

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED SPECIAL BUDGET MEETING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1980

16th BOARD OR REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

An Adjourned Special Budget Meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1980, pursuant to a "CALL" from the PRESIDENT, SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. This was a continuation of the previous night's meeting.

The meeting was called to order by the President at 8:38 P.M. after a brief caucus by both political parties.

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

ROLL CALL: Roll Call was taken by the Clerk, Annie Summerville. There were 36 members present, 4 absent. The absent members were John Hogan, Ralph Loomis, John Kunsaw and Alfred Perillo. (B. McInerney came in 9:00 P.M.)

The PRESIDENT declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: The machine was found to be in working order.

"CALL" OF THE MEETING:

The following is the "CALL" of the meeting which was sent to all Board members and which President Sandra Goldstein read:

"I, SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, PRESIDENT of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, and pursuant to Section 202 of the Stamford Charter, hereby call a SPECIAL MEETING of said Board of Representatives at the following time and place:

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1980  
Wednesday, May 14, 1980  
at 8:00 P.M. in the  
MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
Second Floor  
429 Atlantic Street  
Stamford, Connecticut

for the following purpose:

To consider and act upon CAPITAL PROJECTS and OPERATING BUDGETS for the fiscal year 1980-1981, as transmitted by the Board of Finance on Thursday, April 10, 1980, pursuant to provisions of Chapter 613 of the Stamford Charter.

-----

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: For the purpose of this meeting, Mrs. Hawe will be recording in Mrs. McInerney's chair and vice versa when Mrs. McInerney arrives this evening.

Before we begin, I am going to ask all members of the Board to take their seats. I am going to ask all non-members to please leave the floor of the Board. This meeting tonight is probably going to be extremely long. We have so much left to do in both the Operating and Capital Projects Budget. I can only ask that everyone truly limit, it's almost like self-censorship the amount of time they will speak on any and all items, or else I cannot fathom how we'll accomplished what has to be accomplished. We will begin by proceeding to the Public Works Department, where we left off.

MR. DeNICOLA: At this time I would like to make a MOTION to reconsider the Board of Education Budget.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: Just a couple of questions. How many votes are needed for reconsideration?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: A majority.

MR. DeLUCA: My next question. If the majority votes for reconsideration, how many members must be present on the floor in order to have a meeting?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: At all times, to have a meeting of this Board of Representatives you must have 21 members on the floor of the Board. We cannot have a meeting without a quorum.

MR. DeLUCA: Therefore, if members were to walk off the floor and leaving less than 21 people in their chairs, you will not have a quorum.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is correct. There is a motion on the floor to reconsider the Board of Education Budget. It has been moved and seconded. If there is no further discussion...

MR. CONTI: We went through this at the last meeting with URC and I mentioned doubt jeopardy. I believe what is happening tonight is exactly the same thing that happened at that meeting. Now, by taking this up again tonight, it means that every single taxpayer in this town, every single person who voted against this last night is now in jeopardy of losing what he has won at the previous meeting. I strongly object to it.

MR. DeLUCA: I realize I heard your comments about keeping our rhetoric down to a minimum but, when I consider the fact that our meeting is starting forty-five minutes late, which we could have had a lot accomplished, I have comments also to make regarding like Rep. Conti. Reconsidering this item tonight, maybe I'm speaking out of line, leave a lot to be desired. It's like the URC Plan or the

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing)....or the URC game, you lose, reconsideration, bring it up again. Are we really reconsidering this item because people really feel they made a mistake the way they voted, or is it due to the lobbying and the pressure. Is this the democratic process that people have to come back, that we have to be subjected to this kind of nonsense, that you have to yield to pressure, everytime a vote is made by this Board that doesn't agree with a few people, you have to come back after the lobby groups make their phone calls. I would hope that the Board members tonight reject this item for reconsideration.

MR. ESPOSITO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. There is no discussion on a motion to move the question. We are going to vote by use of the machine. There are 35 members present right now. The vote is 21 yes; 13 no; the MOTION to MOVE the QUESTION HAS LOST. We will proceed with our list of speakers. As you know the motion to move the question requires a 2/3 vote.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'm extremely disappointed to have to come here this evening to discuss an item that was completely and thoroughly discussed at great length last evening. If tonight we do this, I believe we are setting a precedent for the future Boards of Representatives, that any time a group which is not on the prevailing side, wishes to can come back the same meeting or a future meeting and asked for an item that has been defeated to be reconsidered and possibly approved. Needless to say if it comes back enough times the odds are simply in favor that eventually it would be prevailed upon that the item will be changed. I feel it's unfair to come back here this evening, after staying here until almost 2 o'clock in the morning, as I said, to discuss an item that was thoroughly and completely discussed. There were some strong sentiments raised by certain members in the heat of the discussion, which I think, at least I want to think, it was only due to the stress at the moment and not really meant because we're all here, we're all entitled to our opinions, whether they agree or disagree with the rest of us. I believe it totally unfair to the public also to have to be subjected to another evening of possibly a long discussion on an item, as I said was discussed at great length and voted upon and acted upon and that was it. Again, if we do it, we're opening up the door to the future, not only budgets meetings, but every single monthly meeting when an item is defeated, next month that item will again appear on the agenda if some people decide that they're not happy the way the vote went. I strongly urge my fellow Board Members not to reconsider the item at hand.

MR. CORBO: I would like to know if it's in order at this point to make a MOTION to have a question-and-answer session, by having Dr. Peebles on the podium for the Board members to ask questions.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Corbo, that motion is out of order.

MR. CORBO: I would like to CHALLENGE the CHAIR.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Our Board meetings do not provide for public participation. It has never, and I certainly rule such a motion out of order.

MR. CORBO: I still would like to challenge the Chair, it's very vital.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The Chair has ruled this meeting should not be opened to the Board of Education to have a question-and-answer period. I feel that with 100 million dollars budget before us this evening as well as a reconsideration of the Board of Education budget before us, we cannot possibly permit such an action. We must proceed to our business; we have never, in my experience permitted during a Board Meeting, not to mention during the Budget Meeting which is one of the most important meetings all year long, such an action. I strongly urge the members of this Board to sustain the rule of the Chair.

MR. ZELINSKI: It seems that if we're considering an item that was previously voted on, as far as my recollection on the Board and possibly some of those members who have been on here much longer than I, I think if we reconsider the Board of Education Budget, we'll be setting a precedent as I said which has never been done before. Secondly, I would like to ask you then, during our meeting regarding URC, was it not a fact that prior to that meeting, we did have a question-and-answer period with the Chairperson Mrs. Sherman and some members of the URC Commission.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You're quite right, Mr. Zelinski, prior to; I called a special question-and-answer period prior to the beginning of the meeting, prior to the call of order of the meeting, prior to the attendance of the meeting.

MR. ZELINSKI: It's a different thing, ok, bearing that fact in mind, again, being we're doing something I don't believe we've done in the past, I think if we could open up the door to that, I think anything we do this evening we could start something new.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I urge my colleague to sustain the Chair and vote for the Chair. If anybody had any questions about the Board of Education budget prior to tonight, in all due respect to my colleagues, they should have done their homework previously and waited until tonight to first start asking the questions. If we open up the floor to the Board of Education, then we have to open up the floor to the rest of the pages in our book here, sunlight will be peeping through the windows pretty soon, so let's vote this down and let's get on with the order of business.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Can we proceed to a vote. The motion is to sustain the rule of the Chair. We will vote by machine. The MOTION is LOST. 31 yes; 4 no; the Rule of the Chair has been sustained. We will go on to the next speaker.

MR. JOYCE: I would like to address myself to what is becoming a serious issue with respect to this Board. It takes two parts, one is the respect or lack

MR. JOYCE: (continuing)...of the same, which the Board is acquiring in the eyes of the public because of a lack of certainty. The second part is a legal matter. When we as a body corporate vote, we establish law. It is the same thing as a doctrine at law known as res judicata, something cannot be taken up twice if you are to have a finality in terms of giving certitude to people who depend on rulings. This is equally true with respect to legislative enactments as it is to judicial determinations in courts. Unfortunately this Board seems to be abusing Robert's Rules of procedure to the extent that we are taking up under the rule of reconsideration, we are going back and re-enacting, we began this particular thing with the Urban Renewal situation where we had not once but several times, matters which were not even changed factually, voted upon by this Board a second time. This opens up the City of Stamford, in my opinion, to litigation and law suit from taxpayers who are aggrieved parties, and if a class action may be brought, we could find ourselves in a very serious legal position.

Once this Board takes an action acting as a body corporate, this action becomes subject to being the rule of law of this particular Board, merely because some people are dissatisfied<sup>or</sup> there is a concentrated lobbying effort waged, turn around the very next meeting and reverse it; then what happens now if we don't like this, is it going to be constantly reversed, constantly turned back and forward. The public will lose confidence in what the Board does and consequently we are weakening our system of government. What we must do is reduce the parliamentary maneuvering on this Board, thoroughly discuss these items which come before this Board and vote them once and with finality.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to clarify something. The move to reconsideration is a proper motion before us; I would not permit an improper motion to come before us. The next speaker is Mr. Weiderlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: When we had the URC vote before us, the reason given for reconsideration was, well some of the members got some further education as to the merits of the plan. Now we have the education budget before us, what's the reason this time, did some members between last night and tonight get some more education on the plan, or possibly some people figure they voted emotionally and they wanted to change their vote. Either way, either excuse, and I use the word excuse, it does not bode well in the eyes of the public. If you are going to vote on something, you should study the issues clearly, make up your mind after deciding which way you're going to vote and you vote, and you stick by your vote. Vacillation is not a characteristic that should be in a legislature, one that is charged with the responsibility of a budget that we are, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to reconsider for these reasons.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm opposed to reconsidering this question because I feel that I personally would have acted differently on the part of the budget that we passed subsequent to the vote on the Board of Education budget. If the amount of the Board of Education had been changed, I would have acted differently when the consideration for the rest of the budget came up, so for that reason I feel the motion to reconsider is out of order, because in all fairness we would have to go back and reconsider everything that happened subsequent to the passage of that part of the budget and I urge you to consider that.

MRS. SANTY: I would like to know the rationale for considering this item less than 24 hours after the first vote. If there are new revelations, I would like them brought to our attention right now by those who wish to reconsider it. I understand that there has been a great deal of lobbying done in the last 24 hours. I received one phone call from a Board of Education member without pressure, without any new revelation, just to discuss it. I think we are losing our credibility as a Board here tonight, and I urge all our members to vote against this reconsideration.

MR. DARER: I pass.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I don't know but for some reason we're acting like this is a brand new thing of reconsidering a issue. Our budget is being presented to us but at the same time there is no one in this room that isn't, that once this budget is approved, starting the new fiscal year, if there is a department that needs an emergency appropriation for one thing or another that was not provided for adequately in the budget, we'd be reconsidering it anyway. Most of our agenda during the year is made up of items that are being reconsidered and so, I think it is proper and correct that we do reconsider this item. Another thing, and my feelings are very strong, the way we are conducting our meeting. Our President has asked us to restrain ourselves and not continue to prolong discussion, but it still happens and it never fails that some of us try to restrain ourselves, and we limit our participation and then others prolong the meeting by continuing their discussion. I'm not saying that it is wrong for them to do this, but I think we should all be considerate of each other and if there is an issue in this budget that any of us feel we should be speaking out on, I feel that we should reserve that right and continue to speak out on them.

MR. FASANELLI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 25 yes; 11 no. We will now go on to the motion to reconsider. We will proceed to a machine vote. The MOTION to reconsider has been PASSED. 21 yes; 16 no; we will now go on to the Board of Education Budget.

MR. DeLUCA: Excuse me, Madame President, you said 21 in favor, 16 against, that 37, I thought we only had 35.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, I said 20, 20 in favor.

MR. DeLUCA: It sounded like 21....you said 21.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If I said 21, I apologize.

MR. DeLUCA: We're just trying to get the vote correct.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm quite sure I said 20 - 16, but, whatever.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like the President to acknowledge my presence and also that I will be voting in Mrs. Howe's number tonight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That will be noted. We will proceed to the Board of Education Budget.

BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET (reconsideration)

Page 151 - Code 810

MR. ESPOSITO: A majority of the members of Fiscal tonight have authorized me to make a MOTION that the Fiscal Committee recommends a \$600,000.00 cut in the Board of Education Budget.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Esposito, as you know we have a continuing motion on the floor. If Fiscal's report is to cut \$600,000. it doesn't need a motion. We're going to be consistent in this, and we have been consistent in the entire time. If Fiscal has come out with a report for \$600,000. and there's no motion and we just turn the page.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I make a MOTION that we delete from the Board of Education Budget by \$601,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: Is it possible to amend that motion, to reduce the Board of Education Budget by 2 million dollars as it was last night?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No. We have this motion on the floor, we have not done that, we have not done that in the past.

MR. DeLUCA: You mean we only have one motion, you can't make amendments?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If this motion fails, you are free to bring up another motion. Just as the motion for 2 million dollars last night, or any other amount, was discussed in the very same manner.

MR. DeLUCA: Just clarify it, why in the past, when someone makes a motion to reduce something by \$1,000., someone makes an amendment to reduce it by \$2,000. in the past, what makes this meeting any different.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Because we have a running motion on the floor, the motion on the floor is for \$600,000. and the rules that we have been operating under for the budget, has been to take one motion at a time. If there is any amendment to the Chairman's recommendation, then we take each motion as it is. If it falls, then we go on to the next one.

MR. GUROIAN: I'm totally confused. I always thought a motion to reconsider was a motion to reconsider the original motion. You right now have a budget standing of 2 million dollars, if he proposes to reconsider, you have to reconsider voting the original motion again. You're not reconsidering the consideration of the motion you're reconsidering the passage of the motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We reconsider the particular item that came before us un-voted upon, any motion that was made to that item in abeyance, is null and void until if we choose to reconsider.

BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: It seems to me you first have to vote against that original motion to vote down before you propose a new one.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, Mrs. Guroian, that is not the way a motion to reconsider works. Is there any discussion on the motion to cut \$601,000.00 from the Board of Education Budget. If there is no discussion on that number, we will proceed to a vote on cutting \$601.....

MR. DARER: I make a MOTION for a five-minute recess.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RECESS: Lasted from 9:14 to 9:54 P.M.

MR. LIVINGSTON: With regret and reluctance, recognizing the realities of this room, I would WITHDRAW my motion for a cut of \$601,000.00.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Does the seconder withdraw? yes.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'd like to make a MOTION at this time to cut the Board of Education Budget by 1.2 million dollars.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DARER: In light of the lengthy discussion that we had on this motion last night, I would like to MOVE the QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will vote by machine to move the question. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will now go on to the question before the Board, which is to cut the sum of 1.2 million dollars from the Board of Education Budget. That would bring the total for the Board of Education, and I would like a figure from the Chairman of Fiscal.

MRS. HAWK: The total figure is \$40,927,313.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed by use of the machine.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to request a Roll Call Vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The Clerk will call the Roll.

BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET (cont.)THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

Betty Conti  
Grace Guroian  
Burt Flounders  
Lathon Wider  
Stanley Darer  
Barbara McInerney  
Everett Pollard  
Patrick Joyce  
Doris Bowlby  
John Roos  
Lois Santy  
Philip Stork  
Anthony Conti  
Robert DeLuca  
Audrey Maihock  
Paul Dziezyc  
Robert Fauteux  
Mildred Perillo  
John Zelinski  
Mary Jane Signore  
Michael Wiederlight  
Marie Hawe

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION

Paul Esposito  
Moiria Lyons  
Ann Summerville  
Jeremiah Livingston  
John Boccuzzi  
Fiorenzo Corbo  
Handy Dixon  
Richard Fasanelli  
David Blum  
Vincent DeNicola  
Mary Lou Rinaldi  
Gerald Rybnick  
Sandra Goldstein

ABSENT

John Kunsaw  
Alfred Perillo  
John Hogan  
Ralph Loomis

ABSTAIN

Donald Donahue

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are 22 votes in the affirmative, 13 votes in the negative, the MOTION to cut 1.2 million dollars from the Board of Education Budget has been PASSED.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Page 151 - Code 810

TOTAL APPROVED \$40,927,313

-----  
MS. SUMMERVILLE: I voted in the negative because I still feel that we're not being fair to the children of the City of Stamford that we represent.

MR. DeLUCA: I voted in the affirmative because I think we're still being short changed; the Board of Education budget is still over-stacked.

