MINUTES OF MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1980 REGULAR BOARD MEETING

16th Board of Representatives

City of Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1980, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:50 p.m. by PRESIDENT SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Rev. Mark Sullivan, Emmanuel Episcopal Church 977 Hope Street, Stamford, CT. 06907 gave the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Sandra Goldstein led the Pledge.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 38 present and 2 absent (Reps. Pollard and Signore).

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Upon checking the machine, the President found it to be in good working order.

PAGES: BETH GOLDSTEIN; 6th Grade, Newfield School, President's daughter.

LIZA ROSENTHAL; 6th Grade, Davenport Ridge School.

JENNIFER MILLER; 6th Grade, Davenport Ridge School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE: For Victor I. Cizanckas, Chief of Stamford Police Department.

For Josephine Sienkiewicz, grandmother of Rep. McInerney.

For Dr. William Troy

For the 26 persons who died in the Stauffer's Inn fire.

A joyous note: The birth of the first male grandchild, John Alexander Boccuzzi, grandson of Rep. John J. Boccuzzi.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to WAIVE the reading of the STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT. SECONDED. CARRIED.



STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, November 24, 1980 in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called for 7:30 p.m and began at 7:35 p.m at which time a Quorum was present. Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairperson
John J. Boccuzzi
Annie M. Summerville
Handy Dixon
Paul Esposito
John Zelinski
David Blum
Donald Donahue
Stanley Darer
Robert DeLuca
Anthony Conti
Mary Lou Rinaldi

Alfred Perillo
Richard Fasanelli
Lathon Wider
Jeremiah Livingston
Barbara McInerney
Audrey Maihock
Marie Hawe
Robert Fauteux
Jeanne Lois Santy
Fior Corbo
Everett Pollard

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were Donna Coppola for the Board of Tax Review; Elizabeth G. Gershmann for Southwestern Regional Planning Agency; Robert Fields for the Welfare Commission; Vincent Martino for the Human Rights Commission; Charles W. Stobbie for the Park Commission and Theodore Santy for Environmental Protection Board. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were Eileen Berets for Southwestern Regional Planning Agency; Linda Holton Lombardo for the Human Rights Commission and Helen Gewirtz for Commission on Aging.

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the name of King Whitney for the Personnel Committee

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the 30 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 6 items appearing on the Tentative Agenda. ORDERED HELD were 7 items; 1) Proposed Ordinance Paper Vending Machine, 2) Tax Abatement for Bell St. and Tresser Boulevard Property, 3) Tax Abatement for property owned by St. John's Urban Developemnt Corp. (Hanrahan Center), 4) Proposed Ordinance Safety of Construction Equipment including Cranes, 5) Tax Abatement for St. Joseph Hospital Corp. for property at 50 Strawberry Hill Ave., 6) Sewer Permit from Stamford Ambulance Corps, 7) Waiver of Building Permit from Stamfor Ambulance Corps.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (cont.)

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was one item, Proposed Ordinance dealing with the notification to property owners by registered mail, return receipt. One item in L&R for study re garding Self-Service Gas Stations.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 2 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were 2 items; 1) Status of Non-Classified or Non-Civil Service Employees, 2) Matter of Civil Service Vacancies being filled with Non-Classified or Contract persons and without prior approval of Bd. of Reps.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first two items; 1) Residents of Swampscott Road requesting Acceptance of this Road by the City; 2) Richard Schlesinger v. Board of Representatives. One item was ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE being the Referral on another Zoning Board decision by Attorney William Ivler.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items appearing on the Tentative Agenda being 1) Neglect of Southend and Waterside; 2) Repair work at 87 Leonard St. and problems encountered by Mr. & Mrs. Joseph Porto.

(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items appearing on the Tentative Agenda; 1) Low water presssure, Dolphin Cove; 2) Park Manor ability and willingness to serve the elderly, etc. ORDERED HELD was one item being Creation of an Emergency Medical

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of Duck Hunting and Discharge of firearms at Cove Island Park.

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was the matter of the Stamford Golf Authority with and into the E. Gaynor Brennan Golf Commission.

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED HELD was one item regarding Violence in the Schools as per report in the Newspaper.

(10) SEWER COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items; 1) Request from Rep. Corbo, Cloverhill drainage problem and Status of in-house design of Westwood-Skyview Drive sanitary sewer design. 2) Follow-up on problems of sewer easements for Project 17-2a.

(11) TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item regarding parcels of land located on Newfield Ave., Colonial Road, High Ridge Road, Vine Road and Fifth Street.

(12) CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was Commissioner Hoffman's letter dated Nov. 24, 1980 regarding appointing Charter Revision Committee for limited purpose of rewriting Section 746.

(13) ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the Resolution changing the date of the Regular Board Meeting from Jan. 5, 1981 to Jan. 12, 1981.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman Steering Committee

CMI

MR. RYBNICK MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to bring forward and consider under PERSONNEL: Item #1.

THE PRESIDENT said SECONDED and CARRIED.

5.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

(1) LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN THE FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION and the CITY OF STAMFORD for period July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1981; 7% retroactive to 7/1/79; 7½% retroactive to July 1, 1980; and 2½% effective January 1, 1981. Bd. of Finance's advisory opinion of 11/13/80 recommended denial with 2 voting yes and 4 voting no. Official receipt date of contract at Representatives' office is November 15, 1980.

MR. BLUM stated that the Personnel Committee met with the Firefighters and the City arbitrator, Mr. Barrett to discuss the contract. His Committee voted 4 - 0 with 1 abstention to ratify the contract and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM spoke about the Contract and said the negotiations were opened on January 1, 1979. It went to Factfinders and came back to the Board and was ratified. It was turned down by the Firefighters' Union. Now the Contract was vulnerable for binding arbitration. The reason for rejection was the wages of the uniformed services did not have parity.

MR. BLUM read the highlights of the new Contract. Also mentioned that a Firefighter, prior to this Contract, could have retired at 2/3's his pay after 20 years. Now he retires at the age of 48 with 20 years of service.

MR. DeLUCA commented that this Contract is beneficial to the City. He wondered why the Board of Finance rejected this Contract and passed the Police Contract.

MR. DeLUCA asked MR. BLUM about the stand-by pay which is \$ 7.00, and asked whether this was going to be changed to \$10.00?

MR. BLUM said if it is written in the Contract for \$7.00, he assumed that it is \$7.00

MR. DARER MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

The PRESIDENT :put the main question to ratify the contract to a vote. The Contrawas ratified with a vote of 38 yes; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Handy Dixon, Chairman

MR. DIXON said his Committee met Thursday at 7:30 p.m. in the Pemocratic Caucus Room. Present were Committee members Signore, Summerville, Fasanelli, Boccuzzi, DeLuca, Darer and Dixon.

MR. DIXON MOVED to place on the CONSENT AGENDA items 2, 3, 5, and 6 and so MOVED.

MINUTES OF MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1980 REGULAR BOARD MEETING 6.

APPOINTMENTS (continued)

BOARD OF TAX REVIEW

TERM EXPIRES

(1) DONNA COPPOLA (R)

Replacing Thomas Lombardo Dec. 1, 1984 27 DePinedo Avenue 06902 whose term expired 12/1/79.

MR. DIXON said this is HELD IN COMMITTEE.

SOUTHWESTERN REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY (SWRPA)

(2) ELIZABETH G. GERSHMANN (R) 88 Saddle Hill Road 06903 Held in Steering 10/27/80 Replacing Charles Festo March 15, 1982 whose term expired.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

WELFARE COMMISSION

(3) ROBERT FIELDS (R) Replacing J. Litaker Dec. 1, 1981 240 Fairfield Avenue who resigned. Held in Steering 10/27/80

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

(4) <u>VINCENT MARTIN</u>O (D) 24 Charles-Mary Lane Held in Steering 10/27/80

Replacing Fran Adams Dec. 1, 1980 who resigned.

MR. DIXON said this is HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PARK COMMISSION

CHARLES W. STOBBIE (D) Replacing Ronald Malloy Dec. 1, 1981 33 Island Heights Drive whose term expired. Held in Steering 10/27/80

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

(6) THEODORE SANTY (R) 133 Thornridge Drive Held in Steering 10/27/80 Replacing L. Casale Dec. 1, 1982 who resigned.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

APPOINTMENTS (continued)

7.

MR. DIXON MOVED to confirm items 2, 3, 5, and 6 on the Consent Agenda. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. SANTY abstained on item #6.

MRS. McINERNEY said she was unable to attend the Appointments Committee meeting and wanted her votes to be recorded as abstentions for 2, 3, 5 and 6.

MRS. PERILLO said she was also unable to attend and she would like to abstain on all the names.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED to Suspend the Rules to hear Planning and Zoning item #2 referring to the Schlesinger Referral. SECONDED. CARRIED.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

(2) RECEIPT OF "ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATION" from Donald H. Dowling, Chief Clerk of Supreme Court of Connecticut re case No. 0019744 L CV 77 RICHARD SCHLESING v. BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES.

To reconsider referral from action of Zoning Board approving application 72-007 of Richard Schlesinger - to change zone to R-5 multiple-family residence district for property now in R-10 one-family residence district, located on East side of Bedford Street approved by Zoning Board on April 3, 1972 and filed with office of Board of Representatives on April 26, 1972, and subsequently remanded to this Board by a clarifying Memorandum of Decision dated May 5, 1977 by the Honorable Milton H. Belinkie, Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Again remanded by Judge Novack on September 9, 1980.

MR. DONAHUE said the Planning and Zoning Committee met on December 4, 1980. Reps. Stork, Fasanelli, Wider and Donahue were in attendance. This came before the Board this evening with a recommendation from the Zoning Board of 1972 for the change from R-10 to R-5. It came with a recommendation for denial of that same application from the Planning Board of 1972.

MR. DONAHUE stated with four (4) members voting; two (2) voted for that denial and two (2) abstained; however, in the course of their recommendation, they further recommended that this be made an RD-1 multi-family residential zone. Rumor was that the Zoning Board was going to create such a zone. This type of zone has never been presented. The closest zone to that is the R-5.

MR. DONAHUE said that it was the view of the Committee after careful deliberation and research, that the Zoning Board did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner. The Committee voted to place this zone in agreement with the Master Plan of the City which recommends multi-family residential and which today still recommends that.

