: One of the Representatives said something about we should pass it and then change it after publication. Why is it not better to change, to make the corrections before publication?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Are you asking that of someone, or would you like the CHAIR to answer? I don't really want to intrude an opinion here. I'd rather have Mr. Livingston or the Chairman answer it. You are bringing up an excellent point.

MR. LIVINGSTON: During the process of publicizing this ordinance, we will still have the chance to make amendments however we see fit. You can make amendments tonight that would be part of the publication, but one thing we should not do is spend the rest of the night debating on something we are just simply going to publish.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I feel I must comment. We have an obligation by Charter to publish every ordinance. Now, if there is any intention of making very substantial changes in an ordinance that has been published, it is the duty of this Body to republish. The public has a right to know, and if Mrs. Guroian wishes to make changes to the language, or anyone else does, it is most fitting to do it before publication so that the public knows what we are dealing with.

MRS. GUROIAN: That's precisely what I wanted to hear because, as I look at it, if the effort by the proponents of the ordinance is to save time as exhibited by the Motion to Waive Publication, then it would behoove us to make whatever changes are necessary now and not publish and then make changes and have to publish again and possibly have a hearing on it; so I wanted that fact made clear so that if any effort is made to change the ordinance, it's not to delay it but in order to expedite it; that's my point of view; somebody else could have another point of view.

I had some questions to ask about some wording in the ordinance. I know I'm not a lawyer but I thought I did understand English language when I read it,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MRS. GUORIAN (continuing): It says here "at least every six months, the Mayor is to compute and certify the percentage". The Mayor may be responsible for having it done but I don't think he's going to go around and compute it himself. Second, is it implying that the same people who compute also certify that computation? Is this what the mean by saying that?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I believe that would be the case. Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein

MRS. GUROIAN: The same people compute and then certify their own work?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, right now, the Community Development, through HUD, get some of this information and that's why the Mayor's Office was put in there for that particular purpose. He has more access to the various departments to get that information.

MRS. GUROIAN: Would Mr. Zelinski, through the CHAIR, please give me a definition of what is meant by a proposed vacancy rate? On Page 2 on top, it says, it talks about the computation and the certification and then it gives format, what they should consider in this work, and then it interjects something afterwards which I don't understand. It says "after the proposed vacancy rate is arrived at." What is the proposed vacancy rate?

MR. ZELINSKI: That is the vacancy rate in the City of the apartments, the availability of apartments in the City, how many are actually free to rent.

MRS. GUROIAN: That's an existing vacancy rate. It is not a proposed rate, as I would use it, at least in financial language. When you make, you have a proposed budget; it is not an existing budget; it's a proposal.

MR. ZELINSKI: Excuse me, I see your point, but in other words, the reason it was put in was that the vacancy rate may change. That's why proposing, meaning whatever it is at that time, that they are doing evaluation.

MRS. GUROIAN: The existing vacancy rate at that time, but this implies that he is proposing a vacancy rate, which misled me completely.

MR. ZELINSKI: I see where you could be, yes, Would you like to change that?

MRS. GUROIAN: I would prefer it if you changed it. I'm asking for my own clarification because that really threw me off. I didn't know what you were talking about when you were talking about proposed vacancy rate.

MR. ZELINSKI: Mrs. Guroian, would you like us to change the word "proposed" to maybe "anticipating"?

MRS. GUROIAN: No, the existing vacancy rate, existing at that time, at that particular time, at the time of the survey.

MR. ZELINSKI: All right. In other words, we're changing the word "proposed" to "existing"?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Guroian, you don't want it?

MRS. GUROIAN: I don't want to make the proposal. He can make the proposal.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: I would MOVE, according to, based on Mrs. Guroian's comments, I would change the word "proposed" to "existing", SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on this Motion to amend and change the word from proposed to existing. CARRIED.

MRS. GUROIAN: I have another question. I'm rather concerned about the fact, if under this Whereas, about safety, health and morals, which Mr. Joyce very kindly interpreted for me, the City now takes the obligation upon itself, under that Whereas, to look out for the safety, health and so forth, welfare of elderly people to see that they get adequate housing, is this opening the door to the City taking responsibility for those who cannot pay their taxes as well, and have to leave their homes, then we have to find them apartments? You can't single out, by my way of thinking, you can't fairly single out people who live in apartments and ignore people who may be living in homes and can't afford the homes they are living in.

MR. ZELINSKI: May I answer that? I see your point but this particular ordinance deals nothing, with nothing more than just the apartment crisis, not anything dealing with houses. It relates strictly to apartments being converted and nothing more.

