

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 1981

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, AUGUST 3, 1981, in the Legislative Chambers of the 16th Board of Representatives in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:52 P.M. by President Sandra Goldstein after both political parties had met in caucus.

Just before the meeting was called to order, Scutti Photographers took a group photograph of the 16th Board of Representatives members.

INVOCATION: Given by Rev. Sweppie Mal-Bon of the United Methodist Church of Darien, 345 Middlesex Road, Darien, Connecticut.

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

ROLL CALL: Clerk Annie M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 36 present and 4 absent at the time of Roll Call. Absent were Reps. Darer (who resigned at this meeting, being replaced by Mrs. Ann King Saxe), Bowlby, Joyce, and Stork (who came in at 10:13 P.M.).

The President declared a QUORUM was present.

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

PAGES: MISS VIRGINIA HAWE, 7th grader at St. Gabriel's School, and the daughter of City Rep. Marie Hawe.

MISS MARYBETH WOODTKE, 8th grader at Our Lady Star of the Sea School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late FRANK CAPUTO, requested by Reps. Annie Summerville and Handy Dixon.

For the late MICHAEL WALDEN, requested by Rep. David Blum.

VITAL STATISTICS:

Rep. Annie M. Summerville extended the congratulations and best wishes of the Board to a new father, Kevin Roche, of the WSTC-WYRS Radio Station on the birth of a new son, JESSE ROCHE, expressing the hope that young Jesse will some day follow in his father's footsteps and report the activities of this legislative body.

RESIGNATION OF STANLEY DARER (R-13)

THE PRESIDENT said she received the following letter from Mr. Darer under date of August 1, 1981:

"It is with sincere regret that I must tender my resignation as a member of the Board. In April my firm asked me to accept an important and challenging assignment which necessitated a change in direction of my career from Sales to Management.

"After two months of extensive training I have recently been appointed to the New York Sales Office at One Liberty Plaza in New York. This is Merrill Lynch's largest office (incidentally, it is by itself larger than many brokerage firms) with approximately three hundred personnel.

"My service on the 15th Board and the current Board have been meaningful to me and I hope that my work has been helpful to the people of Stamford.

"Susan and I are happy that we have not been transferred, and that we will continue to live in Stamford. Perhaps in the days to come we will be able to serve again.

"Best wishes to my fellow Board members. I wish you all good health and happiness. Sincerely, Stanley P. Darer."

THE PRESIDENT said it was with a great deal of sadness that she and the Board accept Mr. Darer's resignation. Mr. Darer has served for many years with a great deal of distinction and he will be sorely missed.

MR. DIXON said this comes as a total surprise to him and he personally will miss Mr. Darer who served so faithfully on the Appointments Committee, as well as the Housing and Community Development Committee.

MR. FLOUNDERS has been a wise and distinguished member of this Board, as well as a good friend and a personal mentor and he will be missed.

MRS. McINERNEY said Mr. Darer has always been a devoted public servant. The numerous hours that he gave to this service and the Community Development Office and staff will have ramifications and outstanding benefits to this City for many years to come. As a Republican, she will miss him in their caucus as she has always found him someone that she could rely on and turn to whenever advice and courage were necessary. She wished him the best of luck.

MR. WIDER said he is a little full as he has lost an arm in losing Mr. Darer. He was wonderful to work with and wonderful to have for a friend. He is glad for Mr. Darer in his career opportunity, but he is sorry we are losing the quality and dedication that he gave.

MR. ROOS, too, will miss Mr. Darer, who was on the same committee with him, and agrees with the sentiments expressed by the speakers before him.

ELECTION OF ANN KING SAXE, 15 Halliwell Drive, 06902 (323-3621)

MR. FLOUNDERS nominated Ms. Ann Saxe to complete Mr. Darer's unexpired term on the Board. Ms. Saxe has been a resident of Stamford and the 13th District for the past 12 years. She has been active in the National Junior Tennis League. She is a real estate professional who has had an accounting background both in terms of experience and training. She is a graduate of Packard Junior College, New York City. He MOVED for her appointment to the 13th District vacancy. There were many Seconds.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED to close nominations. Seconded. Carried.

THE PRESIDENT asked the Clerk to cast one ballot on behalf of ANN KING SAXE. She administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Saxe, who then took her seat on the floor of the Board.

MS. SAXE said she wished to thank the Reverend for his prayers as she felt they all need them and she needs all the help she can get, and she will be happy to try and fill Stanley Darer's shoes.

THE PRESIDENT said with Ms. Saxe's appointment, there are now 37 members present and 3 absent.

STANDING COMMITTEES

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, July 20, 1981 in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to Order at 7:40 P.M. at which time a Quorum was present. Majority Leader JOHN BOCCUZZI called the meeting to Order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

John J. Boccuzzi, Acting Chairman and Majority Leader	Jeanne-Lois Santy
Annie M. Summerville, Clerk	Robert Gabe DeLuca
Handy Dixon	Robert Fauteux
John Zelinski	Audrey Maihock
David Blum	Marie Hawe
Donald Donahue	Everett Pollard
Alfred Perillo	Anthony Conti
Michael Wiederlight	Philip Stork
Lathon Wider, Sr.	Peter Blais
Barbara McInerney, Minority Leader	Fiorenzo Corbo
	Mary Lou Rinaldi

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(1) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 4 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Two items were ordered HELD: (a) Matter of Agent Orange Victims; and (b) Complaint Regarding Improper Dump on Fahey Street being held for next month.

(2) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the 4 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(3) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda: Inquiry into past functioning of the Smith House Nursing Facility.

(4) SEWER MATTERS

FOUR items were ORDERED ON THE AGENDA, being the three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and the one item on the addenda to same.

(5) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

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

(6) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

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

(7) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

There were no items to be considered.

(8) CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(9) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 13 names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, two of which were corrections of expiration dates of previously-approved appointments. ORDERED held for September was Sybil Taccone for the Human Rights Committee. While Edward Greenberg for the Tax Review appeared on the Tentative Agenda, he had been approved July 6, 1981, so his name was removed.

(10) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 14 items, 13 of which appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda, and the one item on the addenda thereto.

(11) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first eight items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The ninth item was HELD IN COMMITTEE, being publication of an ordinance for sale of City-owned property on east side of Hurricane Barrier, south of Seaview Avenue. Also ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were two items: (a) Publication of tax abatement ordinance for Nature Conservancy, which appeared on the addenda to the Steering Agenda; and (b) Publication of tax abatement ordinance for Church of God at 690 Pacific Street.

(12) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(13) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

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

(14) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on Tentative Steering Agenda.