MR. DONAHUE stated that with a vote 4 to 0 in favor of the recommendation MOVED that the application of Richard Schlesinger to change the Zoning Map of the City of Stamford for the land describes in said application from R-10 one family residential district to R-5 multiple-family residential district be adopted. SECONDED

- MR. DZIEZYC left the floor as he was going to abstain.
- MR. DeNICOLA also abstained and left the floor.
- MR. CONTI left the floor. and abstained
- MR. JOYCE left the floor. and abstained.
- MR. DONAHUE added that this motion was drafted by the Corporation Counsel's office.
- MRS. GUROIAN wanted to know if she was correct in understanding that if we vote yes on this, we will be approving a zone change from R-10 to R-5. If we vote no, we will be not approving the zone change from R-10 to R-5?
- MR. DONAHUE stated that that would be the case.
- MRS. GUROIAN mentioned that she is a member of the Planning and Zoning Committee and was not present during the meeting on which they voted for this application and wanted the opportunity to address herself to her vote as a member of that Committee.
- MRS. GUROIAN stated that this application was referred tonight to this Board for the third time; originally voted on in 1972. She stated that the Board's consideration tonight will have an impact if the Board approves the zone change when developed on existing conditions in 1981 not 1972. She said that she cannot disregard that certain changes have occurred which may not have occurred in the peripheral area had construction been actually realized since 1972 on this large tract; one of the few remaining in the inner City.
- MRS. GUROIAN went on to say that even the consideration of the use that it will actually be put dependent on our decision tonight must of necessity have changed. The market place and and the value of the property has changed so that the owner having received the judgement by us on conditions prevailing in 1972 is not bound in his developments of the tract once a zone change if effectuated by a market prevailing in 1972 either on the type of construction or on the price of the property if sold.
- MRS. GUROIAN urged her fellow Representatives to consider closely what she has said. This change could affect the future of Stamford. The impact could be felt in everyone of the districts. She stated that since so many changes in Stamford since 1972, it behooves the Board to consider turning this application down and requested that if Mr. Schlesinger wishes to pursue this, that he re-apply to the Zoning Board where it can be discussed under conditions prevailing at this time and not 1972.

MRS. GUROIAN urged the Board Members to turn this application down so that it can be re-heard if the applicant so desires.

MR. DARER stated that the Board has to vote on something that is affecting the City today not something that happened seven (7) years ago. The Board must bear in mind that the decision is one that is based on how we today see the situation, and said that this is the way he must consider this.

MR. DARER also stated that he believed that this matter rightly should have been solved by the Courts. He thought it was a mistake to return this matter to this Board and thought that the Judge that did so probably gave the Board a decision that we rightly should not have. The responsibility is one that we should act upon with diligence in a correct manner and that manner is to reject this motion and offer to the owner the suggestion that he return to the proper bodies, Zoning and Planning, with his application to conform with the rules and regulations that exist in our City today.

MR. ESPOSITO said that he would like to add his voice to those in opposition to the recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Committee. He said that he is concerned with over-development and congestion not only in Revonah Woods and Bedford Street, but with every part of the City including the East Side. He stated that where is all the traffic going to go in the City when all these buildings are emptying at 5 o'clock; even at Ridgeway with the one-way system. He also stated that this Board's history is supporting up-zoning as opposed to down-zoning, and said that each area has to be looked at to see what affect a high density concentration residential units would have on that area regardless of residential or commercial.

MR. ESPOSITO recommended that the Board turn down this particular request.

MRS. CONTI stated that she was opposed to this application. She is opposed to any application where you down-zone where there is adjoining land that is already developed. An injustice is done to those people who own property in an existing zone. These are the people who suffer a loss and can go to the City to be compensated via a reduction in their assessments which results in a loss of revenue for the City. She urged her fellow Board Members to vote against this.

MR. LOOMIS said that a hard-look must be taken at our Zoning regulations wherever they might be throughout the entire City. He is fearful of approving this change.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that if this is approved this evening to down-zone the property, you will see this as an illness or disease if not allowed to be checked, will spread throughout the whole body and possibly throughout our entire City.

MR. ZELINSKI said he did not choose to appear before the Planning and Zoning Committee because of past technicalities that were brought up as result of previous votes by this Board. He did not want to jeopardize his vote this evening. Residents of the area attending the meeting represented why this property should not be down-zoned.

MR. ZELINSKI reminded the Board of the various things that could be built on this property. If the zone changed is approved, there is nothing that says that the present owner or a future owner, once the zone is changed, can build other than multi-family dwellings; other things could be built that are marked with a small "x" in the Land Use Schedule that was given to Board Members.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that this will be spot-zoning. This area should be maintained as a residential zone, and should not be changed at the present time. He read the letter received from Dr. Mancinelli, President of the Revonah Woods Property Association and David Cohen, Esq., who is President of the Revonah Neighborhood Association. The highlight of the letter is they vigorously oppose the present application but support the concept of using this property for needed residential development. The present application has a flaw of permitting drastic down-zoning to two full zoning categories without guaranteeing Stamford any new housing. Also stated was the Board has the responsibility to evaluate the present application inlight. of present conditions not those of 1972. This letter urged the Board to reject the present application so that this matter can be returned to the authority of the Zoning Board for the development of a realistic alternative.

MR. ZELINSKI urged not to grant this down-zoning.

MR. WIDER said that he heard ll people speak concerning this application and all were opposed to it. He visited the site but wondered how many people here tonight have sons or daughters that eventually will be able to live in Stamford that can afford the housing here. He stated that some opposing this are caught in the category that cannot afford this. He asked whether we can continue to burst the inner City because we are trying to keep everyone downtown? He said that this is the largest place on the Master Plan. He spoke with people in the Planning Department who said that single family housing in that area would not be saleable and multi-family housing would fit in that area.

MR. WIDER further stated that we must develop this land and will not be developed in one-family housing and will be developed in something multiple because that is what the Master Plan calls for. He feels that the Board should do some re-thinking.

MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. BOCCUZZI called for a ROLL CALL VOTE on the main motion. The motion for a Roll Call was carried.

THE PRESIDENT reiterated the motion before the Board which was that the application of Richard Schlesinger to change the Zoning Map of the City of Stamford for the land described in said application from R-10 one-family residential district to R-5 multiple-family residential district be adopted. If you vote yes, then you are voting to effectuate this change. If you vote no, you are opposed to making this change.

THE PRESIDENT stated that it would take 21 votes to pass or reject this motion based on Judge Novack's decision which is the law we must follow.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked the President what would happen if neither side gets 21.

THE PRESIDENT said that if neither side gets 21, then according to Judge Novack's decision, the Board has taken no action. She read from his decision: "In the absence of 21 votes for or against a particular zoning amendment, there could be no decision by the defendant".

THE PRESIDENT stated that if no one gets 21, then the Charter provisions will prevail. The Charter provisions say that if the Board takes no action on an application, the Zoning Board's action will stand.

MS. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll for the vote. (Copy attached to end of Minutes).

THE PRESIDENT announced the vote: 18 in FAVOR of the motion; 16 OPPOSED. Because neither side prevailed by getting 21 votes, the Board has taken NO ACTION.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairperson Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito

MRS. HAWE said the Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday evening, December 3rd. Present were Reps. Esposito, Betty Conti, Flounders, Livingston, Lyons, Hogan Rybnick and Hawe. She MOVED that the following items be placed on the Consent Agenda: Items #3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 22, 28, and 29. Proper secondary committee motions where required were made.

(1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT WITH STATE OF CONNECTICUT FOR FEDERAL FUNDS TO OPERATE W.I.C. PROGRAM, PER MAYOR CLAPES' REQUEST OF OCTOBER 9, 1980. Returned to Committee 11/10/80.

MRS. HAWE said that W.I.C. is a program for low income women, infants and small children who are nutritionally at risk. She spoke on the details of the Program. She said that between 2200 and 2500 individuals were served and given vouchers worth over \$540,000.00. The vouchers are redeemed by the State and are not included in the appropriation which we are being asked to appropriate tonight under item #2. She said the \$149,467.00 is the administrative cost of operating the Program for the current fiscal year.

Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and she so MOVED.

MRS. SANTY of the Health and Protection Committee agreed; 3 yes and 2 no. SECONDE

MR. DZIEZYC said that the Welfare Department can administer this Program more efficiently than the Health Department and thus save the City \$50,000.00 to \$60.000.00

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that MR. DZIEZYC should make a formal presentation if he thinks the City could save money on this Program.

MR. DZIEZYC stated a family of four (4) earning almost \$16,000.00 is not in dire need and this Program calls for that.

MR. FOUNDERS said that this a nutrition education program help mothers, who in turn, help their families to develop a better understanding of nutrition. This Program has accomplished a great deal of good over the years and has prevented many medical problems surfacing that otherwise might have had the nutritional help not been given.

MR. WIDER said that many times, these are one-parent homes and these people are doing the best that they can to stay off Welfare. He stated that their rents and utilities are so high that they are unable to buy milk and other food for their children, and asked that his Colleagues would vote for this Program.

MR. LIVINGSTON said that this is one of the programs that if we refuse or reject this Program, it is not going to save any taxpayer a single penny because the Federal Government will simply give these funds to someone else. He felt that this Program has been attacked for the wrong reasons. One of the good things about this Program is that it generates money. When these coupons are turned—in at the stores, this takes surplus food off the market and helps maintain a stable price for farmers. Many of these items are destroyed if not used. He encouraged every Member of this Board to support this Program.

PRESTDENT called for a vote. The MOTION was APPROVED, 28 yes; 3 no; 5 abstentions.

(2) \$149,467.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - various 573 Codes - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes - resubmitted his letter Nov. 13, 1980 (Bd. of Reps. DENIED this item at 11/10/80 meeting). Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and I so MOVE.

MRS SANTY: Health and Protection voted 3 in favor and 2 opposed.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 8, 1980 REGULAR MEETING

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MRS. CONTI: I don't consider the issue before us to be the merits or the demerits of the W.I.C. Program. What I consider to be the issue, is the fact that Congress has not appropriated the funds for this, and even if they do, if they should act this week, it will only be through December 15th and we are asked to approve funds for a year. If we approve these funds and Congress does not appropriate the money, I believe we are giving leave to the Health Director to deficit spend and I am opposed to allowing anybody to deficit spend.

MR. FAUTEUX: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. continue with the debate.

The MOTION is LOST. We will

MR. JOYCE: Earlier in Caucus we had a discussion about an item which is on the Agenda this evening, which is the completion of the bond for the City, and I raised it at that time, the fact that we may be getting ripped off for \$400,000. When I made my comment last month regarding this particular program, I would certainly make a very large distinction between the humanitarian expenditure monies, whether they be Federal, State or Municipal monies for something like paying a bonding company a questionable amount of money and a contract for the completion of a garage. On the other hand, where we're talking about the expenditures of money, such as we're talking about here for single parent families, you can't make any comparison, this is something which is the matter of survival for many, many people, particular in this day and age, where we have single parent families, women struggling to support children and to keep the family together, I think we need a program.

MRS. SANTY: Last month, many questions were raised regarding this appropriation, and it was a great debate, this month it obviously is going to be passed with approval and I'm not arguing the question of the program, but if Dr. Gofstein had taken the time to come to last month's Fiscal meeting, maybe this wouldn't have occurred, instead of making the aggravated telephone calls that he does, and they are one way calls, because after you say hello, there is no way you can get anothe

MRS. SANTY: (continuing)...word in, I'm telling you this publicly because he has says he listens to our every word and I hope he is listening now because under no circumstances will I undergo any of this torment, this harrasment, that's what I call it and I am very upset about it. It is incumbent upon him as a head of a department to attend the Fiscal meetings. If he has to come before my committee, he has to attend, if not I will not speak to him on the telephone.

MR. ESPOSITO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. The President called for a vote on Item #2. The MOTION was CARRIED, 31 yes; 3 no; 2 abstentions. I would like to correct the vote on the previous motion, which was for the Resolution. The vote should read 5 abstentions rather then 7, it doesn't change the outcome of the vote.