Page 175 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - SECTION TOTAL \$41,457,035

MR. ZELINSKI: If I may I would like to MOVE at the present time to take up the Police Department's budget; we do have people here from the Stamford Citizen Action Group and the West Side Group and I think in fairness, they did come and stay quite late last evening and we did not Suspend the Rules then but I would really urge my colleagues to; it's only a matter of one section, there right after Public Works and Public Works is kind of lengthy and we may be here kind of late, so I'd like to MOVE that we take up the Police Budget.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'm sorry, I'm going to rule that out of order. We will go on to Public Works.

MRS. McINERNEY: Based on the fact that we took the other item out of order, I would support Mr. Zelinski and CHALLENGE your ruling.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 17 yes; 18 opposed. We will take the Police Dept. Budget up.

#### POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Page 71 - Code 410

MRS. HAWES: The Police Department budget is on page 210 of the old book and on page 71 of the new smaller book. The Fiscal Committee has recommended a cut in the salary account of the Police Department budget, Code 410.1110, of \$1,200. That is because there was a position that will be getting a MAA increase when that is settled and inadvertently it was budgeted in here, we reduced that line to reflect that. That line now reads \$4,902,924.

The next cut recommended by Fiscal is in the Maintenance of Vehicles account, that is line .2510. Fiscal has recommended a cut of \$5,000. which would bring that line down to \$107,850. We have recommended that cut because there is a projected \$20,000. surplus in that account.

The next cut recommended by Fiscal is in Stationery and Supplies, which is on page 72, line .2930. We recommended a cut of \$1,804. which would bring that line to a total of \$15,000. We recommended that cut because there is a projected \$400.00 surplus in that account at the end of the year.

The next cut recommended by Fiscal is in line .3422, Major Investigation Unit. There we have recommended a cut of \$2,000. which would bring that line down to \$20,069. We listened to the presentation of the Police Department and we concur that there is need for more money in this account but we think that they can do with the \$20,069.

The next cut recommended by Fiscal is in Emergency Equipment, line .3430. There we recommended a cut of \$2,000. which would bring that line to a total of \$15,000

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. What was the reason for cutting the Emergency Equipment?

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: According to the back-up material, we concur that they do need an increase in that account but we think that \$15,000 will suffice for their needs this year.

The next line we recommended a cut in is line .3444, Internal Affairs, we recommend a cut of \$1,000 which will bring that line down to \$2,000. The rationale for that was it's projected that \$1,500 will be used this year.

The final cut made by Fiscal is on page 73, line .3483, Communication-Miscellaneous. We have recommended a cut of \$2,933. which would bring that line down to \$19,000. The rationale for that was left in the account now is \$2,147.00 and we think that \$19,000 will be sufficient for next year.

MRS. CONTI: I have a minority report. I concur with all the cuts made by the majority of Fiscal with the exception of account 410.3422, Major Investigation Unit. From reading a recent Grand Jury Report, I learned that this is one of the accounts used for under-cover investigations and I do not wish to impede our Police Force in that area in any way. Thus, I would recommend restoring this \$2,000. cut. I would however make additional cuts as followings: from the Salary Account, I would like to reduce it by \$177,396. from the present \$4,904,124. and that would then make that account an adjusted total \$4,726,728. This would delete 16 new Police Officers from an October 1st phase-in. I would also like to reduce the part-time account by \$17,000. While I would like to see 24 new Police Officers and I would like to see everything that they want but, we just cannot hire 31 people in one department in one fiscal year. We must learn to live within our means and we just cannot afford this kind of staff in one year. The \$17,000 for the psychologist, I would like to delete that for two reasons, it would set a precedent for other departments who could also lay claim to working under stressful conditions and we might end up with resident psychologist in numerous departments at the expense of our constituents.

Secondly, the matter of the confidentiality required between Doctor and patient leaves me with grave reservation as to the maintenance of such secrecy with the recent events in police under-cover matters. I would be greatly concerned with the possibility of law suits being incurred from leaks of employees' confidential affairs. If our police officers have need of such service, it would be better to negotiate it into the union contract as a medical coverage and have any officer who needed such service be treated by a doctor of his own choosing. This would also remove the responsibility for maintaining confidentiality from the pockets of the Stamford Taxpayers. The additional cuts I have to make here, after the psychologist, I would like to restore #410.3422, then the other two cuts on Salaries and on the part-time account.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let's take one motion at a time.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. DARER: May I make a statement at this time? I would like to remind my fellow Board Members that we fought hard to increase the years of service that the police and fire department personnel have to serve before they would qualify for a pension to 25 or more years. At the moment if we authorize the hiring of number of policemen which I think many of us agree we need, or be it there may be some discussion on the number of policemen.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I really have no objections to your making a statement. As part of Mrs. Conti minority report, she has the.....

MR. DARER: I withdraw my discussion and wait until she makes her motion.

MRS. CONTI: My first MOTION is on salaries, #410.1110, reducing it by \$177,396 to a new total of \$4,726,728.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION is to reduce #410.1110 by \$177,396 to a line total of \$4,726,728. There are a number of speakers who wish to speak. I would just say one thing. If you are going to say something that already been said by a previous speaker, please take that into consideration before you speak.

MR. DARER: I would like to ask my colleague to amend her motion, unfortunately I don't have the exact figure, to reduce the salary account by all the new positions pending the completion of the police contract, that we do no hiring prior to the new police contract.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You will have an opportunity to speak. Mrs. Conti, if you agree with changing your motion to read that way?

MRS. CONTI: I'm not sure if Mr. Darer understands. I'm deleting 16 of the new police officers but I am including the 5 matrons and I would include the 2 dispatchers and let them be police officers so that they could use them not only for dispatching but for police duty also. Do I understand that you want me to just reduce the 16 policemen, you don't want to take out the matrons and others, do you?

MR. DARER: I would like you to reduce everything, any one who would qualify currently for a 20-year pension, which we have fought long and hard to have increased to 25 years. Anyone we hire under this current contract has a 20-year pension and I think that goes against the work we've all done on this Board over the past two, and three and four years.

MRS. CONTI: I'll be glad to amend it to that.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Conti has withdrawn her motion, does the seconder to that motion agree? If the seconder doesn't agree, then we still have it. Mr. Darer if we have your figure, we will have a new motion on the floor.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. DARER: To reduce line item #410.1110 by \$354,792 which brings it to \$4,548,132.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION is to reduce line 410.1110 by \$354,792 to a total of \$4,548,132. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO: Mr. Darer, consideration was something that bothered me also. I share his concern and the last police contract we approved I made a commitment to myself that I would not approve and vote for another one without a 25-year retirement. Obviously we cannot do that with present police officers, but we can do that with new police officers. On Saturday when we considered this issue I raised that in committee, but we had to make some decisions, we had to establish priorities and the rationale was as follows: the police contract is now in negotiation, it may not be settled for the next year, it's a good chance it won't be settled, it may go to fact-finding, it may come to us where we really don't have any choice, we may be stuck with the 20-year retirement for the next two years, these are all possibilities. I think it's clear however, that we're not going to get a police contract with a 25-year pension plan for the next couple of months, which for all intents <sup>and</sup> purposes cut out these 25 people, officers, or 31 total personnel for the entire year. With that in mind, I have to make my own personal decision, do I sacrifice that principle of not wanting to hire 25 additional police officers with the 20-year retirement or do I sacrifice the safety and protection of the citizens of Stamford. And my personal conclusion was that I bite the bullet and vote for the new positions even if they have to be hired at a 20-year retirement, because we have a drastic need for them. We are spending million of dollars in this town center, and if this town center opens up next year and we do not have proper security and the reputation is spread that the town center in Stamford is a dangerous place to be at night and maybe a dangerous place to be during the day, because of lack of police protection, that entire investment of the City and private corporation goes right down the sewer. I don't think we can afford that, so therefore I made the hard decision that we had to have these police officers; we have to start training them now. If the Super Block opens up next summer, we have to start the process now, we're not going to have 25 police officers on the line next summer unless we appropriate the money now, already it's only in there as of August 1st. It's already been phased in by the Mayor, a couple of the other positions have been phased in over the cost of three months, so they're not all coming on July 1st. Even if we start on August 1st. we won't have the trained police officers on the street until next spring and I don't think we could afford not to have them there.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I have to agree with Mr. Esposito up until his last statement, about the Super Block, correct. My primary interest is to get the men on the police force and into the areas, the West Side, the East Side, South End, North Country. People can't even go to Church, they have to get a house-sitter. People get mugged going into church, people get their pocket-books ripped off in parking lots. I can go on and on, break-in by the hundreds, these are in

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing)....the neighborhoods, not in the Super Blocks, I want the cops in the streets where they are going to do the most good, where they protect the people that pay the tax in this town and that's the little people who own their homes. I'm going to vote against eliminating these policemen until they get a contract for 25-year pension, if they want to try to increase the pension to 25, I think it could be negotiated into the contract as of July 1, anyone hired will be up to 25 years. I don't think we have to hold the policemen off. I'm going to vote against it, not for the reasoning of the Super Block, but because of all the people sitting out there in the audience who need the protection.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I want to support Mr. Esposito and Mr. Boccuzzi. This problem goes well beyond pure fiscal considerations and we start approaching our police needs on a pure accounting basis we're just going to compound the problem we have and we do have a protection problem in the City of Stamford. We talk about the Super Block, and evidently there isn't that much concern about the Super Block because after all that's not going to be opened until August, 1981. The fact is of the 25 officers that are being requested in this budget, only eight of these officers will be used for the Super Block. There is ample justification for that because the Super Block will mean 20,000 to 30,000 more people per day and this has nothing to do, by the way, with the internal security of the Super Block, this is external. The additional people, 30,000 a day, an additional 500 or 600 cars a day, not to mention the 30,000 people that will be down town because of the new buildings. Again that is only eight, there are ten officers in addition to those eight that will be used to strengthen the protection in both the East and West Districts. In 1972/3 we had 271 sworn officers in the City of Stamford. We now have 241. We have a very serious problem downtown, 40% of the crime in this city occurs in section nine and twelve and zone one, which is downtown. Much of the protection therefore that is provided in the northern areas on both the East and the West Side is by necessity because of the demand for the protection, for the emergency situation downtown, we're being forced to bringing police cars down from the North, this proposal for ten officers merely provides two added patrol posts, one for the East Side and one for the West Side, so that the officers that are now being brought down to take care of this area, this concentrated area in which we have 40% of our crime, can stay where they are supposed to be patrolling, up in the residential neighborhoods, and we just must I believe follow this very carefully worked out plan which the police department has developed. They have computerized every call, they know precisely in each district, by block, where the demand is for police protection and they worked this out very carefully, as pointed out by Mr. Esposito, these people are really not effectively going to be on the force until July or August, or perhaps later. We can't afford to delay this. There are ten officers for two new patrol posts, eight officers downtown for the Super Block. In addition, we have I think one or two men working the burglary squad right now, we have I believe no one working narcotics at the moment.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. FLOUNDERS: There are six men, four for burglary squad and two for narcotics. The Police Department has pointed out to me, and I spent a long time discussing this with them, as the narcotics problems increase, the burglaries increase because there is an absolute, definitive relationship between the two. We need, we are understaff, we need these twenty-five additional officers. I urge my colleagues on the Board to support this. This is nothing we can look at just from a pure fiscal and accounting point of view, we must consider it within the context of the true police needs of the City and I think that the citizens of Stamford have amply demonstrated their concern with the increasing crime rate that we're experiencing, and we must take action now within this new budget to do something about it and we can't sit back and wait for sometime perhaps in the future that might not materialize for a year or two years, to wait for a new contract, there is just too much pressure on us to provide the additional protection.

MRS. HAWE: I agree with Mr. Flounders on the merits of this and I won't speak any further; however, if we're going to vote on this I would like to clarify the numbers, because I think that Mr. Darer had arrived at the wrong figure. Mr. Darer, you have to take the figure that you reached, \$354,792. away from the departmental request because the Mayor had phased in 16 policemen and 5 matrons for one month and the eight Super Block policemen over a period of three months, so I think you subtracted from the wrong figure, I come to a different one. The figure that we'll be voting on would be for the bottom line on that account would be \$4,609,099.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would just like to say that we must have a firm figure to vote on. Right now, since we don't have the amount cut, we don't have a figure, it doesn't appear we have a figure that Mr. Darer agrees with, what is the number cut?

MRS. HAWE: The total cut from that line according to what Mr. Darer wants will be, if we wanted to include the \$1,200 that Fiscal recommended, plus you also have to take out the Lieutenant which the Mayor deleted. The figure that we would vote on, the cut would be \$399,120. which would bring that line to \$4,609,099.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Are you agreeable to that Mr. Darer? Is your second agreeable, Mrs. Guroian, are you agreeable to that revision, that's \$399,120. cut, with the total becoming \$4,609,099.

MRS. LYONS: I don't want to prolong the debate, but I think it's a very important issue that's we're talking on. I attended the public budget hearing of the Board of Finance and the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives. At that session, I heard citizen after citizen speak out for added police protection. They were desperately afraid of what is happening to this City. Just to echo what Mr. Flounders also said about the Super Block, it does receive the highest number of calls for service, and it is estimated that when completed an additional

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. LYONS: (continuing)...20,000 to 30,000 people will be moving in and out of this area, although it is already one of the highest area for service, I think this will make it receive even a larger amount of calls. If and when these calls do come in, if they do not have proper police patrolling in the area, they will have to pull out patrols from other parts of the city and leave those un-attended. In addition to the eight patrol policemen that will be attending the Super Block, you will notice that ten new officers will be used to increase the police patrols in high service areas, and I think these are very essential and necessary for the welfare of our city.

MR. CORBO: I would like to talk against the motion because I would like to agree with all my heart with Mrs. Lyons, Mr. Flounders, and Mr. Esposito. If you can go back about a year ago or two years ago, the Police Department made a statement that they don't need additional police officers on the street, they can do the job with the force they have right now. One point, the various neighborhoods got together, screamed <sup>and</sup> cried to have more policemen on the street, that wasn't the choice of the police department to increase this budget, that was the cry of the citizens of Stamford, they need more protection, they want more protection, they pay for that protection, let them have it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 29 yes; 5 opposed.

MR. DARER: I apologize for bringing this motion forward, I would like to WITHDRAW it at this time, with one comment.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You can withdraw it only if your seconder agrees.

MRS. GUROLAN: I want to hear the comment.

MR. DARER: My comment is that I'm opposed bitterly to a 20-year pension; I never said any of us feel that we're against police, we're in favor of more police, but I think it's financially irresponsible to hire people for twenty-year pensions.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Does the seconder agree?

MRS. GUROLAN: I'd like to agree with Mr. Darer. I think we're making a bad mistake, because if you don't hold the line on that pension, sometime it's going to break the city completely. I really think this is a bad mistake for a good cause, a very, very good cause, but, as Judge Brandeis once said "tyranny didn't get elected by choice, tyranny is instituted by good meaning people for good reasons in accumulated decisions in which the ultimate result is tyranny." If you don't start holding the line somehow, somewhere, you're going to break the bank, just as New York City did, and I think this is the place we should start holding the line, but, if Mr. Darer wants to take back the motion with that comment, I'll take back my second.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION has been WITHDRAWN and we now will go on to the next motion in this department. What I'm going to do Mrs. Conti, especially since you have so many motions in relation to this. We're just not going to permit this kind of correction again, if you want your motion fine, if there is going to be a change to that motion that's going to go all the way at the end of the list, I really think it's grossly unfair to proceed this way. If you like to give us your motion that's fine.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to MOVE to delete \$17,000. from the Part-time account #410.1130 reducing the account to a total of \$300,000. That delete the part-time Psychologist.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would like to speak against that motion. Being a police officer is probably one of the most stress-producing occupations in the United States. Police officers have one of the highest rates of divorce, the highest rates of alcoholism, a great deal of stress is generated in the position, high rate of high blood pressure, the Police Chief is aware of this and has been trying in the past to get this position into the budget, and every year somewhere along the line, it's been deleted. I do not believe that there is any other position in the City of Stamford, perhaps being a member of the Board of Representatives, which produces such stress, in any case I don't believe it would be justifiable for other departments to come and request this kind of thing.

The other thing I'd like to is the fact that Mrs. Conti suggested that maybe it be negotiated into the contract that police officers have this as a part of their medical benefits. I suggest that we might pay a heck of a lot more than \$17,000. if that be the case. The insurance premium for including psychological counseling for 245 police officers might be three times as much as the \$17,000. and there is a big difference between having the possibility of you going to an out-side counselor than having someone who is on staff in the Police Dept. that you can visit at any time.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is on cutting \$17,000. from #410.1130 to bring that to a total of \$300,000. The MOTION has been LOST, 13 yes; 19 no;

MRS. FERILLO: Madam President, I have been trying to get a question asked here and I am just simply going to not vote, I work hard all day and I'm trying to vote sensibly on the Budget, I didn't finish yet Mrs. Goldstein, everybody keeps moving the question because they want to go, I want to vote very intelligently, but if it's going to continue to go like this, I am going to vote no; we're voting on things we don't even know about, people can give information not that I expect to change anybody's vote, no one's going to change mine either, but I'm still trying to get a question asked about the first item that went through, and I didn't get an answer, so I'm just going to have to vote against the whole budget.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Perillo, if the motion to move the question passes, it passes.