MRS. GUROIAN: My point that I'm making that once we acknowledge, on this basis, that we have a responsibility to people who live in apartment houses, it seems to me that it would be in order for somebody to propose that under the same Whereas, we have a responsibility for people who cannot live in the homes that they own. This is just my own thinking.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think that's a good point but I think it would by law have to be a separate ordinance. I don't think we could incorporate it to this.

MRS. GUROIAN: That's right, but it will be setting a precedent.

MR. ZELINSKI: Well, yes, because we are looking out for the welfare for the people in Stamford in this particular area, yes.

MRS. GUROIAN: Yes, and this area we are only looking out for the welfare of the elderly who apartment house to the exclusion of elderly who own their own homes.

MR. ZELINSKI: No.

MRS. GUROIAN: That's the way I interpret it. I think that's about all I could see at one glance. Thank you.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Point of Information. The changed proposed by Rep. Guroian was to change the word proposed on Page 2 to existing. In that same paragraph, which is the top paragraph on Page 2, there are two additional uses of the clause or phrase or whatever-the-hell it is, proposed vacancy rate. So if the change from proposed to existing applies and makes sense in the last sentence of that paragraph, I submit that it would make sense in the other two places in that paragraph where the word proposed occurs,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Reading that last paragraph, Mrs. Guroian, since it was your question and I know not your motion, Mr. Zelinski, it must be reconsidered that the wording because it does not make sense as it now exists. Please read from the first paragraph after we change the word to existing. Read the paragraph and determine whether you wish to clarify. Mr. Zelinski is taking a moment to go over this.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you. I'm sorry to take a moment here. After re-reading this, it would be best to keep it at the original word of proposed because it is a proposed rate arrived at by the Mayor. That's why it's proposed. It's dependent on what the situation is at the time, and the Mayor establishes it at that time. I would like to leave it at proposed. If I could make a Motion to..

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, you cannot. We would need a Motion to Reconsider except if everybody is in agreement that we should bring that back to proposed, then that would preclude having to go through the formalities of ...

MR. ZELINSKI: So MOVED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there any objection to putting proposed back. If there is none, we shall do that and it shall now read proposed again because that is the only way it makes sense. Mr. Conti is the next speaker.

MR. CONTI: There is a dire emergency or urgency for this to be passed this evening. They say bureaucracy rolls slowly. This has been going on for many months. We do know that the law that was passed in Hartford has been extended to May 7th, and that is just a few short weeks away. If we don't do something tonight, before we even have our next meeting, there will be no law whatsoever on the books protecting the apartment dwellers. Now, in our 11th District, we have many, many apartment dwellers and we, as Representatives, must see that the people who elected us must be protected, and the ones who have the most apartment dwellers in their districts are the ones who are most anxious to see this thing passed tonight.

We could go on for month, after month, after month, changing, proposing, and nothing is going to be done. We had a public hearing on January 10th and people did speak. They spoke for an hour and a half or whatever anyone wanted to say, but they were represented. We have made many changes. We have put many an hour on making sure that this was brought up on the floor this evening, and I would like to see, if there is even any matter of reconsidering the waiving, I would like to see that done. In all urgency, this must be passed as rapidly as possible. Thank you.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Regarding Ms. Perry's letter of March 25th, in view of the litigation exposure which this letter makes very clear that we would be subject to, at least in her opinion, and in view of the suggestion, and indeed the offer which she made on the third page; her suggestion was that we make full use of all the City resources, meaning in this instance the Law Department to get their help in formulating an ordinance that would conform, clearly conform, with the powers granted to the City and that would be in harmony with the State's prerogatives to legislate on this matter or on this subject. My question to Mr. Zelinski is: did you or your Committee consult with Corporation Counsel in response to this suggestion?

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)(2) Re Condominium Conversion (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, as I mentioned early in my presentation, I did spend over two hours sitting with Mr. Cookney and Mrs. Perry. Quite honestly, I got the very strong impression very clearly that they did not want any legislation passed in Stamford. They felt that it would be up to Hartford, and let Hartford do it and not worry about it; and that was the extreme thing that I got from them, and that's why I feel that we've got to do something because, as I mentioned to them, Mr. Flounders, I would be very happy tonight if I knew for certain that Hartford would pass something that would help the people in Stamford who are getting removed from their apartments. But we don't know for sure, so that's why I would like to publish something here so we can help them, and that's the whole purpose of this.