(3) \$2,275.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and Corp. Counsel Cookney 10/30/80 for 35 mm Camera with lens and flash attachment(\$675) plus 3 transcribers and five portable recorders, total \$2,200; have \$600 in account). Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

(4) \$2,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.2940 CONFERENCES AND TRAINING - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and Corp. Counsel Cookney 10/30/80 and 11/3/80. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: It is continually necessary for the lawyers in our city department to upgrade their knowledge and skills in various aspects of the law. In particular this appropriation will be mainly for appraisal causes since the city is in the process of re-assessment and it is imperative that our attorneys be prepared to defend the city in the anticipated suites relating to tax appeals. Also Civil Rights suits and suits in which government employees are sued have been increasing due to recent Supreme Court decisions. These costs will help the attorney be better prepared to handle these when they arrive. Fiscal voted 6 in favor, 0 opposed; 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: This also went to EWG. I'll accept a motion to waive, Mr. Fauteux. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. I will now accept a second to the motion. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: Please let the record show that I abstained on this vote.

PRESIDENT: We will proceed to a vote on Item #4. The MOTION is CARRIED.

' 35 yes; 1 no; (Mr. Joyce).

(5) \$750.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 5240 COURTS & SHERIFF SERVICES - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and Corp. Counsel Cookney 10/30/80 and 11/3/80. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

(6) \$6,000.00 - PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT - Code 270.3620 MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3 and S. Bernstein 10/28/80, for medical exams and lab tests and physical exams, and chest x-rays for Police, Fire and Teamster personnel.

MRS. HAWE: This appropriation is necessitated by the fact that numerious police and fire department vacancies have resulted in the need for many more physical than normal. There are ten firefighters and about nine police vacancies which will require about 25 physicals at \$145.00 per person. In addition the new Teamster's contract now calls for chest x-rays which will be covered by these monies. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 0 opposed and i so MOVE.

MR. BLUM: Personnel concurs with an exception. In as much as it was only recently that the Personnel Dept. took a Transfer from the Police Dept. for \$6,000. for the same reasons.

PRESIDENT: Personnel concurs, MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. HAWE: In response to Mr. Blum or as a Clarification, the \$6,000 that was transferred last month was mainly to cover the new police. This money is for the police who will be filling vacancies and some unusual retirements that they have had, not for the new police that came on last July.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. The MCTION HAS BEEN CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(7) \$55,000.00 - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR 1980/81

OF THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING DEPARTMENT BY ADDING A PROJECT IN

THE AMOUNT \$55,000.00 to be know as #280 HIGH RIDGE SIGNAL

SYSTEM MODERNIZATION to be financed by the issuance of bonds,
per Mayor Clapes' request of 11/3/80. Funding is for design
of needed signal system improvements on High Ridge Rd. Bd.
of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: This amount will cover the design cost for the modernization of the High Ridge Road signals between the Merritt Parkway and Bull's Head. The system is now a part-timedsystem, but the new system to be designedill be a traffic adjust system which means that when traffic reaches a certain level, the signals can be changed to speed the flow. There will also be detectors on side streets so that those signals will only be used on a demand basis. This design work will be done by Storch Engineers of Weatherfield and will hopefully be completed by Sept. 1981 There is a possibility of State reimbursement or Federal reimbursement for the actual construction cost of this project. The traffic signals on High Ridge Rd. are now owned and maintained by the State; Following the completion of this modern ization the city will take over the maintenance, which will result according to the Traffic Dept. in no appreciable increase in maintenance cost. Fiscal voted 5 in favor; 1 opposed; 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: Transportation concurs, SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: High Ridge Road is a State Highway and I am opposed to the City assuming their responsibility for paying for the signalization of a State Highway. I will vote no.

MR. DeLUCA: I agree with Mrs. Conti. There is a letter here from Mr. James Ric Manager of Traffic, which states that this re-design will be accomplished at no cost to the State and there is no guarantee that if money was available, it would even come to Stamford in the future.

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you to Rep. Hawe. If it is a State Road and State maintain why are we asked to appropriate the \$55,000?

MRS. HAWE: Granted the City will be paying for this design phase of it, the Trafi Dept. says this would be the only way to get the design completed. If we left it to the State we would be waiting 8 to 10 years. The Letter that was quoted by Mr. DeLuca was very true however, the Traffic Dept. feels there is a very good possibility of money coming back from the State, also a possibility a reinbursement from the Federal Highway Administration.

MR. FAUTEUX: This is a very critical Transportation item, I'd like to ask through you to Mr. Joyce what the count was in his committee on this particular issue.

MR. JOYCE: Two people concurred.

MR. LIVINGSTON: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: The Motion to move the question is LOST.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to add some information to Mr. Zelinski's question. We know that if we go to the State we have to deal with Hartford and the distributions of funds there, we have seen how long it has taken the State to deal with Courtland Ave. Bridge. We have been waiting for the State to take care of the under-pass at Elm Street. If we say to the State of Conn. "High Ridge Road is your road, take care of it, They will simply say, "It's perfect for our needs!" In addition there has been precedent for this already. East Main Street and the work done on East Main Street, which is a State Road was supported through the Topics Program and also City funding. The City maintained the lights on East Main Street. This Board has to make decisions, Do we want the Traffic Dept. to move the Traffic and are we willing to give them the money to back that commitment up or are we going to come back here in two or three years and try to figure where to start.

MR. WEIDERLIGHT: The issue here is not who owns the road and who's responsible for the road, the issue here at this point is that our citizens are riding on this road and it is our responsibility that we move the traffic. I'd like to also call your attention to the fact that a recent study indicates that with the new commercial business district being completed, there will be approximately 6,000 more cars a day coming into the City of Stamford, and rest assured, quite a few of these cars are going to be using High Ridge Road. It is incumbent upon us to take the necessary action to make this a viable community.

MR. BOCCUZZI: A question to the Chairperson, this \$55,000.00, that is to install the system?

MRS. HAWE: For the Design.

MR. BOCCUZZI: After the design, who is going to pay to install it? You're voting on more than one thing here, two appropriations, one to design it and then the commitment to put the money up to install it, and I would like to know somewhere in the ballpark figure what that number is going to be.

MRS. HAWE: The estimated cost of this is \$520,000, However, at that point if the City had to pay that or part of that we would vote on that at that point. We're only committing our selves to the \$55,000.00 right now.

MR. BLUM: I would like to know if this design has been used elsewhere in this City, for there are many roads that go through this problem.

18.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (cont.)

MR. WIDER: If you had to drive High Ridge Road for any length of time which I have done, also when Ron Weber made application to the State of Connecticut to do those lights, I saw many accidents at 7:30 in the morning because the lights weren't synchronized. If we could get a good plan for \$55,000.00 that would be cheap, and if we could save one light, it's worth \$55,000. I give Cliff Winkel a great deal of credit for moving this far on it.

MR. CORBO: I sympathize with the effort to save money but this is not an occasion to save money. A design is coming from the State to synchronize all the traffic lights on High Ridge Road. I believe there should be a corporation with the City's Traffic Director to co-ordinate the effort to design, in cooperation of the State, all the inter-sections that are going to go in and out of High Ridge Road. It should be a two way effort, the State and the City, therefore by the city incorporathis effort has to go through expenses, that's what we're paying for. I have to praise Cliff Winkel.

MRS. PERILLO: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I wish the record to show that I abstained because I wasn't advised by the Chairman of the meeting and I feel I'm obliged to abstain under those circumstances.

PRESIDENT: We will vote on Item #7, under Fiscal. The MOTION is LOST, with 22 yes; 12 no; 2 abstentions. This needed a 2/3 vote.

(8) \$400.00 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 104.2910 OFFICIAL NOTICES - additional appropriation request from Mayor Clapes 11/3/80. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

(9) \$33,211.00 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3140 - Primary Expenses - Local additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80 to fund Democratic and Republican State and National Primaries, Sept. 9, 1980, per itemized statement submitted. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(10) \$667,995.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM - additional appropriation to fund Day Care Centers per Mayor's request 11/3/80, to be reinbursed by grant from State, from PTA. from client fees, school lunch program, and child care and head start lunches. Budget submitted. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(11) \$8,954.00 - NEW HOPE FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 472.4340 - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80 for an additional paid fireman's salary and related benefits effective Jan. 1, 1981. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(12) \$3,774.00 - NEW HOPE FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 472.4340 - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80 for replacement of overhead (bay) doors at this fire station. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONESENT AGENDA.

(13) \$21,012.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - AMEND the 1980/81 CAPITAL PROJECTS

BUDGET OF THE WELFARE DEPT. BY ADDING A PROJECT KNOWN

AS #510.774 SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE ELEVATOR RENOVATION
to be financed by the issuance of bonds - per request of

Mayor Clapes 10/21/80. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(14) \$15,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - AMEND THE 1980/81 CAPITAL PROJECTS

BUDGET OF THE WELFARE DEPT. BY ADDING A PROJECT KNOWN AS

#520.969 SEPTIC SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS - SKILLED NURSING

FACILITY, to be financed by the issuance of bonds per

request of Mayor Clapes 10/21/80. Bd. of Finance approved

11/13/80 (\$15,000 for Design)

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(15) \$5,000.00 - WELARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE S.N.F. - Code 520.2610

MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT - Mayor's request 11/3/80 to

fund repairs of equipment as well as increase in Refuse
removal fee of 265% since July 1, 1980 from \$120.00 per
month to \$318.00 per month. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee voted 7-0 in favor of HOLDING this pending further information, however, since then we have received the information that

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) we requested What we were looking for was the breakdown. (Mrs. Hawe read breakdown). Even though the Committee had voted to hold, I would like to MOVE to take this out of Committee to accept.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. Mr. Fauteux, I will accept a motion to waive, MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (Secondary Committee report waived)

MR. DeLUCA: I'm looking at the Welfare accounts, where they are looking for additional appropriation for operating expenses. Several years now, and I'm sure it will continue without Mr. DeVos's presence the Welfare Dept. has been showing surpluses ranging anywhere from 300 to 500 thousands dollars each year, my question is why should we appropriate money only to have at x amount of surplus at year-end. Why can't they transfer from one account to the other and then come year-end, see what happens. To create phony surpluses at year-end to make the department look good is ridiculous.

MRS. HAWE: This money is reimbursed 90% from the State.

MR. BLUM: Are we talking about the Welfare Dept. or Skilled Nursing Facility? If we're talking about Skilled Nursing Facility, I've just read a letter from Mr. DeVos on his resignation, he so ably told us as to the amount of money and the great surpluses, as Mr. Deluca said, if the surpluses are there, why can't they take the money from the surplus. I would like to know more about it, that's why I ask that it not be put on consent.

MRS. HAWE: There has been a recent State inspection of the Skilled House Nursing Facility and a lot of these appropriation requests have to do with things that were found to be in violation of the Code. The Welfare Dept. receives money back: the State from each patient that they serve at the Smith House and also 90% of their operating cost are reimbursed by the State. It's not as if they have the surpluses in hand right now; they show on the books at the end of the year.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mrs. Hawe, I'm looking at a sheet that was mailed to us; Smith House Code #520.2610 Maintenance of Equipment. Is that the appropriation we're talking about? They have here, kitchen freezers, ice machine, etc.