MRS. PERILLO: Well I think people are too quick to move the question, we'd like to get some questions answered from the Fiscal Committee, I couldn't go to their meetings, but I'd like the questions answered, I'll vote against everything as long as I can't ask a question.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Perillo, we'll have you as the first speaker on this motion.

MRS. CONTI: The next MOTION is to restore \$2,000. that Fiscal cut from account #410.3422 Major Investigation Unit. I'd like to restore the \$2,000 and make it \$22.069.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO: I would like to know from Fiscal, on this Investigation Unit, there was so much publicity on the radio about money from this account that was used to set someone up in business. Do we have any report on the money coming in from that store, what happened to the money that came in from that store?

MRS. HAWES: I'm sorry we don't have information on that.

MRS. PERILLO: Do you have any information on this money.

MRS. HAWES: On this request for this Major Investigation Unit, why they need the money, we have information on that.

MRS. PERILLO: You didn't answer my question. Did you ask, seeing there was so much publicity on the radio and in the newspaper?

MRS. HAWES: We did not discuss that particular event that you're talking about; we just discussed the budget and why they needed the money they have requested for next fiscal year.

MRS. PERILLO: Why do they need this money?

MRS. HAWES: A lot of this is for photographic supplies, which have increased greatly, color films which have increased greatly in price, to buy field test kits, for the testing of various drugs, identifications supplies, evidence supplies, fingerprint kit.

MRS. PERILLO: Mrs. Hawes, did they had \$7,500 in there, why is it such an increase, does it have to be increased that much?

MRS. HAWES: The Fiscal Committee recommended cutting \$2,000 off that, we felt the increase to \$20,000 was warranted. The Police gave what we feel was a convincing

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...presentation that due to the rise in the cost of equipment and the fact that they anticipate a great problem with a very large influx of drugs from the middle east coming into this area very soon, that they will need this extra money in this account, and we felt it justified. We did recommend \$2,000 cut from that, we felt what would be left to them would be sufficient to their needs.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I just wanted to add to what our Co-Chairman said, to Mrs. Perillo, one of the reason why there is a major increase in this is because of narcotic buys, according to the Chief of Police, when they purchase narcotics as evidence, they can no longer just make one purchase. The way things have been happening in the courts, they need two purchases, which means that your first purchase more than likely the money will be lost and you'll never get it back. On the second purchase, there's a possibility you may get some of the money back.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I listened to Mrs. Hawe saying why they needed the money, what particular items. It seems to me that last year they didn't use the money for that at all, they set-up a store front, which I haven't heard any reports of how great this so-called store front was, who they caught, who they convicted, I don't even know where the merchandise is that was in it, of anything of this nature. Unless they come in with a specific reason and not putting everything in one lumpsum, I don't think I could vote for any thing on this line in particular. The last fiscal year, the money was used, we got nothing for it, so I'm not going to vote for any money at all in that line.

MR. CORBO: I think this question about the report that we didn't have from the police department is irrelevant, because no department comes to us to give a report, especially the police department, which is a secret thing going on. They have to account to the Mayor, to themselves, but never to the Bd. of Reps. We approve a budget item, we let it go, we have to make sure it is spent well, if they have revenue from the store that they opened up, they conducted some business, it goes into the general funds, they don't owe us any report, unless we ask them for it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: You certainly cannot ask the Chief of Police to submit an agenda of who he's going to investigate in the next twelve months, under Major Investigation Dept. We have to place a certain amount of trust in that individual's ability to function as the Chief of Police. What do you expect to get for your money, a return on investment, even if the whole thing is lost, \$22,000. is lost, you don't recoup it, it should be consider money that may be lost, but, then again, how can you measure your return on your investment, if you give them the \$22,000. and he catches five drug dealers, what's it worth, \$100,000., \$200,000. You're giving the man \$22,000. to conduct the Major Investigation Unit, period, it's his prerogative to use the money how he sees fit with our confidence.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Mr. Boccuzzi indicated he wanted more specific information, I have detail; I don't know if you want me to go through it, I can list item by item.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madame President, Mrs. Hawe made a statement in which all these items were listed. All I said was last year they didn't use the money for that.

MR. WIDER: It's too bad that much of this money is wasted on unnecessary investigation. I was a victim of one of them and I promise them then that we would look into their budget when it came before us. I'm proud to see that some questions are being raised. Not everything demands investigation that have been investigated. So many times many hours of police time is lost doing an investigation that warrants no investigation at all, but needs some attention as part of the leadership, so the mere fact is that we said we already have \$7,500. in the account for investigation. I don't see any reason we can't cut a little bit out of there. As the store front goes I don't know anything about it, and I really don't want to know anything about it, but if there was money made I think we all should know about it because we have a responsibility to know the money that's in that general fund, it should be reported to this Board.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I think we should understand what this \$22,000. is for. About \$7,500. of the \$22,000. is actually for the Investigation Unit. These are the funds that are used for organized crime investigations, local criminal investigations, expensive investigation travel, narcotic investigations and narcotic buys. You have referred to the store front operation, this \$7,500. is earmarked for that type of operation, we obviously were not able to get any complete information on that nor did we ask for it. The other \$15,000 is inventory here and I think we should go through it, we're talking about supplies, 50 marijuana field test kits, 50 cocaine field test kits, 50 heroin field test kits, we're talking about photographic supplies, silver has skyrocketed in the last twelve months, I wouldn't even guess the percentage because they would be too lost, it's something like 300., 400., 500%. There's talking about film, enlargement paper, mugg shot paper, chemicals for development and printing, all of which totals \$10,884. We're also talking about identification supplies for \$1,585. these are supplies that are needed, evidence supplies for \$393.00., 150 pocket finger print kits, for \$1,237. All this totals \$15,000. The only debate that I've heard has to do with the \$7,500 for the Major Investigation Unit which for heroin buys and other drug buys, I don't think that that is an unreasonable amount, but please if you're going to cut this budget, you're cutting the request for specific supplies, \$15,000. of it is for needed supplies and equipments.

MRS. GUROIAN: What is the motion to which he spoken to?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The motion is to restore \$2,000.

MRS. GUROIAN: Did he speak in favor or against the motion?

MR. FLOUNDERS: Certain times is difficult to tell what the motion is, but I am in favor of restoration, I am in favor of the \$22,069, and I apologize profusely for not making that amply clear.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We can proceed to a vote. The MOTION on the floor is to restore \$2,000. to account #410.3422 to bring that total to \$22,069. The MOTION is LOST. 14 yes; 17 no.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is it in order at this time to reduce that figure again? In account #410.3422, Major Investigation Unit, he said that \$15,000 were needed for supplies to buy kits, etc., etc. I'd like to reduce that line to read \$15,000. so that the reduction would be \$7,069. The \$15,000. would be to purchase all the supplies needed for testing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The motion is to reduce #410.3422 by \$7,069 so that it read \$15,000 MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO: If we reduce the \$7,500, we don't need the supplies. The supplies, marijuana kits, heroin kits, etc. are to test the drugs that they buy with \$7,500. If we're cutting out the \$7,500, there aren't going to be any drugs to test; we don't need the \$15,000.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I'm really getting confused. Are we against narcotics investigation in the City of Stamford. It seems to me on our Board tonight we can't gain popular support for any program by predicting the dire consequences of not adopting it. Our Board seems to be optimistic incapacitated when it come to approving the action or urging actions required to force all real disasters. What are we going to do, are we not interested in a lousy \$7,500. to try to control narcotic traffic in the City of Stamford. Are we going to paralyze the police department, and tell them in effect, no, we're really not interested in the investigation of narcotic. That's about as irresponsible I think as we can be, and I find it difficult to be a party to it.

MR. BOCCUZZI: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. Mr. Flounders, I am not against narcotics. I'm against the method it was done last year. I don't think the method that it was done last year where nobody was supposed to know about it, but I understand a news reporter knew about it. What makes a news reporter from the Advocate more important to this City than the Board of Reps.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would really not want to get into a cross discussion over this. We understand Mr. Boccuzzi, but I don't want to re partee back and forth now.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would speak against cutting this account. I don't know how many of you have been following the recent reports on narcotics and the effects of narcotics on children that are age 9 and up. They are starting first with marijuana and going on to something that is bigger and better and it's called "coke" and it's very prevalent in Stamford, these kids have accessibility to it and I think anything we can do to try to curb this and control it, we should do it and I would vote against eliminating this account.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Eliminating the \$7,069. I feel is just as irresponsible as voting for huge cuts in the education budget because you don't like the Board of Education, for the same reason you're voting for the cuts in the police budget.

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing)...Everybody is screaming, everybody in this whole community is screaming about police protection, police protection, what are we going to do here, what are we going to do there, and what do we do, we just lacerate the budget, cut it all to pieces and say go out and protect us, but you can't have any money to do it, we're putting hand-cuffs on our police.

MR. ROOS: I had my hand up about five time here, I think possibly, five other people spoke before me. What I have to say is very brief. There is item that seems to be missed here, and that these kits we would purchase, expedite the testing of heroin and cocaine. Normally, without these kits we have to send these samples to the state, they come back possibly two weeks or so. Here we can get instant test and a legal opinion on the purchase of drugs, I think it's very important that we have these kits.

MR. WIDER: I would like to clarify something very quickly. No one is against narcotics or any paraphernalia for testing, but what we are against is the money being spent for other than taking care of narcotic business, that's what we're opposed to.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The question is on reducing line #410.3422 by the amount of \$7,069. so that line will read \$15,000. The vote is 7 in favor; 26 opposed, the MOTION has been LOST.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to try several cuts in this account. The first one, I'd like to make a MOTION to reduce the budget by two civilian dispatchers, the salaries are \$11,630. each, would be a reduction of \$23,260.

MR. ZELINSKI: To expedite the time, there are some situations where a motion is made where it doesn't pass. I would like to suggest that we make the person make the motion to make the cut, the dollar amount, not to have a line figure until the motion is passed, otherwise we're wasting time, the motion may fail and I think we could expedite the time.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: My suggestion is before you make the motion, you get your line figure because when we vote on it we need both, so that before you say I want to reduce it by 50, you know what the final result is.

MR. DeLUCA: My figure would be, working off the \$4,904,124. considering the fact that the recommended cut by Fiscal has not been approved yet, would bring the total down to \$4,880,504. My rationale for reducing the two civilian dispatchers involved a case which recently completed its course up in City of West Hartford, Ct. There was a case up in West Hartford Police Dept., court case involving eleven civilian dispatchers. These people serve as complaint writers for the police and fire dispatchers for the fire department. The civilians were originally working with two firemen and one fire lieutenant. The firemen were then placed on the line while the lieutenant remains with the civilian dispatchers. The court case although settled in favor of the civilians, an agreement has still not been made as to whether these civilian dispatchers would be paid a regular firemen salary or that of a fire lieutenant. In West Hartford, they do not have any civilian dispatchers, the reason being that several years ago a police officer was in trouble,

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing)...a gun pointed at his head, the dispatcher goofed, the union filed a grievance to do away with the civilian dispatchers, because their experience has proven that dispatchers do not know the street codes, etc. I would much rather see us putting two police officers as dispatchers rather than civilians. The police officers are better trained, in case of an emergency they can be relieved of their duties to go out onto the road. There has to be in dispatchers, in using the court case up in West Hartford as a precedent, we would be paying them much higher than what the present salary called for. Therefore I make this MOTION for the reduction.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I thought the reason we were considering civilian dispatchers originally was that we wanted to relieve our police from these jobs so that our more highly paid policemen could do bonafide police work. I think the solution is to make certain that our dispatchers are qualified persons.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We can proceed to a vote. The question is to cut \$23,260. from #410.1110 which would bring that line to \$4,880,864. We will vote by machine. The vote is 14 yes; 19 opposed; the MOTION has been LOST.

MR. DeLUCA: I make a MOTION to reduce line item 410.3451 to zero. The rationale is that as of April 1st, we no longer have a Scuba Diving Team in effect. These people have resigned.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DONAHUE: I have to say that since that date the Scuba Team has been used in one incident up in Noroton River, behind Largo Park, they may not exist as a team anymore, but I know that if they have to respond they still do, this is for supplies, air tanks and equipment and I think we should leave it in the account because it could be very necessary any day.

MR. DeNICOLA: I support Mr. Donahue. It's a very important team; they have saved many, many lives. I think the money should stay there.

MR. CORBO: I have attended the Health & Protection Committee meeting when they had the discussion with the Police Association. They did indeed say that they resigned for some personal reasons or association reasons, I don't know, but they stated that if their problem is going to be resolved, they are going to restore this service and they are going to participate to that program, therefore I think we should maintain this line the way it is would be helpful to them.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There are a few more speakers. If there is nothing new to add to that, can we proceed to a vote, if there is no objection, we shall. The MOTION has LOST, 4 in favor; 28 opppsed.

MRS. SANTY: I would like a clarification from Mrs. Hawe, under line item #410.3445. Police Commission, explain the \$600.00..

MRS. HAWE: These funds would be expended inconjunction with the Police Commission's

POLICE DEPARTMENT (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)...public hearings relative to citizens' complaints. The Police Commission is required to provide a public professional court stenographer for each of these hearings and that's what that money is for.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If there are no further cuts we will go on to a department total.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Page 71 - Code 410.

TOTAL APPROVED \$6,871,081.00

MRS. HAWE: Code 421, Dog Warden, Fiscal has recommended no cuts in this account.

DOG WARDEN

Page 74 - Code 421.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 43,831

MRS. HAWE: Code 440. Fiscal recommended that total stand.

PENSION & RETIREES BENEFITS

Page 74 - Code 440.

TOTAL APPROVED \$2,398,961

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. What is code 440.1423 Medical Benefits Police. What does that consist of.

MRS. McINERNEY: It is my understanding that the last union contract, we voted medical benefits to the police, a certain amount of medical benefits to the police, from the time they retired up to age 65, when they will be taken over by Medicare.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: What does the \$10,000. represent?

MRS. HAWE: Insurance premium.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: In otherwords, insurance has gone up from \$7,500 to \$10,000. , a nice round number like \$10,000.

MRS. McINERNEY: You have more men retired, obviously.

MRS. GUROIAN: Is it possible to get a total of how much we cut so far from the staff.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: If you want to go up there and the staff has it for you, I don't want to disrupt the meeting for it, you're welcome to go up there and ask.

MRS. GUROIAN: The last time you sent me up there, they sent me back to my seat, I don't want to go up there and come back to my seat.

FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.

MRS. HAWE: Code 450. Fiscal has recommended a cut from the salary account, line 450.1110 of \$24,400. which would bring that line to a total of \$3,785,671. This \$24,400 figure represents a \$22,000 amount for an attrition factor, plus \$2,400 for the fact that the Mayor has phased in, their four public safety dispatchers, new positions, for three months, and he neglected to phased in the fourth one for three months. That \$2,400 figure is to represent the fourth public safety dispatcher.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Through you to Mrs. Hawe. I'm confused to what a public safety dispatcher is. There much controversy if you remember, about a possible institution of 911; does public safety dispatcher have anything to do with 911 operation?

MRS. HAWE: No, there is nothing in this budget or police budget that has to do with the 911 operation.

MRS. CONTI: I raised the question in Fiscal Mrs. McInerney, and they assured me that there was nothing in there to cover 911.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 77 - Code 450

|                |             |
|----------------|-------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$4,973,213 |
|----------------|-------------|

PENSIONS & RETIREES BENEFITS

Page 79 - Code 460

|                |             |
|----------------|-------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$2,219,781 |
|----------------|-------------|

BELLTOWN FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 80 - Code 471

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$ 137,950 |
|----------------|------------|

NEW HOPE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 81 - Code 472

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$ 169,109 |
|----------------|------------|

LONG RIDGE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 82 - Code 473

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$ 163,390 |
|----------------|------------|

TURN OF RIVER FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 83 - Code 474

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$ 357,492 |
|----------------|------------|

SPRINGDALE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 84 - Code 475

|                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| TOTAL APPROVED | \$ 132,368 |
|----------------|------------|

STAMFORD EMERGENCY SERVICE

Page 85 - Code 480

TOTAL APPROVED \$ - 0 -

MRS. HAWE: Stamford Emergency was cut by the Board of Finance of the entire Budget.