But, in answer to your question, and I'm sorry I went off the tangent for a minute; I don't think we are going to get too much help. I think they want to pass the buck back to Hartford and that's it. They don't want to be bothered with it. I spent two hours with them because I even said, well, if some of this isn't right, could you help us? Well, it's very complicated. Why don't you just wait a couple of days, as I mentioned earlier, a couple of weeks, a couple of months, and it'll be taken care of in Hartford. Don't worry about it. That was their attitude, and I'm sorry, I have an obligation to the people. I can't just let it stand at that.

MR. RYBNICK: I MOVE THE QUESTION. SECONDED.

MR. CORBO: There is a technical error. Instead of calling it Building Inspector, Inspector of a Building Division, we call it Director of a Building Department, which we don't have in Stamford.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have a Motion on the floor to Move the Question, and that is non-debatable. I know you are not debating that and you want something else, but we are faced with many things here. Mr. Rybnick, unless you wish to withdraw your Motion, we are going to proceed to a vote to Move the Question.

MR. RYBNICK: We are spending hours, two hours on this, and have all the time a month from now in which to resolve these questions. We should be doing this a month from now, not tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to Move the Question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the Main Motion which is for Publication of the Proposed Ordinance, and asked the members to corroborate their votes on the lighted panel. Mr. Livingston and Mr. Kunsaw have left and she said there are now 33 members present. The vote is 19 in favor and 14 opposed. We shall count manually. There are 19 in favor, 13 opposed and 1 Abstention. The Motion has been CARRIED.

MR. HOGAN: I quote from our Rules of Order, "On voting, no ordinance or appropriation resolution shall be adopted except by a majority vote of the entire membership of the Board."

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Hogan, this is for Publication, and if this was going to be the final adoption of the ordinance, it would have needed 21 votes; but for publication, it's a simple majority. We now have 33 members present.

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

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE GREENWICH LAND TRUST, INC. FOR 10.059 ACRES CONVEYED TO THEM BY FRANCES D. CLYNE ON 12/17/79. - located on Farms Road, Stamford.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO APPOINT THREE ALTERNATE MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF FINANCE AS PER STATE STATUTE SECTION 7-340a. Submitted by Rep. D. Blum and B. Cohen, Pres. of Westcott Neighborhood Assn.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT TO GIVE WILLIAM AND PHYLLIS CHAPIN ACCESS TO OLD LONG RIDGE ROAD, per Asst. Corp Counsel A. Perry's letter 1/8/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR NATURE CONSERVANCY PROPERTY - Atty. Badget of Greenwich re-submitted 1/16/80.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (7) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TX ABATEMENT FOR SOUTH-WESTERN CONNECTICUT GIRL SCOUT COUNCIL, INC. - Letter from Paul F. Jacobson, P.C. Published 11/13/79 .

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR EXEMPTION TO HOUSING AUTHORITY OF PAYMENT OF FEES FOR DUMPING AT SOLID WASTE TRANSFER SITE. Letter from Atty. S. Kweskin.

MR. ZELINSKI: We voted unanimously to deny this publication. I know we have to have a position motion so I would MOVE for publication bearing in mind that the Committee voted to reject it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DENIED. (Ms. Summerville abstained)

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

- (9) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT ON SEWER ASSESSMENT CHARGES ON SALVATION ARMY'S clergyman's recently-acquired residence at 36 Pepper Ridge Road-submitted by Atty. Wm. J. Murray.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Committee voted unanimously to deny this. The reason for it, according to the Corporation Counsel, there's no basis for such an exemption under Connecticut Law. Know we have to have a positive motion, I MOVE for final adoption.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DENIED.

- (10) 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.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (11) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING RESTRICTION OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLE PARKING - AMEND CODE SECTIONS 20-34 and 20-35. Submitted by City Rep. Paul Dziezyc.

MR. ZELINSKI: There is an apparent problem with this Ordinance. Under the Charter Revision of 1977, the power to legislate in this area was granted to the Department of Traffic and Parking under Title 4, Chapter 49. It only reserves to our Board the power to set penalties for violation so that's why we voted to reject the publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It might be better if we put that under Resolutions for next month. I don't foresee any problems and then we can vote on it properly with everyone having seen it next month.

MR. ZELINSKI: Being we voted to reject that, we have to make a positive motion anyway, so I MOVE publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. DENIED.