(15) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED off the Agenda permanently was the matter of contingency plans in case of loss of power at Cos Cob Sub-Station.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(16) ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION STUDY MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item submitted by Mr. Corbo, being a resolution from Commissioner Spaulding re the re-submission of a fiscal request for \$90,000 (Capital Projects Budget) for a Solid Waste Plan, Phase II.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made. SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 P.M.

JOHN J. BOCCUZZI, ACTING CHAIRMAN AND
MAJORITY LEADER

JJB:HM

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman

MRS. SANTY said they have held five meetings to discuss this ordinance and they are aware of an existing water shortage, but it is essential to hold this in committee. However, they have reviewed this with Corporation Counsel and there are many questions remaining that need answers. They expect to have a finalized ordinance for the Board at the October meeting.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL ADOPTING REGULATIONS RESTRICTING USE OF WATER DURING WATER SHORTAGE. Submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes. Held in Committee since January, 1981. Held 7/6.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. SANTY said that Michael Wiederlight and Everett Pollard are working diligently on item #2, but because of the complexities, it is unlikely they will be able to approve this concept before the December meeting. However, a detailed report will be made and it is expected the new Board coming in will accept this concept in January.

- (2) REPORT ON CREATION OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. SANTY said the Committee met on this, and then Mrs. Santy and Mr. Bocuzzi met with Jim McInerney, President of the Water Company; Leonard Cookney, Corporation Counsel; and Public Works Commissioner Spaulding. They hope to resolve this problem by next month.

- (3) REPORT ON DOLPHIN COVE WATER SUPPLY. Submitted by Rep. John J. Bocuzzi 6/5/81. Held 7/6/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. SANTY said this Task Force was organized in February, 1981 by the Mayor. There have been seven regular meetings and seven sub-committee meetings. Its recommendation is in Barry Boodman's this very moment being drafted. Although he is on vacation, it will be ready September, or at the very latest, our October meeting. She said the committee members are very competent and conscientious and she considers them unsung heroes.

MRS. SANTY said she would like to name these members: Investigator Carl Alton, Stamford Police Department; Fire Marshal Robert Weaver, Glenbrook Fire Department; Fire Marshal John Keenan, Long Ridge Fire Department; Fire Marshal Tom Russell, Springdale Fire Department; Fire Marshal Steve Heilner, Turn-of-River Fire Department; Fire Marshal Carmine Speranza, Stamford Fire Department; Chief Dan Remling, Belltown Fire Department; Deputy Fire Marshal Peter Brown; Fire Inspector Dick Woods; Lawrence James, Building Facility Manager of GTE; Gerald Sarnelli, DeLuca Construction Co.; Paul Sternbach, Architect; Jim Sotire, Building Inspector, City of Stamford; and Chief Joe Vitti of the Stamford Fire Department, Chairman of this group.

(4) STATUS REPORT - FIRE TASK FORCE. Held 6/22/81

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. SANTY said that concludes her Committee Report.

THE PRESIDENT said she wanted the Board to know that Mrs. Santy was part of that Task Force and put in the same long hours that the other members of the Task Force put in and she wished to thank Mrs. Santy.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if the Board members would be receiving a copy of the rough draft before the Corporation Counsel draws up the ordinance or regulation.

MRS. SANTY said the ordinance, not a rough draft, will be sent to the members at least two weeks before the Committee acts on it.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if recommendations he made back in February, which he considered important, are incorporated in this report.

MRS. SANTY said that every recommendation that the Committee received, and she believes there were at least 150, were looked into and discussed by the Committee, and the essence of the vital issues were made a part of the report. Mr. Boodman will have the final draft ready by September, or October at the latest.

THE PRESIDENT announced that the MEA will be having a blood drawing tomorrow from 10 to 3 at Rice School, and anyone listening is urged to contribute.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA said his Committee met on Monday, July 27th; present were Reps. Pollard, Perillo; also Parks Supt. Bob Cook. He Moved to put items 2 and 4 on the Consent Agenda.

- (1) RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OF LAWN AVENUE PARK FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY TO THE PARKS DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6-17 OF THE GENERAL ORDINANCES OF THE CITY. Mayor's letter 6/3/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

MR. DeLUCA said the Committee voted 3-0 for approval of item #1, pending receipt of a letter from Community Development that they would pay for the cost of installing the rubber matting. Since receiving their letter committing themselves to complete the job at their own expense, he would vote for approval, with one exception. At the bottom of the resolution, they would like to add one sentence: "Said park to be hereafter known as THE ANGRIS McKEITHEN PARK," in honor of a Special Police Officer who died of gunshot wounds while aiding the elderly in a robbery, and he so Moves.

THE PRESIDENT said there are special regulations to be followed in the naming or re-naming of a park.

MR. DeLUCA said he was not aware of this, stating that the Parks Department made this recommendation, in the hope that this entire matter could be concluded in the one resolution.

THE PRESIDENT said she would accept the amendment and if there is anything that was overlooked, they will correct that next month, and she hopes there is not.

THE PRESIDENT said she will hear anyone who wishes to speak on the amendment only.

MR. DIXON said he was under the impression that that park was already named after Mr. McKeithen; and he would like Mr. DeLuca to respond if he knows whether that park or any other park was named after Mr. McKeithen.

MR. DeLUCA said this was the recommendation of the Parks Department, and from their correspondence, it was logical to assume that they would not name two parks after the same person.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said there were a lot of releases in the paper and City officials were urged to do that, but it was never done, and that is probably where Mr. Dixon got the impression that it had happened.

MR. PERILLO said this is to finalize the naming of the park.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amendment. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote). She then called for a vote on the main motion, the resolution with the amendment. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER ST. IN FRONT OF PANCAKE HOUSE from Oct. 23rd to Nov. 8. 1981 by Women of St. Francis Episcopal Church (2810 Long Ridge Road) to advertise their ANNUAL ANTIQUES SHOW. Submitted by Carol B. Rice, 128 Guinea Road, Cos Cob 06907; letter received 6/30/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REPEALING CODE SECTIONS 14-4 (b) through (h) to eliminate duplication; they submit a regulation to be adopted in accordance with Section 15-1 - submitted by E. J. Condon, Business Manager, Parks Dept. 6/22/81.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED to amend the proposed ordinance to include 14-4 (i) so that it will read we are repealing Code Sections 14-4 (b) through (i) (rather than through (h) only). This is in accordance with a letter of July 24th from the Parks Dept. MOVED. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for vote on the amendment. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

MR. DeLUCA MOVED to WAIVE PUBLICATION and APPROVE FINAL ADOPTION. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Waive Publication. APPROVED with 29 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 4 Abstentions. Mrs. Santy will be shown as a Yes vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion of Mr. DeLuca for FINAL ADOPTION of the proposed ordinance. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote).