MRS. HAWE: That's why we held it originally, because that sheet was very un-clear as to what they wanted the money for, and when they came to our meeting, they didn't give us an exact breakdown, so we decided to hold it until we got it. We got this in the mail, I don't know whether everyone got it, but they broke it down to exactly what they are spending the money on.

MR. BOCCUZZI: My question is why do they mention these three items in the original appropriation happened to the freezers, refrigerators and ice machine, are they not going to fix them?

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing)....It just irks me when people ask for money to do one thing and they do something else. They went to the Bd. of Finance with 3 items and when we get it these 3 items are no longer what they are going to do, but they have a list of other items. Why don't they stick to the original appropriation?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know Mr. Boccuzzi, that's the problem we had with them, and the reason we asked for a complete breakdown.

MR. JOYCE: I sit on the Health & Protection Committee and we have been having discussions with the people at Smith House and one of the things that really has me irratated is the comparison in cost and I did a great deal of questioning from the people at Smith House, with the cost of the people being shepherded, as they call it,.....

PRESIDENT: : Mr. Joyce, I'm going to ask you kindly to stick to the \$5.000 appropriation.

MR. JOYCE: The question I'm looking at is this, what is this a PR situation, where these people are coming into the Board and asking for money. I wish that this Board could have sat in on our committee hearings and the questioning they put senior citizens through, they take every asset they have before they can get into the Smith House and then charge them three times the going rate for the cost for maintaining them in Smith House.

MR. FLOUNDERS: As Mr. Boccuzzi pointed out, the itemizations of the request should be uniform from first submission to second submission. While the Smith House is revenue producing operation, they still operate on cost budgets and they must account for monies spent in specific cost accounts. They can't draw from their own revenue that goes into the City funds.

MR. ESPOSITO: In light of Mr. Boccuzzi questions, I'd like to MOVE to HOLD this.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SFCONDED. CARRIED.

(16) \$3,000.00 - WELFARE DEPT. - SMITH HOUSE S.N.F. - Code 520.2350 NEW

EQUIPMENT - additional appropriation per Mayor's request

11/3/80 to comply with Public Health Code of the State and install new automatic magnetic hold-open devices on fire doors. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 7 in favor 0 opposed and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. Secondary report.

MR. FAUTEUX: MOTION waived.

PRESIDENT : MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. BLUM: I object to this because it's the same reason as item #15. I want a breakdown of this item Why its necessary at this time, why they can't transfer money from other accounts where they have surpluses.

MRS. HAWE: I can't answer the question as to the surpluses. As to the fire doors these doors have been in place since 1963. There was a violation noted during the annual survey done by the State. It would be advisable to have automatical magnetic hold-up devices tied to the fire and smoke detection system.

MR. DARER: A few days ago there was a disastrous fire in Stouffers Inn in White Plains. One of the problems was the door failed to open. One of the members of my Temple was killed in that fire and I personally think that it is a disgrace that we would take the lives of some of our valued senior citizens that we always talk so highly of. This is a safety fire death prevention recommendation. If we want to examine the budget of Smith House, let's do it, but let's not hold up something that is going to make compliance to the safety code of the State.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm hoping that we judge each one of these items on their own merits. We must recognize that we are talking about senior citizens and if there was a fire and something drastic happened simply because we failed to provide the necessary things to keep such a tragic thing from happening. I hope we approve this.

MR. ESPOSITO: There are about five requests here and we are only in the second quarter of the Fiscal year at this point. I think it would be fiscally irresponsible for any city agency or any city department to start transferring money in November or December of the Fiscal year on the possible projection that they are going to have a surplus in June. This request came down in June, they have observed these problems. We have to keep in mind that the Capital Projects for this Fiscal year was submitted last November so that if something comes up in May, June or July, it's too late for this years budget and there has to be an additional appropriation.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will proceed to a vote on Item #16. The MOTION has been CARRIED with 31 yes votes; 2 no; 3 abstentions.

(17) \$ 20,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE S.N.F. - Code 520.2620

REPAIRS EQUIPMENT - additional appropriation per Mayor

Clapes' request of 11/3/80 to fund over-hauling of
patient-nursing intercom system. Present equipment in
violation of State Public Health Code. Bd. of Finance
approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 7 in favor and 0 opposed and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FAUTEUX: I move for a WAIVER of motion for EWG.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. JOYCE: I intended to say this on the last item and I'm going to make the same point here. If infact, it is not fiscally irresponsible to force this particular installation to pay as they go? If they are showing surpluses, it is only reasonable that that money should be applied to their own improvements instead of coming to this Board for additional subsidy, otherwise reduce the cost to the consumer or user of the particular facility. That is what we're trying to say. I think it is only fair because the people who go to Smith House have a right to get a cheaper rate, but to have a situation where they are charging Waldorf Astoria prices, and then come back to the taxpayers and ask them to subsidize these kinds of things is not good prudent fiscal management.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Surplus is what you don't use of an original appropriation. What your talking about with Smith House and the other facilities is an income. When you make your tax assessment the beginning of the Fiscal year, these things are all taking into consideration, the income from Smith House, Hubbard Heights etc. Your not talking of a surplus, the surplus is not in the line item. When they have money left over at the end of the year, is due to the fact of income.

MRS. CONTI: I voted yes in committee and I will vote yes on the floor of the Board for the simple reason I do not want to assume any responsibility for any harm coming to any disable elderly, however, I am distressed that there are abviously so many problems with the Smith House Nursing Facility and I do not understand why these defective pieces of equipment were not included in the annual budget.

MR WIEDERLIGHT: Through you to Rep. Joyce. You specifically said they have a surplus which to me refers to the fact that at the end of the year this facility will show a profit, can you substantiate that?

MR. JOYCE: Absolutely, you can go to the testimony of our committee and you'll see that the reports that come in at the end of the year. The correspondence from Mr. DeVos states they have been proud of the fact that they have been able to make profit and my question is how are they making profit?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have another question to you. What was the net profit last year for the Smith House?

MR. JOYCE: I don't have the figures in front of me but they are easily ascertainable Mr. wiederlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: If in fact we giving all of this money to the Smith House to make all the corrections of State violations etc., then possibly an investigation of these matters should be put on the agenda of the EWG committee for some study and a report brought out to us at some future date. At it stands right now, there are many violations which are life threatening which exist in this facility. Every day, week or minute counts to get these thing rectified, you don't know when there will be a fire. I think these appropriations should be approved and the improvements should be made immediately.

MR. DeLUCA: There seems to be a misconception about what a surplus is. I've heard comments that surpluses only occur when the revenue is received and at the end of the year because we took in more revenue then what the expenses were, we had a surplus. Going back to 1977, when I was a member of the Welfare Commission at which time the hope was that the Smith House Residents, Skilled Nurinsing Facility would be opened by a certain date. We therefore appropriated X amount of dollars for salaries. Needless to say there were delain the construction work and the salaries were never spent. Therefore, where the money was never spent you had a surplus at the end of the year, no revenue was coming in, that's my argument here, some of these line items that we keep talking about, being realistic, where we all know items have a little fat in it, I'm sure there are accounts where you can transfer from one to another. Let's not mislead the public that surplus only generates from renvenue coming in, they also generate because of things you had anticipal spending but for some reason or other you did not spend.

MRS. LYONS: First of all we're talking about equipment that is in violation of your State Public Health Code. It's equipment that is 17 years old and is currently very deficient in its operation. It is only equipment that is used as a contact between the nurse and the patient, and for many patients their only contact with someone when they are in need of help since they are unable to get around by themselves.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Unfortunately there is a tendency to base our decisions on perceptions of reality rather then reality itself. When our perceptions are mistaken, our decisions are mistaken. We don't have the budget book with us tonight, but if we have a basic question about how the Smith House and Welfare Dept. are operating their accounts, and if they are indeed making tremandous profits, yes, we should do something about that, but, not tonight, let's put it on the Steering Agenda as suggested by Mr. Wiederlight, Rut, let's evaluate the requests that are being made tonight on their own merit.

PRESIDENT: We will now proceed to a vote on Item #17 under Fiscal. The MOTION has been CARRIED by a voice vote. (1 no vote, Mr. Joyce)(Mr.DeLuca abstained)

(18) \$150,000.00 - WELFARE DEPT. Code 510.3601 CASH RELIEF - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80, and Acting Dir. Robert Mendela 10/22/80, to fund sudden increase in applications since July, 1980. State reimburses 90% in most cases and 100% in others. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80 \$150,000.00 of the original request of \$250,000.00.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. Mr. Fauteux asked to Waive the Secondary Repo

MRS. CONTI: I would like to MOVE to reduce this appropriation to \$100,000

PRESIDENT: No second.

MR. DARER: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will vote on the Item #18. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED. (1 abstention, Mrs. Conti)

(19) \$3,600.00 - WELFARE DEPT. Code 510.3612 BURIALS - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3 and Robert Mendela 10/22 to cover costs of funerals projected for balance of fiscal year. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/2

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

(20) \$10,553.69 - WELFARE DEPT. Code 510.1110 SALARIES - additional appropriation to fund salary for Caseworker.

Approved by Bd. of Finance 11/13/80. For an additional caseworker at third pay level step for period 11/1/80 through 6/30/81 per DeVos request 8/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 0 opposed to HOLD this request.

(21) \$\frac{\$\frac{1}{700.00}}{\frac{1}{700.00}}\$ - \frac{\text{HEALTH DEPT. Code 550.5410 LICENSES AND PERMITS}}{\text{Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/and Dr. Gofstein 10/15/80, to cover expense involved in transferring the issuance of garbage license plates and food vending license plates from Finance Dept.

MRS. HAWE: If you'll notice the next item which is #22 for a transfer of \$300.00 to the Health Dept. for this purpose. Dr. Gofstein has assured us that all he would need is \$1,000.00 Fiscal recommend we cut this request to \$700.00 and this added to the \$300.00 will give them the \$1,000.00. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 0 opposed and I so MOVE to reduce this amount.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(22) \$ 300.00. - HEALTH DEPT. - INTER-DEPARTMENTAL TRANSFER FROM BUREAU

OF ACCOUNTS AND RECORDS - TREASURY - Code 241.5410

Licenses and Permits to Health Dept. Code 550.5410

Licenses and Permits. This to purchase vendor license stickers, garbage collector license stickers and restaurant licenses, the issuance of which has been transferred from the finance Dept. to the Health Dept.

Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

(23) \$ 285.00 - HEALTH DEPT. Code 560.3712 VACCINES AND SERUMS (1980/81 Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80 to fund State law mandated tuberculin tests; Bd. of finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to point out that on Items #23 and #24, while they are significantly small, these are both programs that are mandated by the State but yet the State is not funding them. I am opposed to the State mandating something which it refuses to pay and I will not appropriately money for it and will be voting no.

PRESIDENT: We will proceed to a vote. (Mrs. Conti abstained) the MOTION has CARRIED.

(24) \$ 3,194.00 - HEALTH DEPT. PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM Code 560.3710

FIRST AID SUPPLIES - additional appropriation requested
by Mayor Clapes 11/3/80 to comply with School Health
Act, Public Act 80-440 mandating tests for school
children for 1980/81; also Flouride Oral Rinse treatment for grades through 6. Bd. of Finance approved
11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 7 in favor 0 opposed and 1 abstention and I so MOVI

MRS. SANTY: Health & Protection concurs.