- (12) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY CITY REP. F. CORBO THAT DEED RESTRICTIONS BE HONORED: THAT CITY OFFICIALS DENY REQUESTS BEFORE THEM TO WAIVE OR EXEMPT OR GRANT VARIANCES OF DEED RESTRICTIONS: THAT APPLICANTS FOR LAND USE CHANGES FURNISH SWORN CERTIFICATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF ANY DEED RESTRICTIONS BY THE ORIGINAL OWNER AND ANY SUBSEQUENT OWNERS. Submitted by Rep. F. Corbo.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

- (13) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REQUESTED BY CITY REP. F. CORBO 1/7/80 TO LIMIT DURATION OF TERM OF OFFICE OF APPOINTIVE BOARD MEMBERS TO A MAXIMUM OF FIVE YEARS OF UNINTERRUPTED TIME.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (14) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR 12.7 ACRES ON HIGH RIDGE ROAD PRESENTLY OWNED BY STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER WHICH OWNERSHIP IS TO BE TRANSFERRED TO CITY LATER. - Asst. Corp. Counsel J. Smyth's letter 1/18/80 states Planning Bd. and Finance Bd. to take "their appropriate action", as well as this Board.

MR. ZELINSKI: We approved this 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote - unanimous)

- (15) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR DRUG LIBERATION FOR PROPERTY AT 6 WASHINGTON COURT, STAMFORD. - Submitted by Sandra Goldstein.

MR. ZELINSKI: We approved this item 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote - unanimous)

- (16) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTIES OWNED BY BAIS BINYOMIN ACADEMY OF CONNECTICUT, INC. - at 125 Prospect St. and property at 13 Rock Spring Road, Stamford. This is to house students of Bais Binyomin Academy. - Submitted by P. Shapero.

MR. ZELINSKI: This was approved unanimously, 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO: What is this? I never heard of it; I've been living in Stamford for 55 years and this is the first time I heard of this place.

MR. ZELINSKI: This is an educational school for students who are going to school to become rabbis.

MRS. PERILLO: This is the only place they have to use? Is this more than one property we're giving tax abatement?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes it is. It is property at 125 prospect Street as well as property at 13 Rock Spring Road.

MR. BLUM: Evidently the school which is now at the former Jewish Center on Prospect St. bought these condominiums and this is where the students stay, and it's part of that Corporation.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES(cont.)

MR. DeNICOLA: I would like to know who owns this property?

MR. ZELINSKI: The School owns it.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to know if, Mr. Blum indicated, when these students are staying at these apartments? Is there any kind of rent charge?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It's part of the tuition. I might also add this is a registered non-profit organization.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm sorry, I don't understand, "it's part of the tuition". Are there rental fees included in the tuition rate?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Yes, I would say so. The tuition that they pay includes their rental. It's like a college dormitory in essence.

MRS. McINERNEY: It has not been the posture of this Board to exempt property which is getting income, which is income-producing. If you are having a facility for a person and you were charging a rent or including it in tuition as a board, that is income-producing, and I would suggest that, perhaps, this item might be better placed back into Committee for detailed research from the Legal Department of the City as to whether or not we can do this, and I would make a MOTION to return it to Committee.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. We will speak only on the motion to recommi

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to see us pass this. I can't see any problems with it. As I mentioned in the beginning of my report on all the items, I did request an opinion from the Corporation Counsel and I quote: "this ordinance is approved as to form" which means if there was something legally wrong that we could not do, he would have so indicated.

MR. FAUTEUX: I think this should be returned to Committee because this is setting a precedent. I think what we're looking at here is a fragmented seminary type of situation. Seminary, in the classic sense, of course, is a stand-alone operation with both educational and dormitories or whatever it might be. Here, I think we are setting a precedent where we are getting pieces of the seminary out into the community, and I think this is a very great departure from what we normally would expect a seminary to be. I'm concerned about this.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would just like to support what Mrs. McInerney said and I would like to see this go back into Committee and the Committee do their homework that they have to do to answer these questions. I think that these facilities are also rented out for uses other than what you're saying.

MR. BLUM: This happens to be an academy for rabbis, a particular sect of rabbis where they bought the Stamford Jewish Center. They have students coming from all around the Country. How could we be setting a precedent in the sense of this is the only place they could live because they have to be in and around the school area because they walk to their learning. They are highly Orthodox Jews.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: Nobody is debating whether the're highly Orthodox, let's not get carried away. That's not germane to the question to return it to Committee.

MR. ESPOSITO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We have a motion to return #16, tax abatement for Bais Binyomin Acedemy to Committee. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 19 in favor; 13 opposed to sending it back to Committee. The Proposed Ordinance will go back to Committee.