- (4) OUR LADY OF MONTISERRAT CHURCH'S REQUEST OF 7/15/81 TO USE STREET KNOWN AS SUBURBAN AVENUE (BEHIND THE CHURCH) FOR A TWO-DAY BAZAAR (FROM SATURDAY, AUGUST 29th, 6:00 P.M. to Midnight; and SUNDAY, AUGUST 30th, 2:00 P.M. to 11:30 P.M.). Their rectory is only house left on Suburban Ave. which ends at Forest St. This is a fund-raising event for the church. Fr. Roderick Brennan.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED to approve Items 2 and 4 on the Consent Agenda. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA said he would like to conclude his report by stating that if the members were to take a ride to Latham Park, they would find that the banner poles are up and the banners hanging; and that Jim Ford has kept his word for August 1st.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO GIVE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT AT THIS TIME.

MR. POLLARD Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item out of order on the Agenda, being the Public Works Committee report. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on this Motion. CARRIED.

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

- (1) THE MATTER OF DISCONTINUANCE OF CITY GARBAGE COLLECTION SERVICE TO COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN STAMFORD. Requested 7/8/81 by Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi.

MR. PERILLO asked that the record show that Reps. Mildred and Alfred Perillo have left the floor of the Board at this time so there will be no possible appearance of a conflict-of-interest.

MR. POLLARD said the Public Works Committee met Thursday, July 23, 1981, in the Public Works Conference Room. Present were eleven City Representatives: Hawe, Hogan, Kunsaw, Rinaldi, Pollard, Blais, Flounders, Boccuzzi, Corbo, Blum, and Roos. Also present was Public Works Commissioner Bruce Spaulding.

MR. POLLARD said the meeting was called in response to a letter from Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi, the purpose being to encourage the Public Works Commissioner to restore City garbage collection service to the commercial properties which were discontinued on July 1st. The numbers of those properties are:

- 29 apartments and condominiums
- 223 stores
- 159 commercial establishments
- ? an unknown number of non-conforming residents

The briefest summary that Mr. Pollard can give is the Commissioner stated a number of times the service to stores and apartments was discontinued because the Board of Finance cut the budget by \$90,000. The consequence of that budget cut was that he had to reduce the number of garbage trucks and crews from eleven to ten. The Committee certainly prodded the Commissioner in a variety of ways, including acknowledging the possibility of human error. We pointed out that during the budget process, where so many facts and figures are being considered, either there was a mis-communication between the Commissioner and the Board of Finance, or the Board of Finance may have made a legitimate error. We asked the Commissioner if, in order to overcome that error, he would re-submit his request for \$90,000, and he said he would not. We asked him that a number of times, and he continually said he would not. Again, he continually said that, because of the \$90,000 budget cut, he had to reduce the number of trucks and crew that collect garbage from eleven to ten.

MR. POLLARD said that the result of the Committee's action at that point in time was unanimously to issue a resolution to the Mayor, asking for restoration of the services within 15 days, and that 15 days has not yet expired.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD continued to say that the second action by the Public Works Committee was a request to the Corporation Counsel for his opinion as to whether or not the Commissioner had violated the Charter, inasmuch as those people live in districts where they are entitled to garbage collection.

Subsequent events occurred. The Commissioner apparently made some statements regarding me on the radio. I didn't hear the statement, but it did precipitate people telephoning me, including a number of City employees, and more particularly, people who work in the Public Works Department. Their words to me were that the Commissioner didn't tell all. He didn't tell all, because in fact there were still eleven garbage trucks and eleven crews just as there had been before July 1st when the service was curtailed. They felt that his attack on me was an attempt on his part to change the subject. There were more than one phone call, let me establish that.

The Commissioner, was asked by the Committee if he had laid off that eleventh crew. He said no, he had not; that he had re-assigned them to other areas within the Public Works Domain. The statements made to Mr. Pollard by the phone callers were that there were eleven garbage trucks and eleven crews still, despite the \$90,000 budget cut. No one had been re-assigned; and in fact, the crew that generally collects the stores and apartments on a route that is commonly known in that department as the "Center Route" were not working the typical four to six hours per day, but instead were working two hours or less on Wednesdays and Saturdays when the Center Route is collected.

Well, there were several sources for that information, but the end result was that on Saturday, other observers and I went down to the Sanitation Station at 3:45 in the morning. From 3:45 until 6:00, the other observers counted eleven garbage trucks leaving the Sanitation area. In addition, to that, I followed the Center Route truck which, that day, was Truck #365. That truck and crew worked for less than two hours.

Following those observations, I returned to the Garbage Collection Office where it was reaffirmed to me by people in that office that eleven trucks and crews have been working without any change. Nothing has been changed except for the elimination of garbage collection for stores and apartments. The rosters that are maintained, maintain eleven crews. The Scale House receipts are alleged to contain records for eleven trucks coming in every single day except Sundays.

I attempted to obtain at that time, copies of the rosters and the Scale House records, but was denied them. The people there felt that I should ask the Commissioner today. So today I asked the Administrative Assistant to go to the Commissioner's Office and request those reports. I received a letter tonight from the Commissioner which states that this is an extensive amount of information; that it is impossible to have the information today; he expects to get it done in less than a week. I intend, as a result of this action, to schedule another meeting of the Public Works Committee, assuming the Steering Committee and the other members of this Board have no objection, so that the Commissioner can be confronted with what I have learned, what I have seen, and with what other people have seen, and what other people have said. I think that the people who have been paying taxes, who are entitled to those services, should get them.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD went on to say that the Commissioner, somehow or other, seems determined to get out of the garbage collection business, despite the wishes of the people, and the obvious wishes of the elected officials on the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives. At any rate, that is my report.

MRS. CONTI asked how many of the properties mentioned in the report are in compliance with Section 18.1 - 18.5 of the Code of Ordinances.

MR. POLLARD said at the beginning of his report, he mentioned the number of establishments that were denied service that they previously had. He presumed that because they previously had the service, they were conforming. There were 29 apartments and condominiums, 223 stores, 159 commercial establishments, and an unknown number of non-conforming residences.

MRS. CONTI asked what did Mr. Pollard mean by non-conforming residences.

MR. POLLARD said that information was provided by the Commissioner of Public Works and Mrs. Conti would have to ask Mr. Spaulding.