PRESIDENT: SECONDED.

MRS. SANTY: I would like to know when this Act went into effect?

MRS. HAWE: July 1, 1980.

PRESIDENT: We will proceed to a vote on Item #24. The MOTION is CARRIED, (Mrs. Conti voted no - voice vote)

(25) \$804,927.50 - DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE - Code 900.8210 CITY BONDS - INTEREST ON 1980 BOND ISSUE - additional appropriation requested by Mayor 11/4/80. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: These are the bonds that were sold last last August to finance the Capital Projects appropriated in fiscal years 77/78; 78/79; 79/80. The size of the bond issue was \$21,885,000.00 the interest cost was 7.3931%. When the mill rate was set last year, the bonds had not been sold so this was not included in the budget however, the best estimate was made and money was put in the contingency fund. Fiscal voted 7 in favor 0 opposed and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. FAUTEUX: I Move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. JOYCE: What is the actual interest rate that the City is paying on these bonds?

MRS. HAWE: 7.3931%.

MR. JOYCE: What is the current interest rate of interest the City get on its deposits on funds in the Union Trust and State National Bank.

MR. ESPOSITO: I don't have the exact figure but I can just comment what Dr. Hoffman indicated to us because the interest rates have increased the City's yield from these has increased. they get a higher interest rate because they put a large amount in for six months.

MR. JOYCE: I understand we have close to ten million dollars of city funds in these banks. What interest are we getting on an annual basis, It's tax-payers money we have in these accounts in Union Trust and State National Bank.

MRS. HAWE: The interest we're getting now is averaging 9.250%.

MR. JOYCE: We're getting that on the pension funds?

MRS. HAWE: We're not talking about pension funds. This is the money from the bonds that were sold that is in our bank account now.

MR. JOYCE: Are we getting the same kind of interest rates on the pension funds that we're getting on these?

PRESIDENT: Mr. Joyce that is totally a different topic. That question is not in order in relation to this appropriation. I would suggest that you hold that question for Charter Revision because that might be a very good place to ask that question.

MR. DARER: If that's all we're getting on the money that is awaited to be spent from the bonding, I might say from a professional point of view, that not a very attractive rate. At this time money should be getting somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 to 16%.

PRESIDENT: We will proceed to a vote. The MOTION is CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

(26) \$20,000-00 - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES - AMENDMENT TO THE 1980/81
CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING A PROJECT IN THE
AMOUNT OF \$20,000.00 TO BE KNOWN AS "NEW VOTING MACHINE"
to be financed by the issuance of bonds. Per Mayor Clapes request of 11/3/80 and Pres. Goldstein's letter of 10/31
Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: A total package price of \$14,378.00 includes the complete system. The equipment will be warranted for 1 year. Fiscal recommends by a vote of 7 in favor 0 opposed that this request be reduced to \$15,000.0 and I so MOVE.

MRS. BOWLBY: House Committee concurs.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI: Was it decided Rep. Hawe that this would go out for bid or was it waived under the circumstances?

MRS. HAWE: As far as I understood it was being 'waived.

MR. ZELINSKI: That being the case I would certainly be against that. We have an obligation to make sure that when we do get a machine, that we have searched and gotten the best for our dollars. I think that if it did go out to bid, there would be other companies and we would have a choice on this and be just left with one and one only. I think we're setting a bad precedent that if we don't sent it out to bid, which is the usual cours of business and in our Charter, and because of the amount involved here I think it would be a bad move on our part and the public might not also like that. Maybe the President can clarify this. Do we have to have a motion or what would have to be done to approve the funds in making sure it was sent out for a bid.

PRESIDENT: The procedure would be that the Purchasing Agent determine what the proper course on this is.

MR. ZELINSKI: In other words we have no say about it at all.

PRESIDENT: We either approve the money or we don't approve the money. I think we could make a recommendation that he go out to bid but that would not be a binding recommendation because he does have latitude. I will accept a motion to recommend that the Purchasing Agent go out to bid.

MR. ZELINSKI: I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. We are going to speak to the amendment to the motion.

MR. LIVINGSTON: We were told by our Purchasing Agent and even if he desired to take this out to bid, one thing he would have to have is specifications. The only ways he feels he can get the proper specification would be to use the ones that were given to him by the current company that he has been negotiating with. If that happens, this man would be violating the law. You can't take someone elses specs and put it out on the open market for bid.

We need a new machine, we have the opportunity to get it, I would hope that we deny this amendment.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: In the Fiscal meeting Mr. Zelinski stated that he was cerned as to whether Mr. Thomsen, who is our present person taking care of the machine was notified that the Board of Representatives was going out to get another machine. Now, tonight he want this published. I can't believe the public is that concerned about whether we're going to go out to bid for something that is needed so badly. At every board meeting something happens to the machine, it is a matter of necessity and time also. I would ask this Board to please go in favor of the new machine.

MR. ZELINSKI: POINT OF PERSONAL PREVILEGE. Being that my name was mentioned, I not only asked at the committee meeting pertaining to the present inventor of our machine, but also clearly specified my comments why we should go out to bid. I even asked Mr. Canino and he said there would be no problem with that. I'm not against the new voting machine, I'm only saying we should get all the proper bids, so that we get the best machine.

MR. DARER: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. The MOTION has LOST, to move the question, 12 yes; 19 no.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I do think that Rep. Zelinski should understand because he was at the meeting, you don't buy everything according to one set policy. Accordingly the procedure that was used by our Purchsing Agent was an understandable one. He went through all the listing of Signed Companies engaged in the custom manufacture of electronic signage. He sent out letters of interest and inquiry to each of those manufactures, and had one response. That manufacture invented the specifications on his own according to his understanding to our needs. As been pointed out by Rep. Livingston, you cannot take a manufacture specifications and send them to another for his price. I submit that there are extenuating circumstances therefore that makes Rep. Zelinski's motion impractical.

MR. ROOS: On the amendment, we are over \$3,000.00 and it seems we should be able to get bids on a machine but it will have to have specifications. We have companies right here in Stamford and they never have been asked to bid on it. Others that I have heard from in Stamford have heard nothing about this.

MR. BLUM: I would like to say in answer to Mr. Livingston. Specifications when you go out to bid for special items, has to go for bid because they are a public concern.

MR. LIVINGSTON: POINT OF PERSONAL PREVILEGE. I just want Mr. Blum to know that our Purchasing Agent said that those were the specifications he had, the only one he could get.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I read with great interest Mr. Canino's letter. He made so many phone calls, he followed up so many companies, and he deserved credit indeed. I drew the conclusion after reading his letter, other than the fact that he is doing a very credible job, there is no body out there that is going to put this machine together for us other than the people who he is talking to. Therefore let's move along, let's defeat the motion to go out to bid.

MRS. LYONS: I would just like to emphasize the point made by Mr. Flounders for the benefit of the public who's probably listening and wondering about this whole issue. The purchasing department not arbitrarily neglect to put this whole item out to bid. The Fiscal Committee questioned Mr. Canino about the whole bidding process and he went into a very detailed explanation about how he had gone through all the list of companies that he felt were qualified to deal with our particular problem and that indeed because our problem is so small and the machine that we want is not easily found or in great demand that he could find only one company that would be willing to accommadate us. I think putting it out to bid would be a wasted effort because indeed we probably would find that there is only one company which is the company he found that would be willing to undertake this job.

MR. RYBNICK: If the Purchasing Agent goes to the Mayor or Mr. Hoffman, he can certainly get a waiver.

MR. WIDER: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We are now voting on the amendment. The vote is 3 yes; 27 no; 5 abstentions, the amendment to the motion has been DEFEATED.

MR. ROOS: I don't really think we need a new machine. I did make a brief analysis encounted on this system. This system was built about twelve years ago. 95% of the trouble has been at the desks, This can easily be repairs with a study of what we have at the desks. Outside of that this system has served us well. The interest it would cost the city to carry a \$20,000.00 bond would run close to \$1,500. That amount of money could be applied towar preventive maintenance on this system and I think we would have fewer troub! I think we're spending money where we don't have to.

MR. DeNICOLA: Where is this company from?

MRS. HAWE: Freemont, Ohio

MR. DeNICOLA: Who is going to fix this machine?

MRS. HAWE: Any electrical engineer will be able to fix this machine, there will be blue prints and because of its solid state componets.

MR. DeNICOLA: Is someone going to be trained for this unit?

MRS. HAWE: They'll be training manuals and the staff will be trained on how to use it.

MR. DeNICOLA: Are they going to be available to us at any time.

MRS. HAWE: By telephone I assume, not in person.

MR. DeNICOLA: Suppose something breaks down while we're on the floor?

MRS. HAWE: The machine is warranteed for one year. There won't be someone here every night. Mr. Canino said to us at the Fiscal meeting that any electrical engineer will be able to repair this which is one of the advantages of it.

MR. RYBNICK: MOVE THE QUESTION.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will proceed to a vote on Item #26, new voting machine. The vote is 26 yes; 7 no; 2 abstentions, the MOTION has been CARRIED.

(27) \$1,999,959.00 - POLICE DEPT. Code 410, 440 and one 290. additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/10/80 to fund the labor contract negotiated between the Stamford Police Assoc. and the City of Stamford for two-year period from July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1981. Bd. of finance approved 11/13/80.

		Salaries	\$1,026,803.00
	410,1124	Differential	34,742.00
	410.1125	Differential (Night)	19,155.00
_		Over-Time	56,480.00
		Holidays	30,940.00
		Minimum Manpower	59,073.00
	410.1210	Day-Off Slips	22,714.00
		Court Time	1,293.00
		Clothing Allowance	56,200.00
	410.3480		6,833.00
	410.1413	Police Pension	683,418.00
	290.1330	Medical and Life	1,566.00
	440.1423	Medical Benefits - Police	742.00
			\$1,999,959,00

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 7 in favor; 0 opposed and I so MOVE.

MR. BLUM: Personnel concurs but only one particular item. We feel that the letter that was sent to us by Commissioner Hoffman should be looked into in a sense that as long as it is State mandated that the contract must be voted upon, why can't we either ratify the contract or turn it down. The money portion should come with the contract. We're going to look into that matter.

PRESIDENT: We will proceed to a vote. The MOTION has been CARRIED by a vote of 30 yes; 4 no; (Darer, DeLuca, Roos, A. Conti) 1 abstention.

(28) \$ 2,400.00 - ZONING BOARD - Code 107.5110 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/7/80 to enable the Zoning Board to obtain the services of zoning law and planning experts. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(29) \$ 9,000.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR 1980/81 IN THE SUM of \$9,000.00 by adding a project known as #114.961 NEW VEHICLES (Dial-A-Ride) requested by Mayor 11/13/80, also 11/6/80 and application resolution to UMTA. 80% to be reimbursed by grant from UMTA; and 20% by the City of Stamford. to be financed by bonds. Bd. of Finance approved 11/13/80.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(30) \$400,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - HIGHWAY AND MAINTENANCE

GARAGE HANOVER ST. AND MAGEE AVE. - RESOLUTION TO

AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1980/81 BY ADDING

A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #320.365 PUBLIC WORKS

MAINTENANCE COMPLEX, to be financed by TAXATION.