- (17) REQUEST FOR ORDINANCE TO REQUIRE MOBILE VENDORS (ICE CREAM VEHICLES, ETC. TO HAVE SWING-OUT ARMS SIMILAR TO SCHOOL BUSES - From Mrs. Marri Mullaney of Dancy Drive. Submitted by Rep. DeLuca.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (18) REQUEST FOR WAIVER AND REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE OF \$2,800 PAID BY CONTRACTOR FRANK MERCEDE IN CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AT 26 Palmers Hill Rd. for E_aster S^eal Rehabilitation Center. From Atty. Scott Ivey.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (19) REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF A BUILDING REVIEW COMMISSION from City Rep. Corbo.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (20) FOR PUBLICATION PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO REGULATE THE SALE AND/OR RE-SALE OF PRECIOUS METALS, INCLUDING GOLD AND SILVER. Submitted by Rep. M. Wiederlight.

MR. ZELINSKI: That is also being HELD IN COMMITTEE so we can have a Public Meeting on this.

- (21) FOR PUBLICATION PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTY OWNED BY ST. JOHN'S URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORP. KNOWN AS THE "HANRAHAN CENTER" Submitted by Atty. McCabe.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES (cont.)

- (22) PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON COOPER'S POND ROAD, OWNED BY UNION BAPTIST CHURCH. Submitted by Atty. Sherman.

MR. ZELINSKI said this was just a question, not an ordinance. (taken off agenda)

- (23) FOR PUBLICATION PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR BI-CULTURAL DAY SCHOOL at 2186 HIGH RIDGE RD. Submitted by Atty. Goldberg.

MR. ZELINSKI: We voted unanimously, 6 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FAUTEUX: Is there anybody living on the property full-time?

MR. ZELINSKI: According to all the information I have, I really don't know. Nevertheless it is only used for educational purposes so I would presume..

MR. FAUTEUX: That's not necessarily so. There could be somebody who is either employed or staying there on a rental basis. I'd like to have that question answered so I make a MOTION that it be recommitted.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (23 yes; 8 no)

MR. ZELINSKI: That ends my Committee report.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum NO REPORT

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE -Co-Chairmen Everett Pollard and Alfred Perillo - NO REPORT

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairman Jeanne-Lois Santy

- (1) MATTER OF NEIGHBORHOOD WATCH GROUPS TO PATROL FOR BREAK-INS, ROBBERIES, ETC., AS REQUESTED BY ROCCO COLATRELLA. Submitted by Rep. Santy.

MRS. SANTY: The Health & Protection Committee met on Wednesday, April 2, 1980 with Committee members M. Perillo, P. Dziezyc and P. Joyce attending. D. Blum attended when Personnel Committee adjourned. Also attending were Reps. DeLuca, Stork, Fasanelli, Donahue and Corbo.

Taking part in the discussion, and this is important, because many people attended, Chief Cizanckas, Capt. Agostino, Police Commissioner Nathan Goldstein and Paul Esposito for the Anti-Crime Block Watch. Also Rocco Colatrella, Pat Russo, Glen and Aida Evans and Don Nyra, speaking for taxpayers. It was

HEALTH & PROTECTION (cont.)

MRS. SANTY: (continuing).. unanimously decided by the Committee to HOLD this ITEM IN COMMITTEE for more input and discussion.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE DISSOLVING STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY AND FORMING ONE OR TWO GOLF COMMISSIONS, with all revenues going into the City's General Fund. Submitted by Rep. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to yield to my Vice-Chairman, Don Donahue, who will give the report on this item.

MR. DONAHUE: I'm going to make this very short, to the point, not going into any speeches at this point. For a long time the subject of combining the E. Gaynor Brennan Golf Commission with the Sterling Farms Golf Commission has been a subject that has been debated both ways.

As of the Committee Meeting last Monday night, which was attended by Chairman DeLuca, Reps. Pollard, Donahue and Representatives from both E. Gaynor Brennan and Sterling Farms, I'm happy to say that all are in agreement in principle into taking steps at this point to come about to a time when we will have one Golf Commission in the City of Stamford to control both the budgets and the facilities at both locations.

For this reason, the Committee requests through the President of the Board, that the Corporation Counsel will help us in drafting an ordinance to the effect of eliminating the Sterling Farms Golf Authority. Once that is done, the Committee will then have to, in the same body of the Ordinance, assign the responsibility for Sterling Farms to E. Gaynor Brennan.