MRS. CONTI said she presumed Mr. Spaulding meant those who were not in compliance with the ordinances. She is assuming, also, that Mr. Pollard is asking Mr. Spaulding to provide services to people who are not complying with our laws.

MR. POLLARD said that that is Mrs. Conti's assumption. What the Committee asked him to do was to restore the collection service that he provided prior to July 1, 1981.

MRS. CONTI said this was not an assumption because Mr. Pollard has not answered how many of these people are or are not in compliance with Section 18-1 through 18-5 of the Code of Ordinances, and if he cannot answer that question, it must be assumed that they perhaps they are not in compliance.

MRS. GUORIAN asked if this^{is} a report that Mr. Pollard is giving, or is it going to be followed by a motion.

MR. POLLARD said this was a report, as he said at the end of the Committee report.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he has two letters, one from a business establishment dated 7/1/81 inquiring about the garbage collection; and upon inquiry, this person learned from a Mr. Harry Brennan who told him the Board of Finance cut the budget by \$90,000 and as a result he had to make cuts in order to operate within the budget allowed. The person questioned the legality of the action, and Mr. Brennan told the person to get a lawyer and fight it. Mr. Boccuzzi has a reply that Mr. Spaulding wrote to this business establishment and he says "I am in receipt of your letter of July 1st and I truly sympathize with your problem. I gather from your letter that you have talked to Mr. Brennan of this department and he explained to you the circumstances, as well as the tardy notification. You must recognize that this is not a problem of the Administrations thinking. I am prevented by law to spend in deficit unless we made the cut of the crew as we did, there is no way that I could see that we would be able to operate within the budget." This letter was dated July 9, 1981.

Now Mr. Pollard is telling us that the crew was never cut. Mr. Boccuzzi just does not understand what Mr. Spaulding is saying when he writes to a taxpaying member of the City of Stamford stating he is going to cut a crew and the reason, and then

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI (continuing) continually has this crew. Evidently Mr. Spaulding must be breaking the law by spending in deficit. To go further, Mr. Boccuzzi does not want to say "I told you so", but going back to this Grouping that was done in the budget, caused this problem. We have no control any more over the expenditures for new positions, vacancies, or what-not, in any of the departments within the City that have been consolidated and lumped into a budgetary "GROUP", or "GROUPS".

Now, it would be very simple for Mr. Spaulding to make up \$90,000. New Positions in the 1981-1982 for GROUP 34 amounted to 13 at approximately \$204,037; Vacancies amounted to 16 for \$239,774. Between the two of them, we have 29 positions totaling \$443,811. We know that within this department, there are a lot of people who either leave, quit their positions, and it takes weeks to fill vacancies as proven by the fact that there were 16 vacancies at budget time. Now this is just for Group 34. There are also Group 30, Group 31, and Group 33 in the Public Works Budget Complex.

Now the taxpayers of the City of Stamford have been hit with an approximately 5 (plus or minus) mills in their taxes, and yet the Commissioner has decided to do away with a service. This reminds me of last year when he did not want to plow streets. This year, we're doing away with garbage. I don't think next year we are going to have to worry about what he is going to do. I don't think the Commissioner now is being fair to the taxpayers at all and I think he could very well make up the \$90,000 in order to pick up garbage from the establishments where he has ceased pick-up services, especially since he still has this crew aboard.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT complimented Mr. Pollard on the conscientious and diligent work he put into this report, and he has two questions. How was the route chosen to be cut out? Was it done arbitrarily, or was it by some sort of lottery, etc.?

MR. POLLARD stated, that as he said, there was no route that was cut out. The route that had the service reduced is the route known commonly as the "Center Route". It is collected every Wednesday and Saturday. It deals generally with the Downtown area, Strawberry Hill, the Court House, Police Department, Washington Boulevard, Adams Avenue, that area, and where one would find the greatest number of stores and apartments.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said it appears that, in essence, these citizens are now paying for service that they are not getting. And quite honestly, there should be a tax refund due them in view of the lack of service they are getting. There are many contradictions between Mr. Pollard's report and what Commissioner Spaulding said, which leads to a lack of credibility on the part of the taxpayers as far as the appointed public officials are concerned. He would urge Mr. Pollard to, as quickly as possible, get to the bottom of this problem, and to resolve the differences between what Mr. Pollard saw and what he was told, so that confidence can once again be restored by the taxpayers and their appointed officials.

MR. BLAIS said he was at the meeting and he feels Mrs. Conti's presumption that collection has been discontinued to those who are in non-conformance is incorrect. He feels that what the Commissioner meant by non-conformity was that they defied traditional description of a condominium or a retail establishment, and that is what was meant by non-conformity.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLAIS went on to say that in addition to that, after being at the meeting, and listening to discussions tonight, he feels that the Commissioner of Public Works was less than honest and acted in less than a professional manner with the Public Works Committee. As was pointed out, the level of service rendered for garbage collection was inadequate, especially in view of the fact that the Charter requires that all sewered districts, or most sewered districts, have garbage collection. In spite of that, Commissioner Spaulding adamantly refused to request the necessary resources to perform his responsibilities under the Charter. Mr. Blais considers this a grave wrongdoing and less than professional. As the full Board knows, it is standard operating procedure for the Mayor and his Commissioners to request additional resources.

MR. DONAHUE addressed the issue of compliance to the appropriate sections of the Charter and Ordinances. Certainly it is a very important issue, but for a number of years now, compliance has been selectively enforced. There is one such condominium unit in Stamford divided into three parts. One section gets City pick-up, the other two do not! When they asked how they could get City pick-up, they were told they had to comply. When they went out and bought the two garbage cans for each unit, they were still told that their garbage would not be picked up.

MR. ZELINSKI said he was out-of-town on business and could not attend the Public Works Committee meeting. However, he was distressed to learn that Commissioner Spaulding had taken this action. It is perfectly clear in our Code of Ordinances under Section 8.2 which covers the area of the responsibility of the City, it clearly states that it shall be the responsibility of the City to collect garbage and refuse only in the garbage collection district, which district shall include all buildings and areas which are presently serviced for City sewers. Our Code of Ordinances are the law of the City. He is distressed that the Commissioner of Public Works has taken it upon himself to violate a City law.

MR. ZELINSKI went on to say that tonight, under Legislative and Rules Committee, they have a request from Commissioner Spaulding, through the Corporation Counsel, which was to repeal this particular section. But at the present time, even if it were to be repealed, it is still a law of our City and should be enforced not only by the Mayor, but by his appointed officials. Mr. Zelinski sincerely hopes that, based on the comments tonight, and he hopes that ^{if} Commissioner Spaulding is listening, that he reconsiders those actions and obeys the laws of our City, which certainly are to benefit the taxpayers, who pay taxes, and expect services for the money that they spend.