MR. DeLUCA: What really amazes me is that the Mayor made a big hullabaloo about the Board of Finance deleting the Division of Collection, receiving all kinds of legal opinions, and that they acted irrationally, yet the Mayor makes no comments about seeking legal opinions on the fact that the Board of Finance, according to his thinking, cut out the Stamford Emergency Service which should be in the samerealm of thought as the Division of Collection, yet on one hand he wants us to act on Division of Collection but yet this one here he makes no comments on.

MRS. HAWE: Page 86, Ambulance Corps, we recommended no cuts.

STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS

Page 86 - Code 481

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 67,386

HARBORMASTER

Page 87 - Code 482

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 2,174

Page 88

POLICE &amp; FIRE PROTECTION SECTION TOTAL \$17,536,736

MRS. GUROIAN: I ask again, I would like to know how much we have cut so far. Mr. Boccuzzi's notes did me nothing, your recommendation did me nothing, I think its important that I know how much was cut so far.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would ask the staff to total up our cuts. Mrs. Chasek, at your first opportunity please total up the cuts that have accumulated for Mrs. Guorian. We'll proceed to Public Works.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Page 45 - Code 301.

MRS. HAWE: Public Works is on page 45 in the new book and page 146 in the old one. In Code 301. Fiscal has recommended a cut of \$3,000. in Radio Systems Maintenance Code #301.3440 which would bring that line down to \$7,000. Our rationale for this was the fact that this was to maintain over an100-radio units, some are under service contract and the department wants to start preventive maintenance on the others. We felt this was a good idea; however, we felt that \$7,000, an increase of \$2,000 from this year was sufficient in this account.

MR. POLLARD: I would like to request a \$2,500 reduction in account #301.2740, Telephone, which brings that to \$8,000.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. Mr. Pollard, Mr. Blum would like to know your rationale for the cut.

MR. POLLARD: Mr. Blum, I don't know what your experience has been, but mine has that the telephones doesn't seem to get used very often in that department.

MR. BLUM: Well the budget shows that in 78/79 it was \$10,521.77 and in 79/80 it was the same figure, how do you figure, it's not up or down.

MR. POLLARD: Mr. Blum, they have a different Commissioner there now.

MR. FAUTEUX: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will now vote on the motion to cut \$2,500 on #310.2740. The MOTION HAS BEEN LOST.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Line #301.2930, I would like to cut \$500.00 from that, making it \$2,500. and my rationale is that I really don't know that many people who get answered to correspondence.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. It has been moved to cut line 2930 by \$500.00 so that the line read \$2,500. The MOTION has been LOST.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. On the advertising, code 2920. I wonder if the Co-persons could give me some clarification on what they're advertising

MRS. LYONS: I spoke to the Commissioner today and asked him just about that, and he said they used their advertising for various things, for instance, they did extend these hours at the Hanover Dump, it would be spread out, also when they put out, they advertise for bids for the contractors for snow removal, and they also use it for advertising jobs.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like to make a MOTION to cut it, line 2920 to reduce it \$2,000 to \$1,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION has LOST by a vote of 13 yes; 21 opposed.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Page 45 - Code 301.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 352,777

WEIGHTS & REASURES

Page 46 - Code 302

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 18,965

BUREAU OF HIWAYS & MAINT. DIV. HIWAY  
Page 47 - Code 310

TOTAL APPROVED \$1,241,884

DIV OF EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE  
Page 48 - Code 311

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 292,998

PUBLIC LIGHTING  
Page 50 - Code 313

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 873,600

MRS. HAWE: Page 51, Code #314. Snow Removal & Flood Emergency, Fiscal recommended a cut of \$25,000. in line #2181. Which would bring that line to \$115,000. The reason we did that is because of the light snow fall this winter, the department st has half of their inventory and stock, we think that \$115,000 will be sufficient for next year to build up their supplies.

MR. ZELINSKI: Would it be possible to make a greater cut, if they have so much, or do they usually end of buying some of their supplies now, in other words, I don't want to give them money now if they're not going to be using it until maybe near the end, they can come in later for it.

MRS. HAWE: No, they don't buy it now. The State buy these materials and the City buy off the State's bid, however, there are going to have to buy next year in the eventuality of we will have more snow than we did this year. They made a convincing argument for the fact that they wanted \$140,000, they felt that they needed this, but Fiscal felt they could be cut \$25,000. If you're asking if we can eliminate them and have them come back depending on the weather next year, that's not possible because they have to buy this before the winter.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Mrs. Hawe, I noticed that in 314.2663, we have an amount of \$20,000 and this of course as we have admitted is a mild winter but, in a more snowy winter we had \$16,000 expenditure. What is the reason we have an higher amount there, in a less severe winter.

MRS. HAWE: We have more equipment than we had, and this is for parts, repairs.

MR. JOYCE: Getting back to the rock salt and sand. Did I understand you correctly last year we purchased \$150,000 worth of rock salt and sand. We have used approximately \$75,000. and we have \$75,000 worth remaining in our inventory, is that correct? They have now asked for \$140,000 of which \$25,000 is cut, is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: That's right.

MR. JOYCE: I think the next step is that I would MOVE that we subtract another \$35,000 to balance out what ought to be an adequate amount taken into consideration that they have a value of commodity if you will, already in the hopper.

MRS. HAWE: We also have to take into account Mr. Joyce, the fact that this material has gone up in price, last year price for calcium which they also buy out of this was \$13.25 a bag, sand was \$9.40 a cubic yard, salt was \$27.64 a ton. Now they

SNOW REMOVAL & FLOOD EMERGENCY (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing)... project that the price coming this fiscal year, calcium will be \$14.00 a bag, sand \$10.00 cubic yard, and salt for \$30.00 a ton, so this also has to be figured in. If they do have a surplus next year of the inventory, then it will just be carried over, it's not something that's going to be lost.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think, Mr Joyce, you have to look at the departmental request to start with, that was \$278,600. the Mayor has already cut it to \$140,000. and what we're doing is taking off another \$25,000. so actually we're cutting that departmental request more than 50% as it is.

MR. JOYCE: I guess I'm really questioning what they budget ed, \$150,000. sand and rock salt in the last year, you mean to tell me that the price of sand and rock salt has gone up from \$150,000. or double the price.

MRS. HAWE: No, it hasn't but when they put in their request it was the beginning of the budget process, the winter was just beginning so I assume that's what they thought that perhaps they might need, \$278,000. they didn't realize that they would have this surplus inventory.

MR. JOYCE: I MOVE that we reduce that number of the rock salt and sand by \$35,000. off the \$140,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The MOTION is to reduce it by \$35,000 to a total of \$105,000. The MOTION has been CARRIED. 17 yes; 15 no.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to ask Mrs. Hawe on line item 314.5530, Contractors-Snow Removal, How much is in that particular account now in dollar figures. I presume also that there were no cuts made of the \$150,000.

MRS. HAWE: The Board of Finance cut \$25,000. off the figure, now it's \$125,000.

MR. ESPOSITO: There is currently \$93,000 in that account, this is as of March 31, they may still be some outstanding bills for the month of March. March 13th, we had a nine-inch snow fall.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to make a MOTION to delete on line 314.5530, an additional \$25,000. which would bring that line to \$100,000.

MR. FAUTEUX: I'd like to object to that. How can Mr. Zelinski be certain as to what next winter will bring in the way of snow.

MR. ZELINSKI: If we already have \$93,000. in there I don't know how much more one light snowfall will cost, but they're still going to have a balance of at least \$50,000. and it seems to me if we're going to put money in there so they can transfer or play games, I'm sorry, I don't go for that.

SNOW REMOVAL & FLOOD EMERGENCY (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The question is on cutting \$25,000. from code 314.5530, so that we have a line total of \$100,000. The vote is 14 yes; 18 no; the MOTION has LOST.

SNOW REMOVAL & FLOOD EMERGENCY

Page 51 - Code 314.

TOTAL APPROVED

\$ 341.910

MRS. HAWE: Page 52, Division of Land & Building Code 320. Fiscal recommended no cuts

MR. DeLUCA: On line item 320.2710. Fuel oil. What is the projection cost per gallon #2 oil?

MRS. HAWE: Estimated cost for 1979/80 for this current fiscal year, \$100,500. at 82¢ per gallon plus they are figuring an 30% inflation factor, so they are anticipating \$1.08 per gallon.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm getting a little confused. I'm looking at the memo you sent me Mrs. Hawe, we talked about #2 oil, 82.9¢. I look at a memo I got from Purchasing Agent, Tom Canino in 1979/80, we used up 66,000 of #2 oil and we're under contract with Fairfield Oil, and the most recent price we're paying was 95.9; I raised the question why do we pay so high, and someone comments were that last year, if Fairfield Oil was the only one that was guaranteed an allocation, as no other oil companies were taking on new customers. I then proceed to call up Hoffman Fuel, I talked to a Mr. Cole, he assured me that if they were requested to bid, which they were not, they would definitely be lower than the 96. They will charge the City lower than the domestic customers, the homeowners, (which I was paying 89.7) thereby the city would be a few cents cheaper. I would like to make a MOTION based on the consumption of last year's figure of 67,000 gallons, and a saving of 10¢ per gallon, I would like to recommend a cut of \$6,700. in this account.

MRS. CONTI: POINT OF INFORMATION. May we have from the Chairman what's left in the account now.

MR. ESPOSITO: The original appropriation for that account was \$50,000. and they had a \$47,000. additional appropriation, out of that they have \$48,500. To answer your question, they spent more than \$50,000. so far this year, and probably would go over the \$60,000 or \$70,000 mark.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm not questioning how much was spent; I'm questioning that we're paying 95.9 when Hoffman Fuel, to a regular homeowner like myself, is only charging 89.7. If they were to supply a large account like the City of Stamford, their price would have been much cheaper than 89.7.

DIVISION OF LAND & BUILDINGS (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (sitting in for Mrs. Goldstein) We will proceed to a vote. The question is on reducing line item #320.2710 to \$92,400. The MOTION has LOST, 16 yes; 16 no.

DIVISION OF LAND & BUILDINGS

Page 52 - Code 320.

TOTAL APPROVED \$1,073,902.

GASOLINE

Page 53 - Code 321.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 180,000.

PETROLEATES

Page 54 - Code 322.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 18,200.

REPAIRS

Page 55 - Code 323

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 196,500.

MRS. HAWE: Page 56, Code 330. Fiscal recommended a cut of \$18,292. in the salary account, line 1110 and by that cut we eliminated the salary for the Supervisor of Subdivision. This position is vacant now and it has been vacant at budget-making time last year and we felt that if it's been vacant for this long, it wasn't all that indispensable, so we recommended a cut of \$18,292 which would bring the total for the salary line to \$478,821.

We also recommended a cut from the car allowance line code 330.1220, a cut of \$1,200 which would bring that line to \$18,000. We came to this figure by adding up the people in this department who get a car allowance of \$100.00 a month, that's 15 people for twelve months and that totals \$18,000.

MRS. SANTY: The car allowance, can you explain that a little further.

MRS. HAWE: This is car allowance to pay employees for the use of their private automobiles. They use their own cars, there are 15 people.

MRS. SANTY: I think we have some city cars there, how many city vehicles are being used, and my next question is, are they allowed to take these vehicles home?

MR. ESPOSITO: That wouldn't come under this car allowance. Car allowance is when you are paid for using your own car, if you're talking about this particular line item, it's for the MEA employees using their own cars.

MRS. SANTY: There is nowhere here, in this department, where city cars are being us

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: As I understand it, there are no city cars in this department, they just use their own cars.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: What does the Travel Expenses consist of.

MRS. HAWE: This account is used for trips to <sup>H</sup>artford and various areas of the State when necessary.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Am I correct in assuming that they used \$3.00 last year.

MRS. HAWE: That was the year before last, 1978/79. Apparently they did.

MRS. SANTY: I'm not clear in my mind. I know this department uses city automobile and somewhere in this budget there should be an accountability for these vehicles that are being used, I know there are, I just want to know if 15 people are using their automobiles, I want to know how city vehicles are being used.

MR. ESPOSITO: There is no evidence that they use city vehicles, there is no maintenance vehicle account, no replacement of vehicles account.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. Is this the City engineer department, I have to concur with you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I don't see anything in the line items, would it be anywhere else in the budget, Paul?

MRS. SANTY: I think there should be some clarification here, we're voting for a car allowance, but somewhere there are people in this department, namely one is the City Engineer, I think there are others, that use a city vehicle. Where is this accountable, it has to be somewhere.

MR. ESPOSITO: You're asking us to account for something that isn't there. There is nothing in the budget to support any vehicles. There is no gasoline allowance, no maintenance of vehicles, no replacement of vehicles.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. Is this car allowance mandated by contract otherwords, \$100.000 a month for employees regardless of usage period or by contract or what.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, it is by contract.

MR. JOYCE: I think the question being raised by Mrs. Santy is the fact, is that certain employees are driving in city-owned vehicles and they know them to be within this department, yet we have in front of us a budget for the department with either a ghost-like car involved, or her eyes are deceiving her tonight, I know Lois to be a very perceptive woman, so therefore I have to presume that there is something missing from this item.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: If it's not on the line item, they're not getting any money for it.

MR. JOYCE: The individual is donating his car, is that correct?

MR. BOCCUZZI: No, I didn't say that.

MR. ESPOSITO: It may be that people borrow cars from other public works department we don't know that. All we know there is no line item in their budget.

MR. FLOUNDERS: We have a car allowance list here for that account and its two assistant city engineers, they get \$125.00 each per month, one supervisor field person, 6 senior engineers, two street opening inspectors, one URC inspector, one house inspector, one supervisor of sub-division, one hydraulic engineer, one painting inspector, which total 16 people by contract who get this car allowance.

MR. RYBNICK: These Engineers take their cars out to the field and if you cut this car allowance and they have to use foot or get on buses, by the time they get to the job it's time to go home again.

MR. CONTI: There seems to be some discrepancy, Mrs. Hawe said that there were 15 cars x 100 x 12 months comes down to \$18,000. Now Mr. Flounders said there were 16, that would come out to \$19,200.

MRS. HAWE: We cut one position, we cut the supervisor of sub-division.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

Page 56 - Code 330.

TOTAL APPROVED

\$ 516,546

MRS. HAWE: Page 58, Division of Building Inspection, Code 332. The Fiscal Committee recommended a cut in Conferences and Training of \$290.00 which would bring that line to \$500.00. which is Code 2940.

MR. DENICOLA: These new positions, are they filled?

MRS. HAWE: No, the Mayor cut the heating and air-conditioner inspector and the plumbing inspector and also the clerk typist I; and the Board of Finance cut the two deputy building inspectors. There are no new positions in this department.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Does that in anyway affect the new equipment budget?

MRS. CONTI: What we have here in new equipment is two calculators with plain paper read-out at \$150.00; one electric pencil shapener; five individual record cabinets, for \$435.00 each; anticipated increase of order 10%; one desk, \$330.00; one male swivel chair, \$196.00; one side chair, \$84.00.

DIVISION OF BUILDING INSPECTION (cont.)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I note with interest that the telephone account is quite large, than most of the other department in public works, any reason for that.

MRS. HAWE: The telephone account based on the back-up material represents basic monthly charges, \$521.50 per month, which is a total of \$6,250.50 and then there are toll calls on top of that; most of that is the basic monthly charge.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Looking at the car allowance. They requested \$14,958. and now they're down to \$10,158.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, due to the positions that were deleted by the Mayor and the Board of Finance.

DIVISION OF BUILDING INSPECTION

Page 58 - Code 332.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 297,581.

MRS. HAWE: Page 59, Code 340. Fiscal recommended a cut in the salary account, which is line 1110 of \$11,100. which brings that line down to \$50,188. We cut that money out because the superintendent of sanitation had been cut out by the Board of Finance, the clerk typist was to be for the superintendent, therefore we eliminated the position of clerk typist. Also the chief sanitation clerk, which there is a vacancy, and not filled, there is not test yet for that position. We phased in that position over a period of three months to start on October 1.

Fiscal also recommended a cut in the conferences and training account of \$400.00 to bring that line to zero because that account was to be for the superintendent of sanitation which is no longer in this department.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would just like to know what is the reason considerable jump in advertising, what are they doing differently.

MRS. HAWE: It's not in the back-up material, and I'm sorry we don't have that information. I know that the advertising rates in the newspaper are anticipating going up.

MR. JOYCE: Despite the hour is late, I would make a motion to re-consider page 52, account #320.2940 of \$4,000 which suddenly appears in this year's budget and not in last year.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, fiscal recommended several cuts on that page.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: No, there were no cuts recommended on that page.