Now, there is a question concerning the Charter where the Charter only recognizes that 5 members will be on the E. Gaynor Brennan Commission so we would hope that through attrition we will be able to wind-up with 5 members on that Commission and having representation from both E. Gaynor Brennan and Sterling Farms. And, once the Ordinance is created and it's passed and the Sterling Farms Assoc. is dissolved, we would then move to do two things: during charter Revision, we would try to form a combined Stamford Golf Commission which would have authority for both courses, and at that time, we would also try to increase the membership of the Commission considering the increased work load. Other things that the Committee is considering would be an enactment date of this Ordinance with enough lead-time for fiscal considerations; that's the take-over of the budget by E. Gaynor Brennan or by the Finance Dept. until such time as one can be planned by the remaining authority.

The last remaining consideration, which we are also concerned with, is the question of personnel at Sterling Farms and the personnel who will be at Sterling Farms after the authority is dissolved, and we are trying, at this

PARKS & RECREATION (cont.)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing)...point, we will continue to try to develop a plan so that on one is hurt by this and that if any reduction in staff comes, it will come through attrition. It is the intent of the Committee to work on that and work out plans for that over the next few months.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I will be happy to get together with you and Mr. DeLuca and we'll request this of Corporation Counsel.

- (2) THE MATTER OF 1980 FEES FOR GREENS AND SEASON LOCKERS, ETC. AT GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COURSE. Rep. DeLuca's letter 3/12/80.

MR. DeLUCA: Item #2 has finally been resolved last night to the satisfaction of most of the people in the City of Stamford, and therefore, will no longer appear on the Agenda.

- (3) REQUEST 3/24/80 FROM FIDELITY TRUST CO. TO HANG BANNER ACROSS SUMMER STREET FROM MAY 5th to MAY 10th to advertise May 10th Youth Olympics at Westhill High School.

MR. DeLUCA: By a vote of 3-0, we authorized the hanging of the banner, and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to make a MOTION to consider an item not on the Agenda. SECONDED

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The motion on the floor is to Suspend the Rules. There are 33 members present and requires a 2/3 vote. The MOTION is CARRIED.

- (4) PARK PERMIT FEE FOR VENDORS - also at Cove Island.

MR. DeLUCA: The motion I would like to make is that effective some time this month, the Parks Dept. is interested in charging a permit fee for vendors that enter our Parks. Their primary concern is to protect the concessionaires at Scalzi Park, Cummings Park and also, even though it's not mentioned here, at Cove Island. These people have submitted bids but yet they're victims of unfair competition by vendors going into the area. Therefore, they feel by charging a \$25.00 per vendor permit fee, this can serve as protection for the concessionaires and also regulate the number of vendors going to our various parks and people will be going in for these permits within the next week or two. Therefore, time is the essence in getting this passed, and I hope my colleagues will approve this.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you to the Chairman of Parks are local vendors going in Parks that do not have concessions required to have a permit and some sort of identification?

PARKS & RECREATION (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, this is the idea of this thing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm not sure that you made a motion to the effect of permitting this.

MR. DeLUCA: I make a MOTION that we approve the rate of \$25.00.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. WIDER: I'm not opposed to the \$25.00 fee but what I am opposed to is taking away the privilege of the people who have vending machines in this town and of taxpayers to have an opportunity to appear before the Committee when they are considering this. This is really something that is pulled out of the hat and put on the agenda and moved upon the assessed people so I'm a little concerned with taking this right away from people to appear in defense of themselves.

MR. DeNICOLA: By giving these people permits of \$25.00, you're allowing them to go into the parks. I think if we don't give them a permit, they are not allowed to go in. This holds up so that the person bidding on a concession will have a right to throw that vendor out; by giving the other guy a permit, you're giving them the right to go in.

MR. DeLUCA: That's right.

MR. DeNICOLA: I deny it.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd just like to ask Mr. DeLuca, when are the bids for these concessions to be made?

MR. DeLUCA: They've already been made. Usually, in some cases, they are done on a 5-year contract. You go in, bid for 4-years, 5-years; like in the case of E. Gaynor Brennan, it's a 5-year contract. At Sterling Farms, it's the same way; and this is, to be truthful, I really don't know when these concessionaires whether, some of them have already been there for a couple of years now and the idea is to give them some protection.

MRS. GUROIAN: I have a few questions to ask Mr. DeLuca. Are there going to be any qualifications to be satisfied before the permits are to be granted?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, They will develop regulations and more literature will be forthcoming.

MRS. GUROIAN: The other question is, if once these regulations are determined, will everybody who meets these regulations be granted a permit or will there be discretion involved where some will and some will not, although they have to meet the same qualifications.