MR. FLOUNDERS said he, too, was present at that meeting, and must admit that he, too, was disturbed by the seeming resistance and inflexibility on the part of Commissioner Spaulding with regard to helping us find a way to correct what the Board considers to be an error, and helping to find a way to resume garbage collection. But he is far more concerned tonight about the reckless indictments that are being made; statements that the Commissioner has disobeyed the law, broken the law. One of the actions that was requested at the meeting was to ask legal counsel for his opinion as to where we stood legally with regard to the discontinuation of garbage pick-up to commercial establishments. To the best of his knowledge, that particular request has yet to be fulfilled.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FLOUNDERS said that Mr. Pollard's survey may indeed be correct. His findings may be correct that there are indeed still eleven garbage crews out there. And if he is correct, there is an obvious conflict and inconsistency in the information that we have been given. A conflict, Madam Chairman, so serious, so basically, blatantly wrong, if indeed true, that Mr. Flounders believes that it is bad judgment for this Board to put the Commissioner on trial tonight without at least first giving him the opportunity to respond to such indictments. There may be another side to the story; at the very least, we should give the Commissioner an opportunity to answer. Therefore, Mr. Flounders recommends that the Public Works Committee set up another meeting with the Commissioner to review this issue and to straighten out and to resolve the inconsistencies that so clearly exist. He would move that such a meeting be set up with the Commissioner.

THE PRESIDENT asked if there were a Second to that Motion. It was SECONDED. The President said Mr. Pollard mentioned that at the very beginning of his Report. The Motion is in order and the discussion will be on the necessity of setting up such a meeting with the Commissioner.

MRS. MCINERNEY wholeheartedly supports the Motion for a meeting between all the parties concerned, i.e., the Public Works Commissioner, Corporation Counsel, and perhaps even the Mayor, and also the Finance Commissioner, to ascertain what, in effect, the City is responsible for in the line of garbage collection, specifically dealing with Sections of the Charter and the Code of Ordinances. It appears that Committee members are unclear, Mrs. McInerney is unclear, the Public Works Commissioner perhaps needs further clarification of these particular issues from the Corporation Counsel. Mrs. McInerney doesn't believe that this is the proper form in which to vent these kinds of character remarks that were on the floor of the Board this evening. She feels there is nothing to be gained by it, and the only proper way in which to proceed is to agree to a meeting of all parties, and certainly to open it up to any Board member here tonight who is also concerned with it.

MR. WIDER said he has a lot of small businesses in his area, and he feels something needs to be done. He gets 3 to 4 calls a week where they live next door, and the business is right next door to them, and the residential garbage is being picked up, but the business garbage is being left. A meeting is an excellent idea and perhaps we can bring Mr. Spaulding around to doing his job.

MRS. HAWE agrees with Mrs. McInerney and Mr. Flounders. Confrontation of this sort where the other part involved is not present to explain, or not to explain, as the case may be, if there is an explanation to give it, is not the way to go about things. A meeting where both sides can air their differences would be very beneficial.

MRS. CONTI is in favor of such a meeting, and recommends that it be open to the entire Board.

MRS. GUROIAN asked if Mr. Pollard limited the scope of his investigation only to the commercial pick-ups, or is he still looking into condominium dwellings as well.

MR. POLLARD said there are several answers. The investigation that he referred to dealt with stores and apartments, commercial establishments. The meeting was a week ago Thursday night. Subsequent to that, Monday or Tuesday, there was something on the radio that precipitated the phone calls which came to him the next three days. He took his action on Saturday. It is his clear intent, which has been the aim of

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD (continuing)...other Board members for a long time, to cause the Commissioner to pick up garbage from condominiums. He persists in a plan which calls for paying people \$24.00 in lieu of that service, so we're in a contention mode on that problem, too. So, yes, we are pursuing condominium service, too.

MRS. GUROLAN said apropos to that, she is particularly interested in the condominium dwellings and she would like to see it pursued at the next meeting with the Commissioner, especially since there are so many condominium dwellings in Glenbrook and because she and Mrs. Conti have received so many phone calls on this subject. She said perhaps the other Board members would like to know that she and Mrs. Conti had no problem in getting the Commissioner to agree to come to the Glenbrook Community Center on Wednesday evening, this Wednesday, at a public meeting to which they are all invited to attend, to discuss just that subject: continued garbage collection for condominiums. Please feel free to come and ask him some questions.

MS. RINALDI said no one more than herself is interested in getting this matter resolved. She does think, though, there is going to have to be a change in attitude on the part of Commissioner Spaulding. When this situation first came up, she and the Public Works Committee, made every attempt to go through the proper channels. They sat down with the Commissioner. They tried to look at alternatives. He was really very obstinate. He refused to look at those alternatives, so she feels that before this second meeting is set up, there is going to have to be a change in his attitude.

MR. ROOS wonders just what the great big offense was in keeping eleven units going. There may have been some extenuating circumstances of necessity to explain why that unit worked two hours on Saturday. And should someone who has 10 standard garbage cans pay the same taxes as someone who has two cans? The meeting may clarify matters.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Stork has now arrived and there are 38 members present.

MR. BLAIS said at the meeting with the Commissioner, they asked him what the Board of Representatives could do to increase garbage collection service. It was suggested to him that he put in a request for an additional appropriation. He refused, until he got a blank check from the Finance Committee. As the President of Nearwater Assn., Mr. Blais wants the Board to know that they have been waiting three years since their condo was built. He wants to know when this condominium is going to get garbage collection for which they have been paying taxes on for three years.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT Moved to amend Mr. Flounders' Motion, and that is a secretary be present at the meeting and minutes be taken. He wants full minutes taken and copies sent to all Board members within 48 hours of the end of the meeting. Seconded.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said a lot of serious remarks have transpired tonight. Unfortunately, everyone cannot attend the up and coming meeting because of either business or personal commitments, although the outcome of the meeting is of real importance to all. The exact verbatim minutes will preclude any more of the "he said," "I said," "she said," etc., which we have heard here tonight. We will thus be able to each draw our own conclusions and separate fact from fiction.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said it is not realistic to have a secretary take the minutes at what will probably be a long evening meeting, work at the Board office all day, and transcribe within 48 hours, plus getting it to the post office, unless we want to hire security to deliver it to the members' homes. It is impossible to get this done in 48 hours, and she asks the maker of the Motion to reconsider those hours.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he did not mean to have it in his hands within 48 hours. He meant put it in the mail in 48 hours following the meeting.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she respects his motion but it just is not practical.