Mayor Clapes' request of 11/13/80. Bd. of Finance
approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE: We approved an appropriation of \$880,000.00 to finish the Publi Works Maintenance garage after the Sisca Company went bankrupt. This was necessary to prove our damages to the Bonding Company. Settlement has now been made with the Bonding Company and this settlement in cludes the following:

- 1. The Bonding Company has agreed to drop any claims previously made Sisc against the City and according to Mr. Frattaroli of the Law Department. The claims could well have ranged from \$75,000.00 to \$175,000.00 or even higher
- 2. We still have material and payment bonds from Sisca and a Performance and payment and material bonds from the Fuschia Company.

- 3. The Bonding Company has paid the City \$1,168,820.00. This check is in our possession.
- 4. The City must pay the current contractor, which is Fuschia Company, an additional \$400,000.00. This \$400,000.00 is tied into the \$1,168,820.00 figure alread paid to the City. This means that if Fuschia had agreed to a \$300,000.00, the amount we received from the Bonding Company would have been \$100,000.00 less. Both figures are tied together. Therefore, the \$400,000.00 is already included in the \$1,168,820.00 that the City received as payment as a settlement of the claim.

In order to fulfill our part of the agreement by which we received this payment, we must now approve the \$400,000.00. Fuschia was allowed 60 days to check to see if there were any defects, deficiencies or damages from weather that were not immediately apparent. The settlement with the Bonding Company includes the \$400,000.00 for this item.

The bottom line of all this is the Public Works Maintenance Garage has cost the City a total of \$100,000.00 of taxpayers money.

MRS. HAWE said that Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed and so MOVED.

MR. PERILLO, on the Secondary Committee, said that Public Works did meet on this but lacked a Quorum and no one from City Hall appeared so there is no report.

THE PRESIDENT asked for a motion to WAIVE. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. HAWE's motion was SECONDED.

MR. LIVINGSTON stated that when Committees are meeting and department heads are invited, the Committee expects them to come. He stated that maybe there should be some means of action that the Board could take if found that depart heads deliberately ignore our Chairmen and Committees.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. DARER MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on item #30. The vote was 28 yes, 1 no and 6 abstentions. CARRIED.

MR. BLUM being on the prevailing side asked if item #7 on Fiscal could be reconsidered, and he MOVED so. SECONDED. CARRIED.

(7) \$55,000.00 - RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR 1980/1981

OF THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING DEPARTMENT BY ADDING A PROJECT

IN THE AMOUNT \$55,000.00 to be known as #280 HIGH RIDGE SIGNAL

SYSTEM MODERNIZATION to be financed by the issurance of bonds,
per Mayor Clapes' request of 11/3/80. Funding is for design
of needed signal system improvements on High Ridge Road.

Board of Finance approved 11/13/80.

MRS. HAWE MOVED the question. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO asked how many Members were present and how many votes are needed for the 2/3's vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that 34 Members were present and 23 votes are needed.

MR. ESPOSITO asked when the Secondary Committee met on this item and the vote.

MR. JOYCE replied that his Committee did not have a special meeting on this. It was discussed this evening.

MR. DONAHUE stated that the Traffic Department is attempting to have the ability to tie the system into a central computerized system to control traffic in the entire City. We will have to invest locally to accomplish that but it will allow us to one day control the signal without going to the State each time we want to retime those devices.

MR. STORK asked Mrs. Hawe if there was something unique about signal system modernization on High Ridge Road in particular that would warrant a \$55,000.00 allocation. He said that he thought that signal synchronization is not a new engineering technique.

MRS. HAWE said the Storch Engineering Co, of Weathersfield who would be doing this, the money would be to design modifications of the High Ridge Road signal system which would convert the existing pretimed system to a traffic adjusted system capable of future computer control.

MR. ESPOSITO spoke about the many small streets off High Ridge Road that have traffic signals and the light would remain green on High Ridge until a vehicle on the smaller street approached the light and it would turn red.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that once the Central Business District is completed, the traffic will be compounded. Not to invest \$55,000.00 into a study to see how we can improve this system is short-sighted. He stated that we are building new buildings, homes, etc. but not completing the transportation necessary to carry people where they have to go. He thought it is critical for this research project to be started.

MR. BLUM mentioned other streets and areas where the traffic is extremely heavy and congested and said if we pass this item, maybe something could be done for other areas in the City.

MR. ZELINSKI said he objected to having to fund a State project but because of the traffic he would vote in favor of this and hoped that the Fiscal Committee could follow-up on this if there might be funds from grants either from the Federal or State government.

MR. JOYCE said that Newfield Avenue is under review in the Traffic Department. Also, every major artery in the City, and when the traffic coordination is completed, not only will High Ridge Road, Long Ridge Road, Newfield Avenue, and streets from the South End will all have to be intergrated into a single computerized operation.

MRS. MAIHOCK wanted to know if anyone knew of any problems with insurance claims should we do this as this is a State Road.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he would assume that the Legal Department is astute enough to take the precaution not to be doing anything in violation of the law.

MR. DARED MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on item 7 of Fiscal. The vote was 26 yes, 8 no; CARRIED.

MRS. HAWE MOVED that the following items be placed on the Consent Agenda; Items 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 22, 28, and 29. SECONDED. CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Anthony Conti and John Zelinski

MR. ZELINSKI reported that the Legislative and Rules Committee met on Wednesday evening, December 3, 1980, 7:30 p.m. Present were Reps. Blum, Fasanelli, Loomis, Pollard, Corbo, Donahue, Anthony Conti, Co-Chairman and John Zelinski, Co-Chairman. Excused was Rep. Wiederlight. Also, present were Rep. Maihock, Alice Perry, Asst. Corporation Counsel, Louis Casale and Atty. Douglas Strauss for the condominium owners, Atty. Richard Fitzmaurice and Monsignor Fiedorczyk and Atty. James Bingham and Mr. Alan Ketcham.

(1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RE CODE OF ETHICS (CONCERNING GIFTS TO OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY) - Submitted by Mayor Clapes, his letter 5/19/80 advising this is directed towards those actions discussed by Atty. Ralph Elliott in report to Mayor. Held in Committee 6/2, 7/7 and 8/4 for draft by Law Department. Held in Committee 9/3, 10/6, 11/10.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that this item is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. BOCCUZZI TOOK OVER THE CHAIR.

THE PRESIDENT stated that there were many issues she would have liked to speak on but as President refrained. She relinquished the Chair to MR. BOCCUZZI for this item so that she could engage in debate and made a motion to take this item out of the Legislative and Rules Committee so that it could be placed before the Board. SECONDED.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said after much thought, she decided to speak this evening. She believes that the President of any organization, or Legislative Rody should speak far and few between during meetings. She is speaking tonight because not publishing this ordinance is at the very heart why there is a crisis of confidence in government. She stated that nothing sabotages people faith in honest government more than the perception that their legislative body is reluctant to pass a law setting standards for ethical conduct in areas of conflicts of interest on the part of appointed and elected officials and their civil servants.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN pointed out that she is saying "perception". She was not saying this is the reality behind why there has been no movement on this. But, the perception is very oftentimes as critical as the reality. This is precisely what has happened in relation to the Code of Ethics Ordinance. She stated that this proposed law has sat in Committee for over half a year. Each month another word or another sentence is changed and another reason is given for not publishing. She stated that she is not attributing blame to anyone for this not being published and attributed it to circumstances.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN went on to say that last month the Board voted to send the Ordinance back to Committee and at that time, were assured that with intensive Committee work, this Ordinance would be ready for publication. Also, several chang were made by Corporation Counsel none of which significantly changed the intent of the law and none of which would have required re-publication.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said that we have the changes before us. We have recommendations before us and said that she contends that this Ordinance is now ready to go out to be published the Board to take this out of Committee so that it can finally be published so that the population of Stamford will have the opportunity of commenting upon it.

MR. CORBO thought the publication of this ordinance was long overdue. He stated that if you have the responsibility of being a Board Member, he didn't think anyone had to be afraid of disclosing whatever they owned. He believed the ordinance should be published as soon as possible. If published, the public would be aware of its contents.

MR. LOOMIS agreed with what MRS. GOLDSTEIN said. He stated that clean and efficient government being run properly is a very high concern of most citizens. He stated that the perception with this measure having sat in the Committee for so long for apparently so little reason, he would chellenge MR. ZELINSKI to tell the Board, specifically what is bad or improper or wrong in the language of this ordinance that demands that it remain in Committee. He thought there was little wrong with the proposed ordinance. Being held in Committee so long, people have not had the opportunity or chance a public hearing would afford them to have. He supported the remarks of MRS. GOLDSTEIN.

MRS. CONTI said she would like to see this removed from Committee for further discussion by the Board; after which the Board could decide to go with publication or not.

MR. FASANELLI stated he supports publication and MRS. GOLDSTEIN'S remarks. He did not believe there was justifiable reason why this ordinance should remain in Committee in longer. He further stated that progress on this could only be achieved by publication or removal from the Legislative and Rules Committee, and advocated publication.

MRS. PERILLO asked, through the CHAIRMAN, MR. ZELINSKI, why his Committee is holding this and what has been done from last month to this month.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Committee voted 4 in favor of publication and 4 against. That meant the other 4 voted to keep it in Committee. He said he was in favor of a Code of Ethics but not in favor of publishing something that is going to be changed. He said there were many changes made to this proposed ordinance, and publication should be made when almost in the final stages of the ordinance.

MR. LIVINGSTON stated that a letter from the Board of Ethics was received on November 5 urging the Board to pass the proposed legislation submitted by Corporation Counsel, and the opinion of the Board of Ethics should be respected. He thought the Board should move on on this as it has been around too long.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that he would hope that this is going to be held in Committee because he could not see spending approximately 500.00 to publish this and then have to re-publish. He stated that the public could attend any of his Committee meetings and speak and offer their opinions before any of the Committees. He mentioned the letters received from Atty. Bingham and Alan Ketcham, who is president of the Municipal Administrators Association, to hold this item because their contract is in negotiations and possible unfair labor practices.

MR. ZELINSKI also referred to the Mayor's letter of May 19th with the proposed ordinance, one and a quarter pages, which dealt with the topic. The Mayor mention his letter was based and directed toward the action discussed by Atty. Ralph Ellin his report to the Mayor.

MR. ZELINSKI said that Atty. Elliott state that an ordinance should be passed concerning gifts to officers and employees of the City of Stamford. He further stated that Corporation Counsel went well above and beyond that Atty. Elliott reported.

MR. BLUM spoke about Section 9 of the proposed ordinance "Outside or future employment". It read prior to this: "no officer or employee if it involves financial interest or personal interest to the employee, shall engage in any of the following activites and practices". He wanted to say that they now cross "no officers" out and basically an employee. He said he was against publication at this time as this would be a conflict of interest at this time because it is citing employees only.

MR. WIDER MOVED the question. SECONDED.

CHAIRMAN BOCCUZZI called for a machine vote. The vote was 19 yes, 13 no. The motion failed as 2/3's was needed.