MRS. HAWE: I'm sorry I thought you were talking about another page.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The vote is 21 in favor; 12 opposed; that page will be reconsidered when Mrs. Hawe is through with page 59.

BUREAU OF SANITATION (cont.)

MR. DeNICOLA: We just keep going over page after page and there are a lot of vacancies and they're not filled. If the 're not filled we should just cut them out.

MRS. HAWE: Code 340, the two vacancies are the chief sanitation clerk, on which they are working on changing classification and grade and the weigh master who is not filled yet, they don't have a test yet. We were convinced when we spoke to public works department, they said that they needed these positions, we asked them about this, if they could be deleted, they said that with the new ordinance passed and the fees that are being charged down there, this is income-producing, that they need those vacancies. The permit clerk is out sick at this point and they are really hard-up for help.

MRS. CONTI: If I may make a further explanation on this, this permit clerk, has had a very serious heart attack and has been hospitalized and is probably now on terminal leave. This man has been doing everything down there and this is why they are trying to re-organize now with these new positions, but he will be on the salary account until such time as all his sick days and vacation days are up. Do you understand?

MR. DeNICOLA: I understand, I just would like to see these vacancies filled.

BUREAU OF SANITATION

Page 59 - Code 340

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 63,238.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will now return to page 52, for Mr. Joyce's motion on that page

MR. JOYCE: First I would like to ask a question of the Chairwoman or the committee if she would give us some information on code #320.2940, conferences and training.

MRS. HAWE: This is to send custodial supervisor and custodians to training boiler schools and heat control schools. This is so that they are acquainted and they become more familiar with energy and heating controls hopefully to effect some savings in the fuel account.

MR. JOYCE: In view of this explanation, I would MOVE that we strike the \$4,000. and have the these gentlemen observe the operation of the boilers and read some books.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. LYONS: I would like to speak against this motion. When we met with the Commissioner he went into some length, if you notice in line #320.2220, building alteration, \$20,000. is being allocated for energy control specifically. This training and conference is going to be used to implement this energy control to make sure that they are being used correctly.

DIVISION OF LAND AND BUILDINGS (reconsideration-cont.)

MR. WIDER: It's so important that we not continue to have poorly trained men, for the new equipment that we buy, which was proved at our Sewage Treatment Plant, and I'm hoping that we don't make that same mistake again. In light of the fact that they want to train the men to take care of the new equipment that they are going to buy, I would hope that we leave this in.

MR. DONAHUE: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is on cutting \$4,000. from line 320.2940. The MOTION is LOST.

MRS. HAWE: Page 60, Code 341. Sewage Treatment Plant. Fiscal has recommended a cut on line 2720 Gas and Electric, of \$20,000. which would leave that line at \$380,000. The rationale on that is based on their current rate of usage and taking into account at 20% rate increase next year, we come to the conclusion that \$380,00 is a sufficient amount.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: A while back we had a problem with the water down at the plant, and the department came to us for an additional appropriation; has anything transpired there as far as them fixing that because I note with interest that the water account, 2730 has gone up \$46,500. from last year's \$30,000.

MRS. HAWE: Mr. Wiederlight, as far as I understand from last talking to the Commissioner, they have not yet resolved that problem, they do not however feel that it is a leak as Fiscal had reported at the last meeting. The increase here is due to the fact that they anticipate an increase in usage and an increase in price for water.

MR. WIDER: In going over this budget I fail to see any request for conference and training and because of the problems we had with this plant, I'm wondering what is happening, do they have all the trained people that they need now to run it efficiently.

MRS. HAWE: We only act on the budget that they presented to us and we didn't question them about that because there was no money in here for that.

MR. ESPOSITO: You might note that line 1230 is the college tuition, has been eliminated, but they had it in there.

MR. BLUM: Code 341.3711 Laboratory supplies, they have gone from a total of \$8,000 in 79/80 budget to \$10,440.

MRS. HAWE: Their usage for laboratory supplies, and these supplies incidently are mandated by State and Federal requirement, but their usage from July '79 to December '79 was \$5,200. they estimate that their yearly usage is \$8,700. and adding in an inflation factor comes to the total of \$10,440.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT (cont.)

MR. BLUM: Does this include the chlorine that they received down there.

MRS. HAWE: I think that is under processing chemicals, Code 2331, that includes chlorine hydrogen peroxide and lime.

MR. JOYCE: Commenting on the question on the absence of money for conference and training, as a practical matter, Engineering Company who supplies boiler to sewage treatment plants and other types of technical equipment, generally as part of their quote to price on this equipment and when they installed the equipment, provide training courses for the people who are to operate this equipment, at no expense to the customer, this is something which whoever the particular corporation who is installing the equipment, any additional money being put into this budget will simply be icing on the cake, the cake is provided by the engineering firms that install these particular equipment, they usually provide training courses for their engineers to train the operators, the people who are going to use the equipment. That's the reason you don't have it in this case.

MR. DeNICOLA: Item 341.1201, overtime, I would like to MOVE to cut that \$10,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWE: This overtime is a contractual requirement. Since the sewage treatment plant must be covered 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, all holidays require staffing and the money for this comes out of the over-time account. Also this account supplies the funds for replacing personnel who are out on sick, personal or vacation time, and this is the amount they are going to need for next year.

MR. DeNICOLA: If there is so much overtime going on, why don't they hire more personnel, we have to cut down on this overtime, I feel it's needed.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is on cutting line 341.120 overtime, \$10,000. so that line will read \$60,200. The MOTION has LOST. (voice)

MR. BLUM: I'd like to ask on Code 2331 processing chemicals, it went up \$22,000. The first year, I believe that was their operational year, was \$147,000 then it went to \$155,000 or \$194,000 and why now \$216,000.

MRS. HAWE: I can give you details of how much is used per day of each of these chemicals, would you like me to go into that, the increase is mainly because they're increasing the usage of some of these because of more stuff coming into the plant, and an inflation factor.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT (cont.)

MR. BLUM: I'd like to say this. When we had the problems at the Sewage Treatment Plant, they had to bring in quite a bit of chlorine and other chemicals to cut down the smell. I believe this was supposed to be resolved now and we should be back on line with sort of a clearance. I would like to make a cut of at least \$10,000, and I so MOVE.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. Code 2331, will read \$206,190.

MRS. LYONS: I just want to make a brief comment, as to the comments made by Mr. Blum. I can guarantee you Mr. Blum that that smell has not decreased or gone away it's still there, so I would hope that we keep in the chemicals to alleviate the smell.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let's proceed to a vote. The MOTION is LOST. (voice)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: On the travel expenses, line 2942, what are they traveling to?

MRS. HAWE: That's traveling expenses for training courses, and education meeting.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: There is no money allocated for conferences and training.

MRS. HAWE: They must be free training courses.

MRS. SANTY: I would like to know why the Sewage Treatment Plant employees need a car allowance, code 1220.

MRS. HAWE: The car allowance is for two cars, at \$32.50 a month x 12 months comes to \$780.00. I'm sorry I don't have the information as to which the two are, Mrs Lyons?

MRS. LYONS: The two individuals that receive the car allowance are Miss Semon and her assistant. I asked her about this and she said she uses the car allowance to inspect the pumping stations and to go to the hurricane areas to attend various meeting, not necessarily in town and sometimes when they go out of town to look at new equipment which they are going to purchase and she wants to inspect it before hand.

MRS. SANTY: I MOVE to delete the entire amount of \$780.00 from that account.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. 17 yes; 16 opposed. That line will now read zero.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Page 60 - Code 341

TOTAL APPROVED

\$1,156,554.

MAINTENANCE OF SANITARY SEWERS

Page 62 - Code 342

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 64.560

MRS. HAWE: Code 343, Sanitary Incinerator, Fiscal recommended a cut in the salary line, 1110, of \$20,000. The rationale for this was we figured in an attrition factor which would bring that line to \$602,531.

MR. DeNICOLA: I was just wondering if that vacancy was filled.

MRS. HAWE: One of the labor was already filled, the other two labor positions, they do have a list and they anticipate filling shortly, the equipment operator 3, is still vacant, but anticipated to be hired before July 1.

MRS. SANTY: Another question on the car allowance, why would anyone at the sanitary incinerator need a car allowance.

MR. ESPOSITO: Two Supervisor administrator personnel.

MRS. SANTY: Where do they travel that they need a car allowance? I MOVE to delete the entire amount of \$1,000.

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

MR. FLOUNDERS: Are these car allowance contractual or are they not. We may just be kidding ourselves, we're eliminating things that are required by contract, am I correct or not Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: As far as I understand they are, either MEA or MAA. I agree with you I'm not in agreement to cut this.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Well if it is incorrect they have to be put back anyway.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd like to make a motion to reconsider this item, I voted on the prevailing side.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is a motion to reconsider item 1220 under car allowance. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: If it is contractual, then the amount of money that they should be asking for should be clear and cut, in other words, they ask for \$1,840. there should have been no dispute by the Mayor or by the Board of Finance and they should have gotten \$1,840. but yet it was cut to \$1,000. so either they padded the amount they asked for or somebody doesn't know what the contractual arrangement is.

MRS. SANTY: Are we absolutely sure and documented this is contractual, that's the question in my mind.

SANITARY INCINERATOR (cont.)

MRS. CONTI: This is paid on a per diem basis, I believe it's MAA, that pays on a per diem basis, it's not the flat \$100.00 per month.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Mrs. Conti, I believe if that is correct that it is only voucher basis, is that correct? So it's per diem on a voucher basis.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We have moved to reconsider that line item, Mrs. Santy if you still want to make that motion to cut it to zero you may, any motion is in order.

MRS. SANTY: I MOVE that we delete the entire amount of \$1,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 20 in favor; 16 opposed, the MOTION has been PASSED.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask the Fiscal Chairman, what are the chemicals that are used at the incinerator.

MRS. HAWES: The processing chemicals are caustic soda to neutral<sup>ize</sup> the water flow from the precipitated fly ash.

SANITARY INCINERATOR

Page 63 - Code 343

TOTAL APPROVED \$1,150,066.

MRS. HAWES: Code 345, Sanitary Pumping Station. We made several cuts in this account due to the fact that the Board of Finance had eliminated the vacancy of Master Mechanic. The cuts are as follows: Code 1221, Clothing allowance, we recommended a cut of \$125. to bring that line to \$250.00. The next line 1222, Tool Allowance, we recommend a cut of \$100.00 to bring that line to \$200.00. Protective Clothing, 2352, we recommend a cut of \$50.00 to bring that line to \$100.00. Line 3481, Laundry, we recommend a cut of \$26.00 to bring that line to \$100.00.

MRS. SANTY: I'm not really going after this car allowance, but I'm interested in how anyone would travel in the pumping station, so I would like an explanation on the car allowance, who is it for, is it contractual and where do they travel.

MR. FAUETUX: Mrs. Santy, there are 21 pumping stations that these gentlemen service, using their automobiles, I think that the automobile allowance is essential to get them around.

MR. DeNICOLA: Yes, again, the vacancy on the Master Mechanic.

MRS. HAWES: Yes, the Board of Finance cut that.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm just wondering why, the personnel was cut and as a result of the

SANITARY PUMPING STATION (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing)....additional people being reduced, we reduced clothing allowance and several other items and yet the \$3,000. car allowance remains the same under the Mayor's request as it does under the Board of Finance request.

MRS. HAWK; That individual was not slated to get car allowance, it was the pumping station mechanic I and II who get the car allowance.

MR. BLUM: If you're cutting the master mechanic job out, he's on stand-by time, why isn't the stand-by time cut also?

MRS. HAWK: The stand-by time as I understand it is for the other two people, the pumping station mechanics, two people at eleven hours a week each, times 52 weeks a year, \$7.50 per hour comes to \$8,580.

MR. BLUM: The master mechanic is just exactly what it means, he is the overall here to make sure that the pumping station is working in proper order. There are times he is called in, he's on a 24-hour stand-by, yet you fail to cut the stand-by account. I'd like to cut that as long as your master mechanic is being cut, that should be cut as well, because he's on a stand-by time. I'd like to cut \$2,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is no second.

MR. JOYCE: Line item 2720, gas and electric, it appears that the department initially requested the sum of \$61,600. based expenditures in the preceding year of approximately \$50,000. and the amount was raised by the Mayor's request to \$67,200. I MOVE that it be brought back to what the department originally requested which is \$61,600.

MRS. HAWK: Apparently the Mayor's office felt according to their usage and the projected increase in utilities that they would need that this year.

MR. JOYCE: How can the Mayor's office know more about the functioning of the department than the people in the department.

MRS. HAWK: Because when the budget was made up for the department, it was done a lot earlier than when the Mayor reviewed it, and more information was at hand at that time.

MR. FAUTEUX: What happen here was the inflation rate was doubled from 10% to 20% for the utility.

MR. JOYCE: I MOVE that amount be reduced to the original request of \$61,600, a cut of \$5,600. so that it will read \$61,600.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The MOTION has been LOST by a vote of 20 opposed, 13 in favor.

SANITARY PUMPING STATION

Page 65 - Code 345.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 124,022.

MRS. HAWE: Division of Equipment and Building Maintenance, we recommended no cut.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: POINT OF INFORMATION. Line 2942 Travel Expenses.

MRS. HAWE: It's for the engineer mechanics to go to technical training school.

MR. DeNICOLA: Could you explain the overtime account.

MRS. HAWE: This is how it's calculated; 52 weeks, two men for Saturdays, \$8,681. Two men for ten holidays, \$1,669.00 plus emergencies, nights, Sundays, major breakdowns etc.

DIVISION OF EQUIP AND BUILDING MAINT.

Page 66 - Code 346

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 507,883.

MR. BLUM: I MOVE to cut \$25.00 from 3431.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: There is no second to that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have a question. Line 3460, Education & Training. We had originally allocated \$2,000 for that and they used nothing.

MRS. HAWE: No, that was the previous year, 78/79, the next applied to 79/80.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: What did they utilize ?

MR. ESPOSITO: They have used \$1,800.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Page 68.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to MOVE that we take a conditional vote so that we don't have to come back here another night, to put \$500,000 back into that account. If the court orders us back, we'll have to come back another night, let the vote be conditional.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Conti, I am going to rule that motion out of order as the Board of Finance has placed nothing into the account and according to the Charter we have nothing to vote on.

MRS. SANTY: I would like to challenge the Chair on this. We have a ruling from our Corporation Counsel, we're always asking for ruling, we finally got a ruling, and I think it's a matter of opinion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is there a second to the motion to challenge the Chair.  
SECONDED.

DIVISION OF COLLECTION (cont.)

MRS. SANTY: I would just like to say that three members of the Board of Finance are responsible for this deletion, three people. I know they had sincere, honorable reasons for voting for this, but, this affects thousands of taxpayers in this city. We are obligated to pick up this garbage under Section 410-414 of the Charter. I read Mr. Cookney's ruling very carefully, no one votes more conservatively than I do, but we have to pick up this garbage, and I think because they have a dispute possibly with the Public Works Commissioner, that we cannot take it out on the taxpayers. We hired this man, a qualified engineer, he heads this department, he prefers to do his thing his way; some how or other, the Board of Finance does not agree with this, so in retribution they eliminate these funds, I think there are other ways to handle this situation. We had many disagreements with people in city boards, but we certainly don't go ahead and eliminate the department. This would mean that those six members in the Board of Finance, anytime that they have a disagreement with a department head, they can eliminate the entire department to teach them a lesson or whatever their reason, so I want to MOVE, and I know there is a motion on the floor, I would like to amend that to restore the whole.....

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, we're voting on sustaining the rule of the Chair that this department is not properly before us.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd like to say that this Board has to operate on the Charter. The Charter states that we can only approve money sent down to us by the Board of Finance or reduce, we cannot add and what you are asking us is for us to add. I understand Mr. Cookney's ruling, I am no way saying that we should or should not have private collection, all I'm saying is that we are going by the Charter. We spoke to Mr. Cookney, we told him, if you get a court order down to us that says we have to, we will proceed to the court order. He hasn't had the court order down to us; we have another meeting coming up in June, if he gets the court order by June we can very well act to amend the operating budget and if the court order comes down the way Mr. Cookney said it should, then we will only need 21, not 2/3 to add that amount to the operating budget. So, I think there is no real urgency at this time, to put this money into the budget, there is still a couple of months left and I'm sure if he's going to get a court order, he's going to get it long before our June meeting and if he does get it, this Board will act upon that court order.