MR. WIDER, too, is concerned about that 48 hours. He doesn't believe it is realistic.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he would withdraw the 48-hour portion.

MR. ZELINSKI, the Seconder, agrees to the withdrawal of the 48-hour provision.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to have staff at the meeting, and to transcribe verbatim the proceedings of that evening. Seconded. CARRIED with a few No votes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Main Motion which is to have the Public Works Committee set up another meeting with the Public Works Commissioner and the other persons mentioned, to resolve the seeming discrepancies that surround the matter of discontinued garbage collection for commercial establishments, and that there be staff, and minutes taken. There are some further speakers on the Motion as amended.

MR. BLUM has some condominiums in his district who have complained to him.

THE PRESIDENT said they are just talking about commercial establishments.

MR. BLUM said he would then like to amend the Motion further to include those condominiums which have lost their garbage collection service. No Second.

MR. CORBO said we heard all the comments tonight, but he feels we missed the point. He was at the meeting, and Commissioner Spaulding (The President said his comments are not germane to the issue at hand and for Mr. Corbo to stick to the subject of whether or not to have another meeting.) Mr. Corbo said he does not think a second meeting would be fruitful. Commissioner Spaulding underlined his position clearly. It is just a budgetary problem that the Boards of Finance and Representatives did n't understand at budget time. He should not have to take the heat of the matter because this Board, if anything, is responsible for that problem. The problem should have been analyzed at budget time. He disagrees with Mr. Blais' comments. He feels that Mr. Spaulding is professional, super-professional, because he made a beautiful budget, and we didn't understand the problem. His attitude was splendid. He said "You tell me what you want, and give me the money, and I will supply the services." Therefore, this Board has to take the blame, not Commissioner Spaulding.

MR. CORBO went on to say that Mr. Spaulding, during the budget process, explained what the money was going to be spent for. He cannot take the money from one budget item and transfer it to another item, unless it is authorized by the Finance Board. He does not feel another meeting will be fruitful, and that the Public Works Committee should take the initiative and ask the Mayor to request the funding.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he does not know who the "we" is that Mr. Corbo refers to as being responsible for the cut. As he recalls, that cut came down here from the Board of Finance by a 4-0 vote. This Board is not responsible for the \$90,000. We did not cut anything. He had his little chart up there and said he was going to get rid of one crew because of the cut. Mr. Pollard states there is no change in the number of crews.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI said that is the crux of the problem. This Board did not make this cut. The Finance Board did with a 4-0 vote, not a 1-0 vote, but 4-0. He wants to know if that crew has actually been transferred to another department because of the cut.

THE PRESIDENT reminded the members that this is on the Motion that there be another meeting held.

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED the Question. Seconded. Carried Unanimously by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Return to Committee to hold another meeting with the DPW. Moved. Seconded. CARRIED with 36 Yes, Zero No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA said he inadvertently forgot to MOVE for acceptance of a fifth item on his Committee, which was to accept the City parks curfews as submitted by the Parks Department under Sec. 15.1, thus giving them the effect of law. Seconded.

(5) REQUEST TO ACCEPT THE CITY PARKS CURFEWS AS SUBMITTED BY THE PARKS DEPARTMENT UNDER CODE OF ORDINANCE SECTION 15.1.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

MR. FAUTEUX said that his Committee has no report this evening.

SEWER COMMITTEE- Chairman Michael E. Wiederlight

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that his committee met July 30, 1981 at 8:00 P.M. in the Mayor's Conference Room. In attendance: Rep. Michael Wiederlight and Fiorenzio Corbo. On Items #1 and #2, DPW Commissioner Spaulding and City Engineer Wm. Sabia were invited to attend and discuss these two matters. Unfortunately, they chose not to attend and sent Mr. Wiederlight a letter instead, declining the invitation for various and sundry reasons. On Items #1 and #2, he was able to set up an appointment for later this week with Mr. Sabia to explore these areas in some detail and a report will be issued for the next meeting.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said Item #3 drew a large attendance of many citizens of the affected Sewer Area: 16-1 and 14-6. In addition, Rep. Goldstein and Rep. Santy were also in attendance. Lou Casale and Meredith Leitch of the Sewer Commission were also in attendance, just as members and not representing the Commission. In summary, the Sewer Commission will be voting on August 12th to decide what the sewer assessments will be for this district. They heard quite a bit of discussion as to why they should revert back to the lower estimated assessment as opposed to the higher assessment. Hopefully, the discussion did not fall upon deaf ears, but a constructive dialogue was instituted that they will bring back to their Commission. He hopes they will hold their meeting at the Newfield Elementary School where many citizens may come out.

SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) PROBLEM OF RUN-OFF WATER FLOODING 191 PRUDENCE DRIVE. Submitted 7/13/81 by Reps. Santy and Signore.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) INQUIRY AND REPORT ON THE FLOODING CONDITIONS IN THE GLENBROOK ROAD-CRESCENT STREET AREA. Long-existing problem with improper drainage. Requested by Rep. David Blum 7/14/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED EXCESS ASSESSMENT OF SEWER PROJECTS 16-1 and 14-6. Submitted by Reps. Jeanne-Lois Santy and Mary Jane Signore (18th Dist.), and Reps. Sandra Goldstein and Michael Wiederlight (16th Dist.).

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) FOLLOW-UP ON EASEMENTS FOR 17-2A SEWER DISTRICT. Submitted by Reps. Michael Wiederlight and Sandra Goldstein 7/17/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said on Item #4, Corporation Counsel Leonard Cookney was invited and did attend. This has been a continuing problem, getting these sewer easements. Mr. Cookney has assured him that all easements and/or condemnations will have taken place by the end of this month.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Lathon Wider

- (1) RESOLUTION DETERMINING THAT THERE IS A NEED FOR THE NORTH STREET ELDERLY HOUSING PROJECT SITE IN AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO AT LEAST THE NUMBER OF UNITS TO BE BUILT. Letter from Margot Wormser, Housing Authority 6/16/81. Held in Committee 6/7/81.