MR. DeLUCA: At the meeting of the Park Dept., they did say there will be some regulations, some discretion as to how many people can go in.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I think we can proceed to a vote. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has been CARRIED. 16 in favor; 10 opposed; 7 abstentions.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux-NO REPORT

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight

- (1) APPROVAL REQUESTED FOR PROPOSED SEWER EXTENSION AGREEMENT BETWEEN MORTON KAHN AND CITY OF STAMFORD. Pursuant to Res. #910 to connect Country Diner on High Ridge Rd. to Turn-of-River Sanitary System.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: The Sewer Committee met April 8, 1980. In attendance were Mr. Corbo and myself. In addition, Mr. Connors, Mr. Repucci and George Vardamis, representing Mr. Kahn. We discussed and voted this out 2-0 unanimously and i so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Stanley Darer and Lathon Wider, Sr.

- (1) LETTER from NANCY MITCHELL RE DEMONSTRATION RESIDENT SUPERINTENDENT PROGRA
- (2) RE-LOCATION HOUSING - letter from Nancy Mitchell

MR. WIDER: The Committee met on Wednesday, and we did have a quorum. We do have a relocation plan that's being prepared for the NPA area which is the West Side. We will come before you at our next meeting.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli - NO REPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

- (1) PROPOSED FLOOD-PRONE AREA REGULATIONS, 2/28/80 REVISIONS.

Mrs. Maihock: An Environmental Protection Committee Meeting was held on April 2, 1980. Present were P. Joyce and myself. J. Zelinski was absent. We reviewed the Deputy Corp. Counsel's opinion dated March 24, 1980, in which Mr. Boodman recommended that the Bd. of Representatives leave the regulation of flood-prone areas generally to the Zoning Board. This matter will be further evaluated by the Corp. Counsel, the Planning & Zoning Boards and the Environmental Protection Board in the very near future.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby NO REPORT

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce (report given by Audrey Maihock, Mr. Joyce off the floor at the time)

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

MRS. MAIHOCK: We met on April 2, 1980. Present were Chairman P. Joyce and Audrey Maihock. On Item #1 we voted 2-0 in favor and I so MOVE.

MRS. PERILLO: May I ask through the Chair, If the Bedford Street merchants had any input on this and what their feels were. Do they go along with this being one-way?

MRS. MAIHOCK: That information was not given to me. In view of the fact that Mr. Joyce is not on the floor, I cannot answer you.

MR. ESPOSITO: It really has nothing to do with the issue of one-way system. This is a relatively minor issue of a traffic controller which is a technicality that's located on the premises and we need an easement for it; approving the easement doesn't have anything to do with the one-way system, nor did the merchants in the areas point of view about the one-way system.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think Rep. Perillo brings out a good point. Pertaining to the merchants, if we indeed do approve this tonight, does that hold up anything in making Bedford Street one-way.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would say no.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We need 21 for passage of an ordinance. We have 29 members present. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by the members who are present.

SPECIAL "ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION" STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman Fiorenzio Corbo
NO REPORT

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - NONE

PETITIONS - NONE

MOMENTS OF SILENCE NONE

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

February 4, 1980 Regular Meeting - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote)

March 3, 1980 Regular Meeting - APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote)

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-~~THE~~ BOARD RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING MICHAEL L. SABIA, D.P.M., ON BEING ELECTED PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF PODIATRY BOARDS. - Submitted by City Reps. Santy and Signore.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY - (also named Podiatrist of the year.)

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM CITY REP. DZIEZYC 3/18/80 RE SUPPORTING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN ENACTING LEGISLATION RE THE CRIME OF RAPE-MURDER.

APPROVED: 15 yes; 11 no; 3 abstentions.

- (3) SENSE-OF-~~THE~~ BOARD RESOLUTION COMMENDING COLEMAN TOWERS' RESIDENTS from Annie Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: There was an error in the Agenda. At the Steering Committee, I asked for a Sense-of-the Board Resolution commending the tenants of Coleman Towers for obtaining improvements to their building and security for themselves and their property. I would like for the Board to recognize the fact that the Office made an error by not placing this item on the Agenda, and I would like it so MOVED, that it be placed on the Agenda.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Ms. Summerville, it really is on the Agenda; although, it is not written here by virtue of the fact that Steering placed this on the Agenda, it is on the Agenda. We do not have to Suspend the Rules to consider it. It's just unfortunate we don't have it visually in front of us on the Agenda, but everyone should have it as part of their notes so that if they want to summarize it or just proceed to a vote.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I MOVE for its approval.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS

- (1) REQUEST 2/25/80 THAT PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN ISSUE PROCLAMATION THAT WEEK OF APRIL 13th BE "HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL WEEK" - From Mark Sternlicht, Chairman, Holocaust Memorial Committee, 760 High Ridge Rd.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I submitted this to the Mayor and he has done so, it is not within the province of the President of the Board to do that.