MR. BLUM: My district as well as other districts are in the A Dist. We have in our district garbage collections, does this mean when July 1st comes that all those in the A Dist. and those who have the sewer system in place, are to be without garbage collection. As Mrs. Santy said, this is nothing but a political fight, in-fight that is going on between the Board of Finance and the Mayor's office. I say no way shall the people in Stamford suffer by the fact that come July 1, if we have to wait for a court ruling, should the garbage not be collected. If that is so, do we have to go to our Health Director who shall come forward and say a Health menace exists in the City of Stamford, and therefore, he will come through the Mayor's office and they'll get an additional appropriation.

DIVISION OF COLLECTION (cont.)

MR. BLUM: (continuing).....One thing I always hear numerous times, we must look for the opinion of the Corporation Counsel. We have an opinion, now, the question is, there are times other people say, it is only an opinion, and there are times where the Chair ruled that the Corporation Counsel's opinion is Law. I ask you, the Chair, is the Corporation Counsel's opinion Law today.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I will answer that question after everyone has spoken, so that I can give my reasoning for my ruling.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I think we have to keep in mind that we were sworn to uphold the Charter of the City of Stamford and the Charter precludes us from voting on this request tonight, that's the first issue. Mr. Blum, I don't think that you're going to be stepping over garbage bags in the street on July 2nd and that the streets are going to be infested with garbage, I think that there are enough people in this city<sup>who</sup> have enough foresight to preclude this from happening, so we're really not voting on emotional issue of whether we're going to be stepping over garbage bags in the streets on July 2nd or not. I choose not to get caught in the middle of any political fights or departmental fights; I stand by the Charter and I say we should uphold the Chair accordingly.

MRS. McINERNEY: Based on Mr. Cookney's letter in regards to a case of Groton vs. Stonington, a judicial mandate was given out by the courts, where it says; we hold therefore that the Board of Finance has not the power by refusing to include in its budget, where if an occasion arises after the laying of the tax where more money is needed, by refusing to recommend a special town meeting, a proper and reasonable estimate of the expenditures necessary to disable the town or its officers from performing those duties which are imposed upon them by statute, which means Charter, or to render it impossible for them to carry out their decisions in matters where by statute, Charter, discretion is expressly vested in them. We have here a conflict, our Charter on one hand says that the Board of Representatives is supposed to act upon a budget which has been approved by the Board of Finance and is appropriately before the Board of Representatives. On the other hand we have Section 410-414 of the City of Stamford, which makes it the duty of the public works department to remove and dispose of ashes, garbage, refuse and rubbish in the City of Stamford. I think we should disagree with the Chair and act in favor of conditionally approving funding in some amount to this account so our actions would not be arbitrary or capricious endangering the health of the City of Stamford and I would make a move to vote against the Chair.

MR. WIDER: I pay for garbage collection, but I'm a little concern when I hear that one elected official who represents what was a land slide, people wanted leadership and I see a lack of it. I can't see this Board, elected official voting on something that hasn't been passed by an elected board, the Board of Finance is an elected board, city wide, they represent just as many citizens as we do, and they are as concerned with these citizens as we are, but the thing that's short

DIVISION OF COLLECTION (cont.)

MR. WIDER: (continuing)...right now is the kind of leadership that will bring them around, and I'm upset when I see any elected official who has such a mandate, that the Mayor of a city could afford the kind of leadership and I see so much a lack of it in the City of Stamford, and I would hope that once and for all we let the people in the City of Stamford know that we expect some leadership and that we will not go on this and I hope that everyone in this building that's really concern will support the President of this Board.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Let me say that it's supporting the decision of the President, not the President, it's a ruling.

MR. CORBO: We've been through therapy session tonight to save \$15.00., \$1,000. or \$100.00 and now we have the opportunity to avoid to go to court to spend time and money of the Corporation Counsel, we have the opportunity to resolve this problem; and to refer to Mr. Wider, about leadership, it's not the leadership of the Mayor, it's the leadership of the Board of Finance trying to subdue the leadership of the Mayor, that's the point. I would like to go against the ruling of the Chair and try to speed up this process as much as we can and eliminate any court action.

MR. DONAHUE: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. I did promise Mr. Blum that I would answer his question. Since the question has been moved, I'm really not going to afford myself the liberty of speaking on it, I would just say that everybody received the letter I sent to the Mayor, I hope that they have read it carefully and understand the reasons I ruled against it. We will proceed to a vote. The vote is on sustaining the rule of the Chair, that the division of collection is not properly before us. The vote is 24 in affirmative; 12 in the negative. The rule of the CHAIR HAS BEEN SUSTAINED.

MRS. HAWE: Page 69, Code 351, Land fill and refuse removal. We recommend no cuts.

MR. JOYCE: POINT OF INFORMATION. Code 351.5520, Contract Haulaway. It appears that expenditures in 1978/79 were approximately \$1,873,428. Appropriations in 79/80 were \$1,800,000. we suddenly jumped to \$2,075. I wonder if there is some explanation for this increase.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, when we get to the capital project budget we will see that there is an appropriation for repairing the '73 incinerator and this will result in considerable down-time for this incinerator, while that is occurring, they will have to haulaway the garbage at \$7,000. a day. This accounts for the increase.

MR. DeNICOLA: On the overtime, why so much.

MRS. HAWE: It's for 48 Saturdays and 10 holidays when the transfer site is opened for citizens, plus they added in a 10% factor for un-scheduled overtime that might come up during the year, it comes to \$14,900.

LAND FILL AND REFUSE REMOVAL

Page 69 - Code 351.

TOTAL APPROVED \$2,131,481.

HURRICANE BARRIER MAINTENANCE

Page 70 - Code 360

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 9,420.

Page 70 . PUBLIC WORKS SECTION TOTAL \$10,612,087

MR. RYBNICK: The hour is 1:15 A.M. we have gotten to page 89, we still have 49 of capital projects, 90 pages of operating budget, there is no way, unless we go through this very, very fast in the next hour or two. We cannot finish this in the way we're traveling.

MR. DARER: I'd like to make a MOTION that we delete 2% from all the up-coming codes across the board and then adjourn. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It's a line item budget; I think that would be wrong and I would have to say that motion would be out of order. Perhaps if we keep moving, we're on the departments that really take far less time. Let's go to page 89.

MRS. HAWES: Page 89, Code 510, Welfare Department. Fiscal voted no cuts.

WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Page 89 - Code 510.

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 414,080

MRS. HAWES: Code 520. This is one of the department which there is a merit increase that has to be inserted in the salary figure. The figure is \$2,683. which brings that salary line to \$1,239,351.

SMITH HOUSE SN FACILITY

Page 91 - Code 520

TOTAL APPROVED \$2,027,056.

SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE

Page 93 - Code 530

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 354,444.

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like it to be noted that I'm leaving the floor for any deliberations on the Health Department.

MRS. HAWES: Code 550, Health Department, here there is also a merit increase in salary. The increase is \$4,103. which brings the salary figure to \$496,205.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Page 95 - Code 550

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 561,005.

MRS. HAWE: Code 551, Code Enforcement Task Force, Fiscal recommended a cut in line 1220, car allowance of \$200.00 bringing that line to \$2,200. There are two people who get the car allowance here, one is MEA, gets \$100.00 a month, one is an MAA who gets \$4.00 a day for an average of 250 working days a year, we did the arithmetic and we came to \$2,200. On the following line 2510, we cut \$250.00 to bring that line to \$1,000. based on what they have spent so far this year.

CODE ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE

Page 97 - Code 551

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 98,810.

DRUG FORENSIC LABORATORY

Page 98 - Code 552

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 13,702.

COST SHARING GRANT FROM STATE

Page 99 - Code 553

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 21,697.

V D CLINIC GRANT STATE

Page 100 - Code 554

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 6,550.

PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM

Page 102 - Code 560

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 481,031.

HEALTH PRO FOR PAR & PRI SCHOOLS

Page 103 - Code 561

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 750,572.

SHAPE

Page 104 - Code 571

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 31,242.

DRUG LIBERATION PROGRAM

Page 106 - Code 580

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 150,000.

MRS. HAWE: Page 107, Code 586, we recommended no cuts.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to MOVE for the deletion of \$5,000 leaving a total of zero in this account.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: This is the agency trying to regulate our hospitals to the point where

SW CONN HEALTH SYS AGENCY (cont.)

MRS. CONTI: (continuing)....they would have us running all over the region for different types of health care. I think they are a very unwholesome group and I think we can do without them and I would like to delete the entire amount from the budget.

MR. FAUTEUX: I'd like to take the contrary position to that, this group takes a coordinating function which ensures efficiency of medical services in the area and I think they have a constructive purpose.

MR. WIDER: I happen to have met with both, HMO and also SYA. I feel since talking with some of the members, it offered a great advantage over some of hospitals and medical care we now have, so I would like to see it come into Stamford.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: For the record, we have an HMO in Stamford already.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will take a vote. The motion is to cut \$5,000 from 586.3751 to make the line read zero. Is Mr. Wider's vote recorded?

MR. WIDER: Madame Chairman I think you caused me to discourage many others to vote for instead of against, so I think we lost the vote by a misconception of what you said.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, I didn't say anything, I didn't mean to imply anything, if you noticed the way I voted it would be totally inconceivable that I could influence anyone the way you assumed. The MOTION has been PASSED, by a vote of 18 in favor; 12 opposed, that line will read zero.

Page 107      WELFARE AND HEALTH SECTION TOTAL      \$4,910,189.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to make a MOTION, we've had two lovely ladies sitting in the audience since we started this evening, they are here for one item, and that is in the Capital Project Budget pertaining to renovation of Burdick School. The hour is late and I think it would be a nice gesture on our part if we could just take up that one item.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is part of a totally different budget, we are working on the operating budget and Mr. Zelinski is asking us to set aside the operating budget and go over to the capital projects budget; as I have ruled on all the other out of order items, I am going to say I don't believe that we should vote out of order on this.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to over-rule that if I may.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You would like to challenge the Chair, is there a second? NO SECOND. Mrs. Hawe proceed.

MRS. HAWE: Parks Department, Code 610. Fiscal has recommended several cuts in this department. First of all on line 1110, there is an increase for the merit in the amount of \$2,630 which would bring the figure under the Board of Finance to \$382,945. Now Fiscal has recommended a \$3,000 cut for attrition which would now bring that line under the Bd. of Reps. column to \$379,945. The next recommended cut is on line 2110 which would bring that line to \$14,200. Our rationale is that as of April 30th, \$8,000. has been spent in that account, there is a large increase due to the fact that they are going to improve the quality of the clay on the baseball infield but we feel that they can sustain that \$2,000. cut. The next cut under line 2510 we recommend a cut of \$1,000 which brings that line to \$17,500. and we base this on the fact that they have \$4,500 left as of April 30th, we feel this is a fair amount for them to have for next year. We also made a cut in line 2660, we recommend a cut of \$300. to bring that line to \$1,400. The same reason prevails the fact that they have \$220 left as of the end of April and based on usage we feel this is a fair amount.

MRS. CONTI: At the time we had the department in, we learned that there was a recent vacancy in the time-keeper dispatcher position. I would like to MOVE that we take out three months of that salary, it is unlikely that it will be filled too much before then. I would like to recommend that we take out \$9,827 which would reduce our total to \$370,118.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWE: That vacancy they intend to test for this month, they say they hope to have it on line by July 1st. That amount would cut out nine months of the salary.

MRS. CONTI: Alright, we take out \$3,240, which bring the line to \$376,703.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, we would like to <sup>know</sup> under 610.2650, what is the equipment that they are asking for.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mrs. Maihock, we have a motion on the floor and we will only speak to the motion.

MR. RYBNICK: I would just want to speak against this motion. <sup>T</sup>his is the season, the busy season of the Parks Department and they're trying to fill that position now, and of all the time they need a person, it's now.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The MOTION has LOST by a vote of 21 to 9.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Page 108 - Code 610

TOTAL APPROVED

\$ 787,626

TERRY CONNERS RINK

Page 110 - Code 620

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 263,808.

MRS. HAWE: Code 650, Board of Recreation, there is a merit increase to be added to the salary account, \$1,315. which brings that line to \$195,893.

BOARD OF RECREATION

Page 112 - Code 650

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 531,355.

PROJECT MUSIC - BOARD OF RECREATION

Page 115 - Code 651

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 31,845.

CUBETA STA & TRANSF BALL FLDS

Page 116 - Code 652

TOTAL APPROVED 8,701.

SELF SUSTAINING PROGRAMS

Page 117 - Code 655

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 60,200.

DOROTHY HEROY RECREATION AREA

Page 118 - Code 660

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 13,630.

MRS. HAWE: Code 661, Ethel Kweskin Theatre, we made several cuts in this account. I'll explain them all first. The Theatre has put on four shows this year and they hope to put on twelve shows next year. We felt that this was very ambitious and we doubted whether they would accomplish this, there fore the cuts we made were based on the fact that we gave them enough money to produce eight shows in the next fiscal year. The cuts are as follows; in the part-time account we cut \$4,500. leaving a total of \$21,600. We cut the advertising line 2920 by \$2,500. leaving \$5,500. in that account. The line that says performing arts which is line 3370, we cut that by \$4,500. leaving a total in line line of \$9,500.

ETHEL KWESKIN THEATRE

Page 119 - Code 661

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 43,530.

RECREATION YOUTH CENTER

Page 120 - Code 662

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 7,156.

STERLING FARMS CULTURE ARTS

Page 121 - Code 663

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 14,886.

BELLTOWN FIELD RECREATION BLDG

Page 122 - Code 664

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 1,719.

SCOFIELDTOWN RECREATION AREA

Page 123 - Code 665

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 1,310.

MRS. HAWE: Code 670, Brennan Golf Course, we recommended a cut in line 2730, water, of \$2,000. bringing that line to \$7,000. We based this on the fact that as of the end of April for this year, there is \$4,000. left in that account.

MRS. SANTY: In the car allowance I 'd like to know for whom and where he travels.

MR. ESPOSITO: That is for the Manager car. That's \$3.00 a day.

MRS. SANTY: I MOVE to delete the entire amount from that.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The vote is 15 in affirmative, 17 in the negative the MOTION has been LOST.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Could you explain Conferences and Training, Code 2940.

MRS. HAWE: This is for the Superintendent of Greens, meetings and dues to various organizations.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to delete that total amount.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. There are 15 votes in the affirmative; 18 in the negative, the MOTION is LOST.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: On travel expenses, who is that for and where are they traveling to? The explanation that Mr. Esposito gave me for the motion that has just lost, they travel to meetings, and that was the reason for the conferences.

MRS. HAWE: No that's the dues and the fees for the meetings, the travel would be for the travel expenses.

MR. ESPOSITO: They do not provide any information in their back-up.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Mr. Esposito, do you still stand as to what you said on the item of conferences went for traveling to meetings.

MR. ESPOSITO: We're reading just what they give us in the back-up material, and it says; Superintendent of Greens meetings and dues for various associations.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd like to make a MOTION to delete that, \$100.00 from line 2942.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. The vote is 18 in the affirmative; 14 in the negative, the MOTION has been CARRIED. Line 2942 will read zero.

BRENNAN GOLF COURSE

Page 124 - Code 670

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 163,194.

Page 125 PARKS &amp; RECREATION SECTION TOTAL \$1,928,960.

MRS. GUROIAN: Can I ask again how much we cut to this point.

MRS. HAWE: The figure I have is \$209,351. cut so far, that's not including the Board of Education.

FERGUSON LIBRARY

Page 126 - Code 710.

TOTAL APPROVED \$2,274,421.

STAMFORD MUSEUM

Page 127 - Code 720

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 332,522.

MRS. HAWE: Code 730, Cultural Events, we recommend no cuts.

MRS. McINERNEY: I make a MOTION to cut line item 730.3315, Hartman Theatre, by \$1,500 to the figure which they received in 1979/80 of \$3,500.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DARER: I'm against the motion. I think the Hartman Theatre plays a valuable roll in the cultural heart of the city. This represents a figure of approximately \$.50 per person in Stamford. The Hartman Theatre provides a lot of services to school children, it is something I think is a valuable assest to the city and I would not like to see it cut.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The MOTION is to cut \$1,500 from that account. The MOTION is LOST. (voice vote)

MRS. McINERNEY: I MOVE to cut 730.3320 Stamford Art Assoc. by \$300.00 to the figure that was received in 1979/80.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY: I do it on the premise that we have sat here for two evenings about mill increases to the budget and I feel that perhaps these are luxu ries to our budget and they can remain at what they received last year.

MR. DARER: The total increase for cultural in the City of Stamford runs \$3,400 this year with the increase in the tax base of the city, a \$3,400 increase for total cultural events in the city which I again repeat go to all aspects of our community, senior citizens, students, the general public, is not out of line for the size of the City of Stamford.