- (2) RESOLUTION APPROVING PROPOSED HOUSING SITES DEVELOPMENT AGENCY'S SELECTION OF NORTH STREET SITE. Letter from Margot Wormser, Housing Authority 6/16/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

MR. WIDER said they met at 6:30 on July 30, 1981 in the Republican Caucus Room. Present were Mr. Handy Dixon, Mr. John Roos, Ms. Anne Summerville, and Lathon Wider, Chairman. Invited to attend were: Mrs. Goldstein, Ms. Dagney Hultgren, Ms. Nancy Mitchell and Mrs. Margot Wormser.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER went on to ask if all members had a copy of the Resolution, and they did, so he did not read it. The Committee voted 4-0 in favor of Item #1 and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA said he sincerely feels there is a need for elderly housing. His primary concern is why the North Street Site. He said Stamford is unique in their selection of sites. Either they put them in the Shippan area where they have the sweet aroma of the Sewage Treatment Plant and the Incinerator, or they put them along Greenwich Avenue or West Main Street by the Mill River. Now they have selected a flood plain area. If they don't get sick from the odors, they'll be gotten rid of by drowning. Why not use the Willard School site which has been considered for Congregate Housing.

At a recent meeting, of which he has so far been unable to get a report, the Welfare Commission stated that the Willard School was not the best site for Congregate Housing as there was no need for it. It is too expensive to convert, plus there are empty beds at the Smith House presently. For five years, we have talked about the North Street Bridge being unsafe, yet nothing has been done.

There was a staff report prepared by Mark Lubbers stating they conclude that the proposal does not promote the public health and safety. It causes an increase in the local flood hazard; although slight, it results in an increased risk to the public. They recommended denial of the application. Yet the Environmental Protection Commission voted 3-2 in favor of it. Presently there are two pending applications to put up additional housing projects in the flood plain area. People along Cold Spring Road and Severance Drive have endured enough suffering because of flooding. Approval of the North Street Site will open the doors for approval of the pending applications along Bridge Street which also abut the Rippowam River. Perhaps it might be wise to recommend to the Mayor to put the Willard School site up for sale to a developer. At least in that area, you are close to shopping centers, recreational facilities, and no worry about flooding. On this North Street Site, we have received elaborate evacuation plans in case of flooding. What about the rest of Stamford, will we have the manpower to save all the others who would need aid in case of major flooding, storms, hurricanes, etc. Who would set the priorities? Anxiety and stress can lead to heart attacks and strokes for those people waiting to be assisted, not knowing whether aid will come in time, or at all. We do not have approval from the Board of Education to use the Hart School property for the proposed foot-bridge. Mr. DeLuca recommends denial of this proposal, and that other sites be considered.

MR. LIVINGSTON said housing is too critical to permit any delay. If this housing is built for the elderly, they will vacate their present living quarters which can then be used for other people whose needs for housing are also critical. If we can provide housing sites for our automobiles, such as we have in our garages all over the downtown area, it seems reasonable that we can also provide rental housing for the people of this City. His understanding of a flood plain is an occurrence perhaps once in an hundred years. He asks the Board to support this resolution.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (continued)

MR. BLUM said 26 Main Street and Greenwich Avenue projects are right up against the river, and both are in a flood plain area, but they were built. He hopes Willard School will be used for senior citizen housing; and we could use that nice land up in North Stamford, if it were ever freed, but it never will for some time to come. Perhaps it calls for legal action such as Mr. Groesbeck took for his property on Old Long Ridge Road, so there can be senior citizen housing in that nice greenery in North Stamford.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said the Willard School site is not possible. The site must be in the Neighborhood Strategy Area. A lot of sites were looked at and had to be rejected because of their location. The Federal Government will not subsidize housing that is not in the Neighborhood Strategy Area.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he shared Mr. DeLuca's concerns about this project, which are sincere and genuine. However, after probing into the project, Mr. Wiederlight found this would be an acceptable site. As far as the flood plain goes, it means that there is a statistical probability that one year in an hundred, this area might be flooded by the type of flood which is not just run-off of water. It is a horrendous flood. That does not happen 1, 2, 3; it is not a flash-flood. There is ample warning to evacuate the individuals in the flood plain area if this should occur. That being the case, both the Police and the Fire Department have endorsed the project, stating they can safely evacuate the people in this area with ample time. Every month, someone mentions we need housing. This project will provide 81 units. The benefits far outweigh the disadvantage of one thing, the flood plain.

MRS. HAWE finds this a very difficult issue. She is satisfied as far as the safety issue is concerned. The one thing she cannot accept is the question of the footbridge, an access ramp for a flood emergency. It terminates in a school yard and the temptation of a ramp across the river would be irresistible to any children playing in the playground. She cannot bring herself to vote for this for that one reason, the footbridge. Aside from that, it is a very good project.

MRS. SANTY said to answer Mr. Wiederlight, while benefits of the housing site outweigh all the other reasons, that it does not outweigh one flood. It wasn't an hundred years ago that I was in my living room, it was in 1955; and the water was coming down the street, and within seven minutes, I lost the foundation to my home. I had a six-week-old baby and the water was in my living room at this point. Everyone said don't panic. We're going to have boats; we're going to have the Fire Department and the Police. It took them a long, long, long time to get there. How was I going to swim with a tiny baby? A boat finally came. It was leaky, by the way. They said they were sorry they were so late and that they would do the best they could. They were yelling with their loudspeakers. They finally got us out. It was a very traumatic experience. I lost the foundation. The water was almost up to the second floor. And I was a lot younger then, and I was panicky, and I had a lot of anxiety, and there were a lot of older people on that street. So you just have to live through this once in your lifetime and that is all you ever need. So think about the elderly then. I lived through this.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (continued)

MRS. SANTY went on to refer to a Staff Report made regarding this site. The staff of EPB maintains and retains the opinion that the proposal is an inappropriate use of the flood plain, and that alternate sites should be thoroughly explored, including the possibility of exchanging City parkland outside of the flood plain for the proposed site. That is from the EPB minutes. Mr. Livingston said we are concerned about a garage. She is not concerned about a garage. She knows we are building them without a garage being flooded. She is very concerned about the elderly in this situation. Mr. Wiederlight stated that there are many warnings and that these people could be reached in plenty of time. Since she had a personal experience with it, she grants we do have a Police Dept. and a Fire Dept., but she was at that meeting and heard the Fire Dept. officials say "within the best of our ability". This isn't the only housing site in this area. There are other housing sites, and there are other people there. How fast are they going to get to all these elderly people. Remember in 1955 when I was flooded out and I had the problem, there were young people and they could swim; but not these elderly. Because people live in a basement is no reason for us to expose them unnecessarily to this type of housing. Mr. Blum mentioned other houses being built on flood plains, but this was before the EPB was established. Now we do have a Board. We do have people concerned. This is the safeguard, the advantage. Many, many things were done many, many years ago that are not right today, but now we have to correct what we can and not build in flood plain areas. No one is more concerned about the elderly and all of you know that. It wasn't many months ago that I stood here, it was just three of us the first time, and I pleaded and begged for a tax relief program. We finally got it through, but I still don't agree with it. I think we should still give it more. But I think we should take a close, long look at what we are doing here tonight. We need housing, and certainly need to do more for our elderly, but please consider this so carefully. Just one flood could do irreparable damage to the elderly if this site is used for the elderly. I am still convinced that we can find other sites which would be more suitable.