- (2) LETTER 3/7/80 FROM STAMFORD BRANCH N.A.A.C.P., Mrs. Betty Saunders, Pres. requesting that Board of Education budget be held until questions answered re alleged discriminatory Hiring and Promotional Practices.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I do think this letter is important and that it be read to the Board even though some of you might feel that it shouldn't have been placed on the Agenda. It is a letter dated March 7, 1980 from the Stamford Branch N.A.A.C.P. Mrs. Betty Saunders, President, requesting that the Board of Education budget be held until questions answered on discrimination hiring and promotional practices. We would like for this to be part of the minutes

52
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Stamford Branch

P. O. Box 885

Stamford, Connecticut 06904



March 7, 1980

Mrs. Sandra Goldstein
Chairman, Board of Representatives
429 Atlantic Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06901

Dear Mrs. Goldstein:

The Stamford Branch, NAACP request that the Board of Representatives withhold the Board of Education's budget, until such time as the questions on the discriminatory Hiring and Promotional Practices have been responded to.

The Community is alarmed at statements made by Board of Education Members, who appear to be attempting to cover-up the deficiencies in the Personnel Department. They feel that too long politicians have been a handicap to the betterment of our Educational System and must be stopped. The NAACP's phones have been constantly busy, as a result of the article that appeared in the March 5th edition of the Stamford Advocate.

RECEIVED

MAR 11 1980

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES
CITY OF STAMFORD

52

Mrs. Sandra Goldstein
Chairman, Board of Representatives
March 7, 1980
Page 2

We call upon the Board of Representatives to make fair judgment when allocating monies to any city agency. In all fairness to the Citizens of Stamford, if you allocate monies to the Board of Education, you too are condoning their behavior.

We have called upon the Mayor, The State Department of Education, The Office of Civil Rights in Boston and The State Human Rights Commission in Hartford; to do an investigation. We are hopeful that the Board of Representatives will take an active part in helping us to eliminate this problem.

Sincerely,

Betty Saunders/das

(Ms.) Betty Saunders, President
Stamford Branch, NAACP

BS/das

cc: Mrs. Maragret Nolan
Chairman, Board of Finance

All Members of the Board of Representatives

RECEIVED

MAR 11 1980

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES
CITY OF STAMFORD

RESOLUTIONS (cont.)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)..of this Board tonight and let the people in the audience know that we did make an effort to have it come before the Board.

MR. WIDER: The Fiscal Committee will be reviewing the Budget very soon. I would like to MOVE that this letter be transmitted to the Fiscal Committee of the District Board.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Wider, every member of the Board received this letter, including the Fiscal Committeemembers, so to transmit a letter they have already received would not be in order. At the budgetary process, if you believe that What Mrs. Saunders says has merit, then you vote to cut the entire Board of Education Budget.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: If I might help Mr. Wider. In Steering Committee Meeting, it was asked to be placed in a Committee and that was denied. I then asked the Committee if I could place it on the Agenda under Communication.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I just want to go back and ask you to record my abstention as a yes vote on Mr. Dziezyc's Resolution.

OLD BUSINESS

MRS. SANTY: I want to remind the Board Members that they received a notice to participate in the Hike-Bike on Sunday and we still need help if anybody wants to do it.

NEW BUSINESS

MRS. GUROLAN: I have a question to ask the Chair. Mr. Guglielmo was a very capable Chairman of the Planning & Zoning Committee of the Board and I am a member of the Board, I'm assuming that the President of the Board will be appointing a new Chairman. I'm asking that I be notified just as soon as that appointment is proposed.

MRS. PERILLO: I don't know if it's old or new business but, I have to say we have a lot of ordinances we pass on this Board. Now, if we're going to take Corporation Counsel's time to give us an opinion, and we're going to ignore the opinion, have outside Counsel write-up ordinance and we pass them, I think it's wrong. If we're not going to go by Corporation Counsel's opinion, then we shouldn't bother with it, and just take outside people to write up our ordinance. I feel they should have a big part in writing up these ordinances for our L&R Committee and I would like the Leadership to get together with Corporation Counsel's office to see how they feel about this. I don't want to vote on things that are going to come back later and say it's wrong and we didn't stay in the guideline of their opinion.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION made by Representative Barbara A. McInerney, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 1:45 A.M.

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

APPROVED:

By Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
16th Board of Representatives

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

CMT: HMM