MRS. LYONS stated the issue was important enough to bear repetition. The Ethic's Code as seen in publication by the public will have a very important impact on the way City Government is viewed. She felt it should be taken out of publication for the very reasons given to keep it in Committee. She stated that the input from the public would bring extensive revisions and we should give them the opportunity.

MR. DONAHUE said he agreed with his Colleagues who have spoken to take this out of Committee to publish. He said the proposed ordinance was one of the best kept secrets in Stamford. Those affected by this Code do not know its contents.

MR. CONTI said he was one of the ones that voted to hold this in Committee. His reason that each and everytime the Committee met, they had something new to work on. They did not have a Code of Ethics that was standing from one month to another. He went on to say about Mr. Cookney's letter of December 3rd with 9 copies of the revised Code of Ethics which was in response to changes suggested in the Committee meeting of November 19. There were changes made on 8 pages. The original Code of Ethics started out with one and a quarter pages and now is 15 pages long. He stated that he felt it should be published when correct and stated that the Legislative and Rules Committee worked long and hard on this Code.

MR. DARER acknowledged the difficult work on this proposed Code of Ethics, He stated the Constitution of the United States has been amended and laws have been made and modified.



MR. CORBO said that as a Member of the Legislative and Rules Committee he thought the Committee did not have enough time to digest all the changes, because of what the Committee has already done, we should publish.

MR. ZELINSKI asked for a POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE and for MR. CORBO'S correction, he stated that some of the corrections were made by the Committee but others were changes dealing with Section 9, pages 6 and 7 and page 14.

MR. WIDER MOVED the question. SECONDED.

CHAIRMAN BOCCUZZI called for a vote to take the item out of Committee, vote yes for out of Committee; if opposed, vote no.

CHAIRMAN BOCCUZZI announced the vote; 20 yes, 14 no; the item remained on the floor.

MR. DZIEZYC said before publication, he would like to make the following recommendations.

CHAIRMAN BOCCUZZI said a motion must be made to publish first. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC said he would like to amend this Code of Ethics by eliminating Section 7, the financial disclosure section. The reasons for the elimination of this Section was to prevent the exodus of honest, capable, willing and conscientious persons from City Government. He thought the requirement of persons to file a statement of their financial worth every year would discourage the honest man or woman from participating in voluntary work for our City. He went on to say that every public servant who serves Stamford voluntarily and those City employees required to file an annual statement of worth would be presumed guilty, and they have to prove their innocence by revealing what they own. Being opposed to this section, he stated that we are accused by Mayor Clapes and Corporation Counsel Cookney of having something to hide and resented this accusation. He further stated that the Mayor and Corporation Counsel are highly paid by the City and are questioning the integrity of some members of the Board of Representatives who are unpaid.

MR. DZIEZYC made a motion to delete this part of the Ordinance. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC went on further stating and pointing-out various instances about this Section, and urged his Colleagues to eliminate the financial disclosure section, Section 7.

MRS. CONTI said she would like plimit Mr. Dziezyc's amendment. What she had in mind was to delete the first paragraph of Section 7 only and substitute in lieu thereof: "any officer or employee against whom a charge of misconduct is filed with the Board of Ethics, shall if so ordered by the said Board of Ethics, file under penalty of false statement a disclosure of financial interest on a form to be prepared by Corporation Counsel", and then the next sentence would read "the statement of financial interest shall include the following information for the period of time specified by the Board of Ethics" and then just continue it as it is.

MRS. CONTI said she did not want to eliminate the disclosure entirely but only require a disclosure if a charge was filed against someone and the Board of Ethics felt that the charge was valid enough to require a disclosure.

MR. BOCCUZZI addressed Mr. Dziezyc and said that was amending his motion.

MR. DZIEZYC replied that he agreed with that motion and accepted it. SECONDED.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the speakers are to speak on the amendment only.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that looking at Section 7, page 5, the four things that are required of the individual to file, he does not see anything horrendous about it or so totally revealing; in reading it, you are not saying, in essence, how much money your worth or what your income is. He further stated that confidence must be reinstilled in elected and appointed officials.

MRS. GUROIAN asked for a POINT OF INFORMATION. She did not understand whether Mr. Weiderlight was opposed to the amendment or for it.

MR.WIEDERLIGHT said he was opposed to striking out Section 7, a, b, c, and d.

MRS. GUROIAN said that was not the amendment proposed.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that Mr. Wiederlight was opposed to Mrs. Conti's amendment to take that part of the Code of Ethics out.

MR.WIEDERLIGHT said that Mr. Boccuzzi's statement was correct.

MR. DARER said the implications that Mr. Dziezyc made were in gross error. He further stated that an Ordinance is a law and anyone that breaks the law can be investigated by the authorities.

MR. FAUTEUX said he would welcome putting down such items. He has nothing to hide, and most of us really have too much concern in that area.

MR. ZELINSKI asked that is the discussion relative to Rep. Dziezyc's motion or Rep. Betty Conti's motion.

MR. BOCCUZZI answered that the discussion was on Mrs. Conti's motion that was accepted by Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. ZELINSKI said this motion which was that only that which had to be . disclosed under Section 7 if somebody brought charges and asked if that was correct

MRS. CONTI said that she wanted to delete the first paragraph under Section 7 and substitute this language in its place. "Any officer or employee against whom a charge of misconduct is filed with the Board of Ethics, shall if so ordered by the said Board of Ethics, file under penalty of false statement a disclosure of financial interest on a form to be prepared by Corporation Counsel.



MRS. CONTI (continuing) said she would change the following sentence:
"The statement of financial interest shall include the following information
for the time period specified by the Board of Ethics" and the remainder would
stay as it is.

MR. ZELINSKI said he supported that amendment very strongly and his reasons were: (1) On two previous occasions, Corporation Counsel Cookney when attending the L&R meetings, was asked the question if this Code of Ethics would be enforceable and do the job without Section 7 included at all and on both occasions in front of all the Committee members, he stated "yes". (2) Due to himself and Rep. Maihock, he requested our Researcher to get copies of the various Code of Ethics of the five major cities in the State of Connecticut, i.e., Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury and also Greenwich and New Canaan and all the ordinances they have on the books pertaining to Code of Ethics, which apply to their officers and employees, only two Codes; one in New Haven and one in Greenwich, even address the question of any type of financial disclosure. New Haven and Greenwich ordinances said simply what Rep. Conti is now proposing; in the event of a possible conflict, the particular person involved, would then have to file in that particular case, any financial interest on any particular item that would be coming before the Board.

MR. ZELINSKI said he thought this was fine and hoped the rest of the Board would support that amendment.

MR. LIVINGSTON said it would be unthinkable to pass a Code of Ethics when we don't have any means or avenues to bring out financial situations.

MR. ESPOSITO said he was opposed to this amendment because it strikes at the very heart of what the Code of Ethics is especially for elected officials. He further stated that when we run for public office, we ask for public trust and when we ask for that public trust, we must be willing to give up something. What has to be given up is some of our privacy. The Community should know what our vested interests are if they are to know and trust us.

MRS. GUROIAN addressed her remarks to Mr. Esposito and said he stated that when we run for office, we have to give up something for the privlege of serving the Community. She said that we give up plenty with a lot of time, effort and energy not even considering the time and energy spent in committee work for which we are not paid.

MRS. GUROIAN said this was a voluntary effort because we are Community minded, and to say that further than that, it is incumbent on us to disclose every bit or our finances so that the public can make conversation out of it and use it for or against us.

MRS. GUROIAN stated that if a question of a conflict of interest is raised and the Board of Ethics so deems that financial matters must be disclosed, that is time enough for financial assests or income be disclosed at that time. She further commented that if you are poor, somebody is going to say you are a failure and you don't deserve to be elected and if you are rich, somebody is going to say you are rich and shouldn't be elected because you don't understand the poor person.

MRS. GUROIAN further stated that Mrs. Conti's proposal is adequate and should fulfill the requirements that anybody has in so far as disclosure goes and supports Mrs. Conti in her efforts.

MR. CORBO said he believed if Section 7 was deleted or changed that we might face some problems because a conflict of interest charge should be supported by somekind of a disclosure of financial interest. The financial disclosure is to prove that your in conflict or not, therefore I think this article 7 will be destroying the purpose of this Ordinance.

MR. DeNICOLA: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to make a MOTION to ADJOURN.

MR. BOCCUZZI: You're in the middle of a vote, we will first have to finish the vote at least on Mrs. Conti's amendment.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I will agree to that.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked Mrs. Conti to read her amendment again before the vote. Mr. Boccuzzi called for a vote. The MOTION has been CARRIED, 14 yes; 13 no.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like to make a MOTION to ADJOURN the meeting.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED. LOST. 9 yes; 20 no. We will continue on the original motion.

MR. FASANELLI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. We will now vote for Publication of the Code of Ethic Ordinance as amended. The MOTION has been CARRIED, 27 yes; 1 no; 4 abstentions.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING GARBAGE COLLECTION FOR CONDOMINIUMS AND MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS, TAX CREDIT, ETC. Approve for publication 10/6/80. Held in Committee 11/10/80.
- MR. ZELINSKI said Item #2 was HELD IN COMMITTEE.
- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING PURCHASE OF PROPERTY ON EASTERLY SIDE OF SPRUCE ST. ADJACENT TO CARWIN PARK, to be purchased for \$75,000 from Captial Non-Recurring Fund, per Mayor Clapes' letter 10/22/80; includes appraisal and sales/purchase contract.
- MR. ZELINSKI said L&R voted 8 in favor for final adoption with an amendment which would state this is contingent upon Bd. of Finance approving the \$75,000.00 and I so MOVE.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES (cont.)

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he was against the amendment. He feels our Board should act on its own and not depend on whether or not the Bd. of finance approve. Mr. Mr. Livingston made a motion that we delete the amendment that was made by the L&R Committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED. Mr. Boccuzzi called for a vote to delete the amendment. The MOTION HAS BEEN CARRIED, 12 yes; 10 no. We will now go to the original motion.

MR. FASANELLI: MOVE THE QUESTION.

MR. BOCCUZZI: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. This vote takes 2/3 or 21 votes for Final Adoption. The MOTION has been DENIED, 20 yes; 5 no; 2 abstentions.

(4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - TAX EXEMPTION FOR CHURCH OF THE HOLY N. OF JESUS, located on Henry St. Submitted by Atty. R. H. Fitzmaurice.

MR. ZELINSKI said L&R voted 8 in favor for publication, and would also like to WAIV PUBLICATION since this was a small amount and had been done before and I so MOVE.

PRESIDENT Goldstein said to waive publication would require 27 votes and there were not 27 members present.

MR. ZELINSKI said he then MOVE for publication.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. (1 abstention, Mrs. Conti)

(5) REQUEST FOR WAIVER AND REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OPERATING ROOM AND RECOVERY ROOM AT ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL, Rolf Mark Controller, letter 10/31/80. Check #3509 for \$2,400. paid-10/24/80.

MR. ZELINSKI said his Committee voted 8 in favor and he so MOVES.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

(6) UPDATE OF SNOW REMOVAL ORDINANCE - request of John R. Zelinski.