CULTURAL EVENTS (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We will proceed to a vote. The MOTION is LOST. There will be no cut in that account.

CULTURAL EVENTS

Page 128 - Code 730

TOTAL APPROVED

\$ 23,100.

MRS. HAWES: We now have Code 740, which is not in the books which is Yerwood Center. An addition to 1980/81 Budget in the amount of \$30,000. to provide assistance to the Yerwood Center with its maintenance and utilities expenditures. Fiscal recommended no cut in that.

MRS. PERILLO: I make a MOTION we delete the money. We gave them a building, we do not supply them with money, that is a known fact, there is a contract to that effect.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: When you say we gave them the building, I'd like you to clarify who are we that you gave the building.

MRS. PERILLO: The City of Stamford.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The City of Stamford gave the building, Yerwood Center.

MRS. PERILLO: They paid \$1.00 for it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Yes, this \$30,000. we haven't come to this Board in three years to ask for any assistance. I'm not going to use any other center because I don't think we're talking about any other center here tonight, we're only talking about Yerwood in this particular item. We have tried to <sup>survive</sup> on our own and I think we have proven to the City that we are still trying. The \$30,000 is for fuel, we went to the Mayor for \$67,000. it was cut to \$30,000. and we are trying to keep the lights on in the building, that's all we're asking for is a little assistance.

MR. DARER: I'd like to speak against the motion. I think the Yerwood Center services a portion of the City's population that really, I think does not receive necessarily, commence, or share of city funds; it is a valuable center in providing services to a section of the city one might call disadvantaged; I think they haven't taken any money for some time; they have some serious problems in the building, and I think a \$30,000. contribution for, where three years money haven't been given to them, is not out of line again, with a city of our size and a center of that importance to the citizens of this community.

YERWOOD CENTER (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: I'd like to ask anybody who would like to answer for me, what the annual budget of the center is?

MR. FAUTEUX: There was a detailed presentation made by two representatives of the Yerwood Center justifying this request for \$30,000. They are presently budgeting a very austere budget of \$240,000 for the up-coming year. I think they went into substantial detail in justifying the request for the assistance, even though it indicated to be assistance for utilities does go toward defraying the whole \$240,000. They do provide an essential service in that part of the city and I think it appropriate we support them.

MRS. GUROIAN: Would Mr. Fautuex tell me what percentage of that budget is paid in salary.

MR. FAUTEUX: I can't readily answer that.

MRS. GUROIAN: I have been told by a member of the Board, I spoke to her yesterday, that approximately 25% of that budget is paid to salaries. How many employees in that center?

MR. ESPOSITO: The total expenses for salaries is \$61,000 and the total budget is \$295,000. I could give you a breakdown; salaries professional, \$61,606. clerical, \$9,425., recreational, \$27,692. special events, \$4,178., maintenance \$8,960., and other \$3,976. It would appear that Mrs. Guroian is correct, that 25% is salaries.

MRS. GUROIAN: This is what I was told, I didn't surmise it myself. How many employees are there, three?

MR. ESPOSITO: It's hard to tell from the back-up, it says professional, total expenses, it doesn't indicate how many people we're talking about.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: You are incorrect in assuming there were only three; there are more than three and also more than seven.

MRS. GUROIAN: I was told that there were three paid by the center and three CETA people who are no longer with them.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Your informer is incorrect, and we're willing to open our books to you to show it.

MRS. GUROIAN: No, I'm asking, I'm not arguing the point, I'm asking for the information. Do you know how many employees they have.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: On the payroll they have exactly twelve paid employees.

YERWOOD CENTER (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: They must be parttime, because I understand the Director gets \$20,000 a year, is that right.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't have the figures before me and I wish you had asked the informer to show them to you because I think you are incorrect.

MRS. GUROIAN: I am not incorrect, you keep saying that. It is the person who wrote the letter that we received in the mail, all the Board members received, she is a member of the Board she told me.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't know if she is a member of not.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Do you have any back-up information on salary.

MR. ESPOSITO: I just gave them all.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm talking about their income, where do they derive their money from.

MR. ESPOSITO: Public support, current funds, contributions, \$21,000. unrestricted, \$13,000. is restricted. United Way, \$109,000. Sepcial Events, \$15,000. so that you have a total of public support of \$146,000. unrestricted and \$13,000. restricted. Grants and Government Agencies includes \$8,532. Revenues from membership fees is \$2,321.00. Rentals, \$34,282.00. Interest, \$602.00. Miscellaneous, \$732.00. Total support in revenues \$234,612.

MRS. GUROIAN: They have an expenditure of \$295,000. and an income of \$230,00. The're running out a \$60,000. deficit.

MR. ESPOSITO: That's correct.

MRS. GUROIAN: What do they expect to do after we give them the \$30,000. Do they expect to cut their expenditures down so that we won't have to give them the \$30,000. every year.

MR. ESPOSITO: No, I think that would be misleading you, they came before us and they said that they have been before this Board a couple of years ago, which is before my time, but at that time it was their intention that they were going to be here as part of the regular budget. It was through a misinterpretation or miscommunication that it was established that it was a one-time, it s their intention that they are going to be part of the city budget.

MRS. GUROIAN: What makes this center any different then the Italian Center or the Jewish Center?

MR. ESPOSITO: It's a community Center. We have established precedence in the various other community centers.

MRS. GUROIAN: Such as?

YERWOOD CENTER (cont.)

MR. ESPOSITO: Southfield Community Center, the Glenbrook Community Center.

MRS. GUROLAN: Alright, stop right there, the Glenbrook Community Center does not own its building,.....

MR. ESPOSITO: But the city has contributed to it.

MRS. GUROLAN: The city contributed to the restoration of the building before it turned it over to the Glenbrook Community Center Trustees. The Glenbrook Community Center does not do anything to the building without, they can't even put a paint brush on the wall, without the permission of Mr. Strat, in the building department.

MR. ESPOSITO: That's right and the city therefore pays all the utilities and all the maintenance.

MRS. GUROLAN: I don't see it in the budget.

MR. ESPOSITO: It's part of buildings and grounds.

MRS. GUROLAN: They pay it for their own building that's all, they don't have a custodian there anymore, they don't have anything, they just pay for the building maintenance. The Glenbrook Community Center pays for the paint and everything else that goes inside that building and cannot do a thing, their lease is renewed every year and cannot do a thing without asking permission from the city. This is not so of the Yerwood Center. When the Yerwood Center, the building was transferred to the Yerwood Center it was specifically emphasized that that center would not be the same as the Glenbrook Community Center, and the other community centers, it would be more like, it would be independent and private owned, more like the Jewish Community Center and the Italian Community Center, for which reason, 1 million dollars was collected by the business community and United Way in order for them to fix over the building.

MR. ESPOSITO: POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE. I'm just trying to answer Mrs. Guroian question.

MRS. GUROLAN: No, he answered it with a comparison and I was already told that if the comparison is made I can speak to it, otherwise I wouldn't have spoken to it. 1 million dollars was collected for them, it was never collected for the Glenbrook Community Center or any of the other centers, that million dollars has, I assume been spent without supervision by the city, that was spent by the Trustees of that center, now they are asking to be put on the same footing as the other community centers. If you grant it to this, I see no reason why I shouldn't contribute \$30,000. to the Jewish Community Center, \$30,000. to the Italian Center, why not, they also get United Way funds. Glenbrook Community Center can't even apply for United Way funds because it's not on the same status as the other community centers. They get a hundred and something thousand dollars, \$20,000 would go a long way with the Glenbrook Community Center,

YERWOOD CENTER (cont.)

MRS. GUROIAN: (continuing)...not 1 million at one point and \$100,000. every year. I see absolutely no reason why we should start a precedent by subsidizing private centers. If that center is transferred to the city, lock, stock and barrel, just as it was transferred, Steven School was transferred to them, I could see reason for paying for everything that is paid for any other community center you mentioned, I did not mention, and under those circumstances I would vote for it, under these circumstances I think it's a travesty and it's setting a bad precedent because I would encourage at that point that any other private center come into this Board and ask for subsidy.

MRS. SANTY: I would just like to say no one is arguing the merits of the center, it's vital, it's necessary, but I remember, and I cannot remember being three years ago, that they came before this Board because they had financial problems, because I remember clearly they asked for and was granted \$20,000 and it was one shot appropriation, they did not under any circumstances expect this every year, they said just help us out this one time, and here we are again, and we're going to be here next year and this could happen with other community centers, We have to tread very, very carefully on this.

MR. DIXON: I would first of all have to agree with some of what has been said. The Center at the outset had in mind and was very serious in getting re-established in the new location. Their intentions were to become self-sustaining and they have certainly put forth many efforts to accomplish just that. Unfortunately they have met with some serious misfortunes such as inflation which they did not anticipate at the time, and it is that kind of thing that has sort of derailed that program. The center serves a very valuable purpose on the West Side. Its service is extended to many many families and children in that immediate area although the service is not limited to the immediate area. The mere fact that they have been faced with high inflation especially in utilities, oil, etc., has made it necessary for them to come back to this city and ask for this kind of aid, it is not their intention to come to the city every year and expect to be put in the city budget every year, the Yerwood Center is still striving to become self-sustaining and I believe that in time with the kind of help that they need now, and the kind of programs that they are anticipating to help raise additional funds, I truly believe that they will become self-sustaining. I hope that we will leave this \$30,000 intact in hope that it will provide them with the kind of assistance that they are asking for and help them along the way to the extent that they will not have to come back to us.

MS. RINALDI: Since the City of Stamford does fund the utility expenses for other centers, I don't think its unfair that we act in favor of this.

MR. FAUTEUX: MOVE THE QUESTION.

YERWOOD CENTER (cont.)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. CORBO: POINT OF INFORMATION. Don't we have a technical problem on this, because we don't have any report from the Board of Finance.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We do have a report, the Board of Finance figure is \$30,000. It came down to us late. The MOTION is to MOVE the QUESTION. The MOTION has PASSED. We will vote on the MOTION to cut \$30,000 from the Yerwood Center.

MR. WIDER: May I call for a Roll Call vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. LOST. We will vote by use of the machine. The MOTION HAS LOST by a vote of 14 in favor; 18 opposed.

YERWOOD CENTER

Page 129 - Code 740

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 30,000.

ROGERS SCHOOL COMM CENTER ORG

Page 130 - Code 741

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 4,850.

SOUTHFIELD COMMUNITY CENTER

Page 131 - Code 742

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 27,061.

COMMUNITY RETURN

Page 144 - Code 770

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 6,000.

YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

Page 148 - Code 792

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 20,000.

Page 150

COMMUNITY SERVICES SECTION TOTAL \$2,717,954

DEBT SERVICE

Page 176 - Code 900

TOTAL APPROVED \$13,385,610

Page 179

DEBT SERVICE SECTION TOTAL \$13,385,610

PAGE 179 - GRAND BUDGET TOTALS .....\$103,973,399.

-----

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said we would now move on to the CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET.

MR. ZELINSKI: Would it be possible at this present time to just move that we approve all the Capital Projects Budget with one motion rather than go through page by page.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: No, we're going to go through it, if there are few cuts it will go very quickly.

MRS. GUROIAN: Before we go on to the Capital Budget, could I know how much we cut on the Operating Budget.

MR. ESPOSITO: \$226,000 that's not including the Board of Education.

MRS. GUROIAN: What will this equate into approximately in a raise in taxes.

MR. ESPOSITO: \$1,400,000 is equivalent to 1 mill. The projected increase depends on what the Board of Finance does with the contingency fund. As I indicated last night if the Board of Finance feels that many of the cuts were in-appropriate, they'll put it in the contingency fund and it won't mean anything in terms of a tax cut. When we came in here last night, if we hadn't cut anything, there was 9/10 of a mill projected increase for the A Dist. and approximately 2½ mills for each of the other districts. If the Board of Finance decides that our \$1,400,000 cut is not going to be put into the contingency that's approximately 1 mill across the board, it would be averaged out based on the district as the services applied to each district.

MRS. GUROIAN: Does this include the projected increases in salary that wasn't budgeted that would go into the contingency fund won't it.

MR. ESPOSITO: It also includes the Division of Collection, that was placed in the contingency fund as well when these figures were made up.

MRS. GUROIAN: Then the salaries are in that increase.

MR. ESPOSITO: You're talking about the \$31,000 in additional merit increases.

MRS. GUROIAN: No, no. there's two or three million for the Board of Ed.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Mr. Esposito can we proceed to the Capital Projects then, while we're waiting for a grand total perhaps we can answer this. I'm afraid we're going to lose our quorum.

MRS. HAWES: On Code 810, Board of Education, Capital Projects, Fiscal Committee recommended no cuts.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET (continued)BOARD OF EDUCATION

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a MOTION to delete line item 810.0793 to bring that down to zero.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA: We cannot let emotional factors prevail over economic reality. Anticipated cost for renovation of this facility is projected at approximately 4 million dollars. During the next five years, enrollment will drop between 20 to 25%. Eventually a middle school must be closed. Back in January we had the pleasure of interviewing before the Appointments Committee, a member from the Planning Board who indicated that if anything, Burdick School should be closed, to invest \$800,000 now when the anticipated expenditures of 4.5 million dollars will be a waste of the taxpayers money. If anything talk has been that Dolan School should be closed in the future, and here is a school that's only about 25 years old versus a school approximately 80 years old. It's a school located in a congested area where more housing is planning to be built, and yet we want to spend all this money with future enrollments projected to continue to be declining. I think this would be a travesty of justice of the people to sink money into this area, therefore I would urge my colleague to reject this item.

MR. FASANELLI: I'd like to speak against Mr. DeLuca's motion. Burdick School has a long history in Stamford, is one of the few downtown schools left, it's a school that doesn't have to bus the numbers of students to its doors that a lot of other schools don't, it saves money that way, it's a school that's used at night as a community center for a lot of groups, the senior citizens, it's a school that used on weekend, it's a focal point in that particular part of the city. to close it, after it's being used by all of these groups, and used during the day by the students, it's a waste of money to the taxpayers, it probably utilizes money most efficiently out of any of the schools right now, so I think that Burdick should remain open and we should keep it alive.

MRS. LYONS: The Board of Education has committed itself to use Burdick as a magnet school, housing pupils in the 5th to the 8th grade. The \$800,000 we are asked to appropriate is to be used to correct building code violations. I attended a meeting where I was shown a ten-page list of code violations to fire and safety regulations. I think it's deplorable that the city has allowed children to be educated in a facility that may jeopardize their safety and I implore you to appropriate this money to correct the violation. The City is currently under State mandate to correct these violations and therefore approximately 45% of the cost will be reimbursable. Just to give you some idea of what these violations are, the fire doors are either missing or else are housed in wooden frames. The windows need to be replaced, their frames are currently rotted to the point where they could fall on someone and injure them, the bathroom facilities are very deplorable, the electric wiring is a fire hazard, and the duct work also needs to be corrected. These building code violations must be corrected and need to be addressed in order to insure the safety of the students.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - Board of Education (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: Mrs. Lyons covered it nicely, I just like to urge my fellow Board members to vote for this, the fact that as we know we can't determine what schools will be closed and which will not, I think Burdick has a unique place in the community due to its location in the downtown area near cultural facilities, near the Library, within walking distance of a lot of these places, the fact is that there are children in there now and it is absolutely unsafe for them to be in there due to all these violations. If anyone has taken a tour of the building and been in it recently you would really be appalled at the state of it. This is mainly for code compliance, the scope of this project has been diminished greatly from last year and as Mrs. Lyons said, 45% of these code violation corrections will come back from the state, that's definite and I urge my fellow Board members to approve this.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to speak in favor of Mr. DeLuca's motion. If Burdick were going to be kept as a neighborhood Junior High School, I would feel differently, but since it's going to be kept only for a magnet program, and the magnet program has not yet been fully evaluated and it may not be successful, I would hate to revamp the school and then find out it's not going to be used, it's too great an investment, so I will support Mr. DeLuca's motion.

MR. DeLUCA: POINT OF ORDER. I heard two comments now saying that the State is going to be reimburse the City 45% of the cost but yet I can remember reading as late as two weeks ago comments from the State that they would not reimburse the City any funds for the Burdick renovation, the funds were cut. I was wondering where these figures were coming from as far as 45% reimbursement.

MRS. HAWE: We questioned the Board of Education in detail on that because we too had read that in the paper. The truth of the matter is that we are getting 45% reimbursement because it is now only a code compliance program. The State Board of Education had eliminated funds, or actually the Legislator had eliminated funding for projects that were not listed priority one, the State Board of Education listed the programs that they were going to fund according to priority, Burdick was not a priority one. Due to budget constraints at the State level, the Legislature decides to eliminate all priority three projects, however, this does not involve Burdick at all, because it is now a code compliance program; code compliance programs get reimbursed no matter what, so whatever you have read in the paper Mr. DeLuca does not apply now, we know that is definitely coming back without a doubt.