Mr. Zelinski said his Committee did not take any action on this but he sent a letter to Commissioner Spaulding.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) Item #1 was taken up under Suspenion of Rules, see page 5.
- (2) LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN THE AFSCE LOCAL 1083, AFL-CIO & COUNCIL 4, CUSTODIANS AND MECHANICS UNION AND THE CITY OF STAMFORD for period July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1982. 7% effective July 1, 1980; 7% effective July 1, 1981; 2% effective Sept. 1, 1980. Bd. of Finance's advisory opinion recommended.approval.unaimously. Official receipt date of contract at Representatives' office is 11/5/60.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked the Clerk to please call the Roll. She said there were 21 members present and very few items left and thanked all who remained. President Goldstein asked Mr. Blum to continue with his report.

MR. BLUM said his Committee voted 5 to 0 to ratify this contract.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED.CARRIED. 20 yes; 1 abstention (B. Conti)

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

(1) PETITION FROM RESIDENTS OF SWAMPSCOTT ROAD requesting that Chapter 64
PROCEDURES BE INSTITUTED FOR ACCEPTANCE OF THIS ROAD BY THE CITY.
Accousti and Vingan houses are not included in this petition. Resolution to be approved to begin this procedure. Submitted by petitioner Wilma Senete.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(2) This item was taken up under Suspension of Rules, see page 7.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Alfred Perillo and Everett Pollard

MR. PERILLO said his Committee met on December 4, 1980. Present were Committee members Pollard, Perillo and Roos. Absent were Flounders Lyons, Kunsaw and DeNicola Also present were Reps. Goldstein, Stork, Dziezyc, Maihock and Wider. Mr. Perillo said the purpose of the meeting was to looked into matters which are on the agenda. Present to appear before the committee were homowners who are affected by a conditional of the City and damaging to their property.

(1) LETTER FROM DPW COMM. BRUCE SPAULDING OF OCT. 1, 1980 re NEGLECT OF SOUTH END AND WATERSIDE.

MR. PERILLO said Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE because Comm. Spaulding failed to attend the meeting.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (cont.)

46.

(2) REQUEST OF 11/19/80 FROM REP. STORK re STREET REPAIR WORK AT 87 LEONARD STREET AND PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH PORTO.

HELD IN COMMITTEE - REPORT MADE

(3) DRAINAGE PROBLEMS OF MR. & MRS. GROGGINS OF PEPPER RIDGE RD.

MR. PERILLO said Items #2 and #3 being related with one another were heard by his Committee. He also said Rep. Maihock appeared to speak on an issue on Erskine Road of the same condition.

MR. PERILLO went on to say this Administration has been in office for 5 years, and asked when do these people get some relief of this situation. He also said it is true that we had three Public Works Commissioners in this Administratio and never has one taken the position of not meeting with the Public Works Committe Mr. Perillo said the Committee has to disagree with Commissioner Spaulding that these were not appropriate matters for discussion with the Public Works Committee He said as elected officials representing their districts dave responsibilities to these duties. Mr. Perillo said to meet for over two hours with these people and their problems and not have a representative from the City to answer, I think it's time for the Mayor to take some action.

MR. BOCCUZZI made a MOTION that the President send a letter to the Mayor with copi to Commissioner Spaulding telling him of our problem and that if he sees fit not to attend meetings, this Board will not look favorably in the future upon any appropriations for Public Works.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

(1) PROBLEM OF LOW WATER PRESSURE WHICH IS INADEQUATE FOR FIRE PREVENTION OR FIRE FIGHTING, which Dolphin Cove Assn. sent to Fire Chief Vitti. Submitted by Rep. J. Boccuzzi. Letter from Stamford Water Co. advises their share will cost about \$30,000 and that pavement replacement will run about \$20,000. Committee will make further reports.

MRS. SANTY said the Item #1 was being HELD IN COMMITTEE for monitoring.

- (2) LETTER FROM PARK MANOR'S OWNER, WM. J. FITZPATRICK TO REP. JEANNE LOIS SANTI RE THEIR ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO SERVE THE ELDERLY, ETC., AT A MUCH LOWER COST THAN PUBLIC HOUSING 8/8/80.
- MRS. SANTY said Item #2 was being HELD IN COMMITTIEE.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

(1) CONSIDERATION OF PROBLEM OF DUCK HUNTING AND DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS AT COVE ISLAND PARK.

MR. DeLUCA said his Committee met on December 8, 1980, and Committee wembers presen were Reps. Pollard, Perillo, Rinaldi. Also present were Reps. Donahue, Roos, Officer Thomas Eddy, Connecticut Humane Society, area residents, and a member of the National Rifle Assoc., Ted Santy.

MR. DeLUCA said he talked to Officer Eddy on Thursday, 12/4/80 and he informed Mr. DeLuca that it is a very strong possibility that Duck Hunting would be stopped in the very near future at Cove Island. I will be in contact with Mr. Eddy this week and will give a follow-up report at our next meeting.

EDUCATION , WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

NO REPORT

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight

NO REPORT

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

NO REPORT

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

NO REPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

NO REPORT

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby

NO REPORT



TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

(1) PASSAGE OF RESOLUTION NO. 1341 RE CONDEMNATION OF PARCELS OF LAND LOCATED ON NEWFIELD AVE., COLONIAL ROAD, HIGH RIDGE ROAD, VINE ROAD, and FIFTH ST. Resolution approved 10/6/80.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that Mr. Joyce has left the meeting but on the Agenda remains a very important item, the passage of this Resolution. President Goldstein then asked Mr. Donahue for a motion.

MR. DONAHUE said there are a number of parcels taking of properties through-out the Strawberry Hill, Vine Road, High Ridge Road area which will allow the city to eventually installed right hand turn lanes and speed up the flow of traffic. I would MOVE for passaage.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED, 20 yes; 1 abstention (Mrs. Conti)

ON-SITE GARBAGE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman Fiorenzio Corbo

NO REPORT

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - Grace Guroian and John Hogan Co-Chairpersons

MRS. GUROIAN said the Committee, John Hogan, Mary Lou Rinaldi and herself met with Commissioner Hoffman regarding his letter. She said Commissioner Hoffman is going to seek assistance in prepairing some kind of change to the Charter at which time when he submits that to the Committee we will review it at that time.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

NONE

PETITIONS

NONE

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

November 10, 1980 Regular Board Meeting

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a MOTION to accept the minutes. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

RESOLUTIONS

(1) Changing the date of the Regular Monthly Board Meeting from January 5, 1981 to January 12, 1981.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to change the meeting date.

PRESIDENT: MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS

NONE

OLD BUSINESS

NONE

NEW BUSINESS

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 1:50 A.M.

16th Board of Representatives

CMT AK

APPROVED:

Note: Above meeting was broadcast by ____ Radio WSTC and WYRS in its entirety.

Sandra Goldstein, President 16th Board of Representatives

50,					J	/)		10			יטי <u>י</u> ניטיי												- 6	10	me	mb	et:)	2									
*)			- _T -	7	7-	7-	1	7	7	7	1		1	7				<u>i</u>	T		7-	7	1	i	1-7				ī	_i -	-,-				; - i		-1-	ī	PAGE 1 of 3 Monday
	Disc./ Party	0:	,	2 - 13	11	200	17	101		2 - 17	2	101	2 - 15	8 - 11	2 - 14	0 - 12	R = 19	3 - 10	- 0				R - 14	g - 15	R - 20	0 - 2	0 - 6	6 - 0	12	11:-	200	1	5 - 5	7 - 0	0 - 3	91 - 0	191 - 0		HEETLING Regular Board Heeting
																	ļ																				PRESIDENT		Changes in Senting!
												_			96					9															. Jr.	le!	- PRES		
	bers	1	30.0	dures	Jac.	200	381041	40.5	21.1	10		ne-Loi	ç	Auo	ert Ga	-	drey	h	-	Anni	JA CAL		90210	12	Derc	,	Achar	Idred	ı.i	ĮĮ.	ry Jane	10000	y Lou	-31d	rald T.	Mch.	Sandra		
	Yen	Berr.	100	i.	SPan		315	25.5	TO	. Dor	, Lebe	Jean	Ph11	Anch	A. Rob	John	X. Au	i Rei	701r	4777 A	77	. John	Fior	C. Pa	IX, Rol	Hand	LLI.	D, Y	David	77. 30			í, Yar	X, Ge	E., Doc	LIGHT	TIN		CODE:
				ET DUN	SARES C	X T V	DOT 1	1040	FSPOS	80(T.3)	8008	SATT	STORK	CONTI	Deluc	HOCAN	NA THO	LOOME	LYONS.	SUMME	ROCAL	KINSK	CORBO	DZIEZY	FAUTEL	DIXON,	FASANT	PERILL	BLUM.	<u> </u>	STUNCT	117.00	LINALD	RYBNIC	DONALIT	VI.DES	GOLDST		\ = Abstalning. { = YES vote. ! = NO vote.
	NO	-16	1			, ,	<u> </u>	α	, 0	10		17	13	17	21	16		128	61	3	16	12	27	25	26	27	28	29	ရှု	33	35		35	36	37	33	1,3		VOTING SUBJECT; HOTTOMS, ETC.
To	5	Y	Y	()	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y 1	r	Y 0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y)	Y		TESTING
	WG	Ni	N	1 1	4 N	N	1 0	N	ıN	N	Λ	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N 1	I	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N I	N	N (N	N	N	N	N	N I	1 N		TESTING
#	1	Y	Y	Y 1	Y	Y	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X 1	r	Y	0	Y	Y)	X	Y	Y	Y		Blum Motion to Approve FIREFIGHTERS (2) 1abor contractAPPROVED UNAN. 38 Yes.
H	2	N	۸ :	Y 1	Y	0	0	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	YY	Y	Y	0	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	A I	4	r o	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		#1 Fiscal W.I.C. Program REsolution to apply for funding. APPROVED: 28 yes:
dt.	3	N A	A I	()	Y	0	0	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N 1	rh	ro	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y 1	Y	1	#2 Fiscal \$149,467 W.I.C.; APPROVED 31 Yes; 3 No; 2 Abstentions.
#	*	N I	N I	()	Y	0	O	Y	Y	Y	N.	N	N	N	N	Y	A	Y	YY	Y	N	0	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N 1	F: V	7 0	N	N	¥	Y	Y	Y 1	Y	****	Fiscal #7 \$55,000 Resolution High Ridge Signal System; DENIED: 22 Yes; 3 No; 3 Abstentions. (needed 2/3) (SEE VOTE TALLY #10 - APPROVED UPON
H.	5	Y			Y	P	0	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	λ	A	Y	Y	¥ ·	YY	Y	Ť	Ü	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y '	Y 1	· Y	(0	٨	Y	Y	Y	Y	r y	Y	i	Fiscal #16 \$3,000 SNF Smith House. #5 Approved; 31 Yes; 2 No; 3 Abstentions.
#	(:	N /	١ ١	! N	Y	b	0	A	N	N		N	N	N	N	0 1	V 1	1 1	Y	N	Y	0	A I	N		N 3	Y 1	r N	N	0	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N N	Y		Motion to Move the Question on Fiscal #26 on amendment to put out to bid; DENIED: 12 Yes; 19 No; 4 Abstentions.
			į								2.																							1	6.		1		continued