MR. WIDER: I appreciate Mr. DeLuca's concern with the waste of taxpayers money, I have another concern, My concern is that we have already closed up the inner-city schools. Now we are building houses down here to ask people to come back downtown, and if we do away with Burdick, we're going to have to build another one, because these people will not see their children bussed back up in the

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - Bd. of Ed. (cont.)

MR. WIDER: (continuing)..country to attend those schools, so I think our best bet is to keep that school and bring it up to par, and I'm a little upset when I heard about it having been a custodian in the public school, having turned two schools around from being condemned. , I was upset that the Board of Education had let it become that run down, for the fact is that this little \$800,000 is peanuts beside what our schools in 1985-90 will cost to build downtown. We're going to build 148 units of co-op and high-rise buildings just on the otherside of Broad Street, I'm on the Downtown Housing Committee, we have already viewed the plan, we're going to need the school, so believe me let's keep Burdick School.

MR. BLUM: Two years ago I visited Burdick School, at that time hearing some of the members of the Board of Education of the deplorable conditions that existed at Burdick School, that this school must go, so I went there and made a visit and yes, it was in a deplorable condition. From that day on I said I was going to work for Burdick; yes, I went to that school when it was a good school, and it is still a good school because it has the basic foundation of teaching some of the children in the inner-city as well as the neighborhoods in and around central city. Central City, some of the parts where the 12th District now encompasses, is in the process of having new houses, and in this housing are coming new people with young families in the Forest, Grove Streets area, in the Broad Street area, in the downtown area, and a school of this magnitude is needed in the downtown area. Yes, the \$800,000 is going for safety features of the school, it was thought to rebuild Burdick at 4½ million dollars but that is not lost as yet because they are turning to other sectors in the State programs where they may find funds to build Burdick Jr. High School or middle school, that it deserved to be along with other schools. It is deplorable to have children come under these conditions to go to school and look up at the ceiling, hoping that that tile doesn't fall down, on them or even a teacher. These are unsafe conditions for anyone to work or to be taught, I therefore ask you to vote on the \$800,000 to bring Burdick Jr. High under safety code, and fire code compliance.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Just looking at this, under normal circumstances I would probably be inclined to support it, but at the present moment there are a couple of things I'm not too sure of. If we take into consideration that tonight we deleted from Board of Education 1.2 million, you add what the Board of Finance did, another \$800,000 we all know the Board of Education is going to do whatever they feel is necessary to come up with what they think is a suitable operating program for the school system and when you take what we did already into consideration, it makes me wonder that if we do go along with this renovation of Burdick School, I'm wondering if we're not just doing something for the sake of doing it. Some of the arguments that have been given by people who are supporting it, you've given some arguments by all means maybe the school should be closed, if it's that run down and in such deplorable condition, when we hear that the Board of Education is considering closing down schools that have been built in the last ten or fifteen years, it makes me wonder if we would be doing the correct thing by supporting this, I'm not sure if we don't support it tonight and if there is a great desire for that school to stay open, I'm quite sure that they can come back for an amendment to the Capital Project, it's not for me to say if there's going to get the 2/3 or not, but at the moment I haven't heard an argument that convinced me that it's worthwhile to support this.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - Bd. of Ed. (cont.)

MRS. HAWE: I would just like to answer Mr. Livingston about whether it was worth-while keeping it opened. Certainly the cost of repairing would be nothing compared to the cost of building a new school. We've heard several times in the past that the schools that were built in the 1950's were of a much lower caliber of construction than those that were built years ago and I think the basic plant at Burdick is in solid shape, it's just these code compliance that have to be brought up to date and I really feel that it's worth doing.

MR. CORBO: I would like to go back to some of the remarks made by Mrs. Lyons. I don't know why the Board of Education is permitting these children to occupy a school with safety code standards, if a tragedy happen to be because of a lack of safety standards, who's going to be responsible for it. I think the school should have been evacuated already and if this safety code has been explored before, a year ago, how come the request wasn't made a year ago.

MR. DARER: It seems to me last night in honesty and integrity we discussed reducing the Board of education budget. The reason for that in many of our minds was not to affect the children of our city but to give direction to the Board of Education to assist them in making them make a directional change in their policy and planning. Now, we know that our enrollment is declining, we know that we have good physical plant in some area of the city, we know that mobility is changed to the point where young people today can take a bus to school, I doubt very much whether in any major city in the world kids walk to school as a rule or as a majority, most kids do take buses to go to school today. I think when you have a situation like we have tonight, a vote on Burdick, a vote tonight is not just to cut \$800,000 but it is a vote of direction to the Board of Education by this responsible body. This issue has come before the citizens of Stamford, it's been bounced around and we now have it in our budget. We can take responsibility tonight, we can show leadership tonight, we can say that we do not want to put 4½ million dollars into that school over the next few years, we think it's the wrong thing to do and we think that what we should do is cut \$800,000 and start our Board of Education to think in directions that are more progressive for the future. It is in my humble view, it is not a landmark building as much of us would like to think of it. It's an 80-year-old, unsafe structure and to throw 4½ million dollars into with declining enrollment, I'm not thinking of building new schools, I'm thinking of using our existing capacity to the best available ability and I think it would be financially irresponsible and an injustice to our taxpayers to take \$800,000 and next year come back for more to save a building that really should be used for other purposes in the downtown area in my humble view. I think we should vote this money down and give direction to the Board of Education, since they did not grab the bull by the horns; we have to do it and tell them the way they should go on this issue.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Much of what I was going to say has been said, but I too was, along with David, on the coldest day of last year, when the Historical Society asked the Board of Representatives to take a tour of that particular area. And Burdick School was the first building that we went into. I don't know that much about the structure or how sound it is and all, but to look at the building and see what has to be renovated, I really think that the Board should consider approving this appropriation. You have dedicated teachers there, the children

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - Bd. of Ed. (cont.)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing)...as someone who spoke earlier has said, they can walk to school. I'm not convinced that bussing is the answer, and just because we made a decision sometime ago that had to be bussing because of a situation that does not mean that we can't say that we made a mistake or the interpretation of what we meant was mis-interpreted, so I'm saying let's save the downtown Burdick, the magnet school I think is good. I think if you all will be a little patient and considerate, you'll find out yourself that that's ideal. There are many things that go on in Burdick and the building is not falling down as you might have a picture of, there are just certain renovations that have to be done. I beg you to please appropriate this appropriation.

MR. DZIEZYC: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The question is to cut \$800,000 from line 810.0793. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 14 in favor; 17 opposed, the MOTION has LOST. (Mr. Donahue abstained from this vote)

I would like to take this opportunity to thank her for the hard work she has done as Co-Chairperson of Fiscal, Thank you Marie. Mr. Esposito will carry on.

MR. DeLUCA: Through the Chair to the remaining Co-Chairman of Fiscal, on line 810.0904, Davenport Ridge Elementary School roof. This school is only seven years old and we already need a new roof. Do we have a law suit against the contractor or anything on this.

MRS. McINERNEY: What has happened is in the past there has been a lot of vandalism at Davenport Ridge and many of the other schools in Stamford and apparently people have gotten on top of the roof and caused leakage and now it needs to be re-roofed.

MR. DeLUCA: This was all due to vandalism.

MRS. McINERNEY: My understanding yes, the Police had a terrible problem with people going up every Friday and Saturday night.

MR. DeLUCA: To the tune of \$120,000 worth of vandalism.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm sorry I didn't sit in on the Fiscal deliberations, I just know what caused the problem with the roof, so I can't speak to that end.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm wondering, the fact that the school is only seven years old, that we have to put a new roof up to the tune of \$120,000. My question is, is it the result of poor workmanship and do we have a guarantee of 10 years, 20 years?

MR. FAUTEUX: There is another problem with the roof, apparently there has been some bubbling or buckling of the roof surface, I believe we were told that there was a \$10,000 bond on the roof, which obviously is inadequate to provide any substantial repair to it. I think I was led to believe there was no way to getting back to the contractor in this regard.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET (cont.)

MR. DeLUCA: We never had a guarantee with the contractor, usually you have a roof put and depending on the material and type of workmanship, most roofs are guaranteed for 20 years or in recent years at least a 10 year guarantee with a bond issue where after the first five years, if you have any problem with your roof, the cost is borne by the contract, and the next five years you share the cost, and I'm just trying to find out if anything like this is in our contract.

MR. ESPOSITO: The issue is that it is not due to the workmanship, it's due to the vandalism, and when you have vandalism then the builder is not responsible.

MR. DeLUCA: I just received word here from Rep. Fauteux, part of it is due to buckling of the roof, not vandalism.

MRS. PERILLO: I would like to ask Mr. Esposito, does Sonitrol pick-up if anyone is on the roof?

MR. ESPOSITO: I'm not sure that Sonitrol is in the schools.

MRS. PERILLO: I think all the schools have it, I think we should check that out to see how much sonitrol is picking up with all the vandalism we're having.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Can we come to a section total for the Bd. of Education.

Page 45

BOARD OF EDUCATION SECTION TOTAL

\$1,230,230.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I notice we're losing a few members, I think it better be noted that if we don't have 21 members for the resolution, we might as well have stayed home for two days because the budget sent down by the Board of Finance will be the budget of the City of Stamford.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: That is correct and I hope that everyone heard that. We will go to page 1 of the Capital Project Budget, and we can really do this fast.  
Mr. Esposito.

MR. ESPOSITO: As I go through these, some of these are going to be recommended for funding by taxation and therefore will not be bonded for.

MR. CORBO: I would like to MOVE to reconsider Burdick School Renovation program. I was on the prevailing side.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: It has been MOVED and SECONDED. We will vote by use of the machine. The vote is 13 in favor of reconsideration, 15 opposed, the MOTION has been LOST.

MR. ESPOSITO: As I go through these I will indicate those projects which are being recommended for funding by taxation.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET (cont.)REGISTRAR OF VOTERS

Page 1 - Code 101

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 25,200.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

Page 2 - Code 110

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 196,000.

SEWER COMMISSION

Page 3 - Code 112

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 43,500.

Page 4

BOARDS &amp; COMMISSION SECTION TOTAL \$ 264,700.

TOWN & CITY CLERK

Page 5 - Code 210

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 26,825.

CENTRAL SERVICES DEPT.

Page 6 - Code 244

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 34,330.

ASSESSORS OFFICE

Page 7 - Code 250

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 300,000.

DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC

Page 8 - Code 280

TOTAL APPROVED \$1,374,200.

MRS. McINERNEY: Line 280.0629 Bus Shelters, I'd like to MOVE to cut by \$53,000 to accommodate the building of ten bus shelters instead of twenty.

MR. ESPOSITO: May I note that \$90,000 of that is going to reimbursed by the Department of Transportation.

MRS. McINERNEY: I'm sorry then I'll withdraw, I didn't see that on here.

Page 9

GENERAL GOVERNMENT SECTION TOTAL \$1,735,355.

BU OF HIWAYS & MAINT DIV HIWAY

Page 10 - Code 310

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 431,000.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET (cont.)DIVISION OF EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE

Page 12 - Code 311

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 401,140.

BU OF HWYS-SNOW REM & FL EMERG

Page 13 - Code 314

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 117,800.

DIV OF BLDGS & GROUNDS

Page 14 - Code 320

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 108,500.

BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

Page 17 - Code 330

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 175,000.

SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT

Page 18 - Code 341

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 202,500.

SANITARY INCINERATOR

Page 19 - Code 343

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 911,000.

DIV OF EQUIP & BLDG MAINT

Page 22 - Code 346

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 6,300.

Page 23 PUBLIC WORKS SECTION TOTAL \$2,353,240.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Page 24 - Code 410

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 344,138.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 25 - Code 450

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 43,000.

NEW HOPE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Page 27 - Code 472

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 7,345.

LONG RIDGE FIRE DEPT.

Page 28 - Code 473

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 11,520.

CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET (cont.)TURN OF RIVER FIRE DEPT.

Page 29 - Code 474

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 45,010.

STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS

Page 31 - Code 481

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 481,800.

Page 32 POLICE &amp; FIRE PROTECTION SECTION TOTAL \$ 932,813.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Page 36 - Code 550

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 15,712.

PARK DEPARTMENT

Page 37 - Code 610

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 175,500.

BOARD OF RECREATION

Page 39 - Code 650

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 25,156.

BRENNAN GOLF COURSE

Page 40 - Code 670

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 71,775.

Page 40 PARKS &amp; RECREATION SECTION TOTAL \$ 272,431.

FERGUSON LIBRARY

Page 41 - Code 710

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 400,000.

STAMFORD MUSEUM

Page 42 - Code 720

TOTAL APPROVED \$ 47,348.

Page 43 COMMUNITY SERVICE SECTION TOTAL \$ 447,348.

Page 47 SECTION TOTAL \$3,447,000.

Page 47 GRAND BUDGET TOTAL.....\$10,698,829

-----

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: First I would like to thank Mr. Esposito, Mr. Rybnick, Mrs. Lyons, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Flounders, Mrs. Conti and Mr. Fauteux, on the very hard work they put in on Fiscal. You did an excellent job and you worked very hard and we're very appreciative. We're going to read the Resolution for the adoption of the Capital and Operating Budget from July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1981.

"WHEREAS, the Board of Finance has transmitted to the Board of Representatives its recommended Budgets for the ensuing year, commencing July 1, 1980 and ending June 30, 1981, for final action by the Board of Representatives;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT the itemized estimate of receipts and expenditures for the ensuing 1980-1981 in the Budgets as submitted by the Mayor, and as acted upon by the Board of Representatives, in the amounts of:

\$ 10,698,829.00 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET

\$103,973,399.00 OPERATING BUDGETS

BE AND IT IS HEREBY accepted, adopted and approved, and specific appropriations are hereby made for each of the several items in the amounts appearing in the columns of budgets under the heading "Board of Representatives" recording the approval, or other action, of said Board of Representatives.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN asked for a MOTION to approve the Resolution. MOVED. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Before we adjourn I think that the Board of Representatives should give our staff a standing round of applause for their dedication to the Budget.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, on MOTION, duly SECONDED, and CARRIED, the Meeting was ADJOURNED at 3:15 A.M.

APPROVED:

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

Sandra Goldstein  
Sandra Goldstein, President  
16th Board of Representatives

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

70.  
MAYOR  
LOUIS A. CLAPES



BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

PRESIDENT  
SANDRA GOLDSTEIN  
MAJORITY LEADER  
JOHN J. BOCCUZZI  
MINORITY LEADER  
BARBARA MCINERNEY  
ASST. MAJORITY LEADER  
JEREMIAH LIVINGSTON  
ASST. MINORITY LEADER  
JEANNE-LOIS SANTY  
CLERK  
ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE  
-----  
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT  
HELEN M. MCEVOY  
TELEPHONES: 358-4025  
358-4027  
CAUCUS ROOM: 358-4024

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06901  
MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING  
429 ATLANTIC STREET

RESOLUTION NO. 1309

ADOPTION OF THE CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGETS

FROM JULY 1, 1980 to JUNE 30, 1981

WHEREAS, the Board of Finance has transmitted to the Board of Representatives its recommended Budgets for the ensuing year, commencing July 1, 1980 and ending June 30, 1981, for final action by the Board of Representatives;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT the itemized estimate of receipts and expenditures for the ensuing year 1980-1981 in the Budgets as submitted by the Mayor, and as acted upon by the Board of Representatives, in the amounts of:

\$ 10,698,829.00 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET

\$103,973,399.00 OPERATING BUDGETS

BE AND IT IS HEREBY accepted, adopted and approved, and specific appropriations are hereby made for each of the several items in the amounts appearing in the columns of budgets under the heading "Board of Representatives" recording the approval, or other action, of said Board of Representatives.

At a Special Meeting and an Adjourned Special Meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives held on Tuesday, May 13, 1980, and Wednesday, May 14, 1980, respectively, the above Budgets were acted upon and approved; and the above Resolution No. 1309 was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY with 25 present (and 15 absent) at the time of voting.

HMM:MS

cc: Mayor Louis A. Clapes  
Town Clerk Lois PontBriant  
Board of Finance  
Chairwoman Margaret Nolan  
Finance Comm. O. A. Hoffman  
Controller William Buchanan  
Deputy Finance Comm. Thos. Canino  
Budget Dir. Frank Harrison  
All Board Members

By:

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