MRS. MAIHOCK said we do need senior citizen housing but we need more careful consideration of where we locate it. If we vote yes on these resolutions, it means we find the site plan acceptable in all respects. She regrets that she cannot vote yes. After very careful consideration, she feels it would not be in the best interests of the City or the senior citizens who would be residents of a complex to locate this housing in this location. We should follow the guidelines of Executive Order #11988, an Order that does not support the development of nursing homes, hospitals, and elderly housing in a flood plain. Persons over 62 years of age can have special needs and higher risk potential than the average population. Therefore, it would not be desirable to locate housing for these persons on a site characterized as a flood plain. Such housing facility would be located within an effective flow area and would thus represent an obstruction. One Saturday morning, a constituent of Rep. DeLuca called Mrs. Maihock early in the morning to come see the Rippowam River on a rampage after a few days of rainfall; not an hundred-year flood, nor a five-hundred year flood situation. When a body of water is not permitted to dissipate its force in a flood plain, it acquires an incredible, frightening velocity. Mrs. Maihock is greatly concerned by the potential danger of flood waters, after that experience.

MRS. MAIHOCK said evacuation of senior citizens during a flooding event is a significant factor in the consideration of this site. A footbridge has been proposed. She feels, much as Mrs. Hawe does, that this would be "an attractive nuisance." There has been an assumption that certain City personnel will be available to rescue these senior citizens who need to be evacuated. Mrs. Maihock said Mrs. Santy has effectively addressed that. Mr. Lubbers' Staff Report has some concern, also, that in such flood conditions, there could be a delusion of available manpower due to the needs Citywide under such flood conditions. Furthermore, the North Street Bridge has been declared unsafe by a consulting engineering firm. There is concern about what effect additional forces on the bridge during a flood event, could have. Because the bridge has three arches rather than a single span, it attracts debris and blockages. A 1976 Engineering Inspection Report recommended no trucks. It certainly does not seem an ideal structure to count on in an emergency condition. It is the City's responsibility to provide for the general welfare of its residents. I believe we would be incurring significant problems and risks by situating this facility in a flood plain area. It was unfortunate that the City permitted two other elderly housing facilities to be developed in a flood plain. We should not repeat such short-sighted action.

THE PRESIDENT said this item has been under discussion for a lengthy period of time, and while she does not wish to limit discussion, she wants to remind the Board that many aspects of the site and the number of units have already been discussed, to please try to limit talk to new issues; otherwise, just state who you agree with; it would move the discussion along.

MR. FLOUNDERS wholeheartedly agrees with comments made by Mr. Livingston, Mr. Wiederlight, and others who have spoken on behalf of this resolution. He said Stamford has a most serious problem of elderly housing and all we can do is chip away at it. We are talking about subsidized units, 81 of them, which will barely scratch the surface in terms of our total needs. Because of a HUD subsidy, we are talking about housing that can be supplied for 25% of the elderly family's income; and on an average, that is estimated to mean that the rent that they would be paying, again on average, would be about \$100 per month. Where, today, in 1981, can you find housing for \$100 per month that would be as modern, clean, and attractive, and well-located, and as close to downtown shopping as this. Because this building is to be built on a flood plain area, it will be built on stilts, to accommodate to the potential danger of a flood. The estimated level of an one-hundred year flood is 23.06 feet. The bottom of this building is 26.5 feet from the ground, from the plain. It is precisely because of this potential 1.01 risk that they are designing the building to accommodate to that risk in that area. It bothers Mr. Flounders that the Board, at the eleventh hour, sometimes tends to second-guess subjects that have been well-explored by many, many people before the issue came to this Board. If we vote down this resolution, we will be sacrificing the opportunity to chip away at this problem, which is going to provide 81 nice dwellings for 81 elderly people. It's easy to sit here and say we can find other locations that are better, but it is very difficult to accomplish that. Mr. Flounders is concerned about the ramp, the bridge that goes into Hart School and that has to be worked out somehow. He urged support of this matter.

MRS. MCINERNEY agrees that the elderly housing needs in Stamford are evident. However, she feels it is our responsibility to promote the public health, welfare and safety of our community. She questions some of the thoughts about building in a flood plain, and wishes to note, as did Mrs. Santy, that she was growing up in 1955 and remembers some of the flooding problems.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said the Broad Street River Bridge was knocked out. The bridges over the Noroton River were knocked out. Two bridges on Camp Ave. in Springdale were knocked out. It became a real problem. When water flows in a flood condition, the current and the rapidity is difficult to contemplate in any circumstances, as is evidenced every year if you are driving on the Merritt to the Hutchison Parkway in rainy weather. It is closed. Why is it closed? It is closed because some people have gotten out of their cars and been swept away. She agrees with Mrs. Santy and Mr. Blum that there are several senior citizen housing on the Mill River presently, but who would be responsible for the priority listing for evacuation of those buildings? We are talking about senior citizens. As you know, many of them use canes; some have walkers. They don't move as fast as someone who is 40 or 50, or early 60's, and 30 and 20 years old. The footbridge is a problem. We just saw the Hyatt Hotel with a problem in Kansas City. Board members should realize that Kansas City is being sued by several people for their part, for their liability in their approval of that building. Another problem that Mr. Wiederlight brought up which is a question whether this building would, in fact, be covered under the Federal Flood Insurance Program, being built in a flood plain, and our being aware that this was a flood plain site. Mrs. Maihock raised very good points and very good questions inasmuch as building in a flood plain was not advisable for nursing homes, schools, or senior citizen residences. Mrs. McInerney feels that the liabilities being mentioned are not in the best interests of our City.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Moving the Question. Motion made, Seconded, and Carried Unanimously (voice vote).

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to approve the Resolution which approves the Housing Sites Development Plan for housing for the elderly on West North Street as described in the documents before each member.

MR. LIVINGSTON MOVED for a Roll Call vote. Seconded. CARRIED.

CLERK OF THE BOARD ANNIE SUMMERVILLE took the Roll Call vote, copy of which is attached to these Minutes.

THE PRESIDENT announced that a majority vote is needed for passage of this Resolution. It was APPROVED with 24 Yes votes, 11 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

THE PRESIDENT said that the vote just taken covers both Items 1 and 2 under Public Housing.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

MR. WIDER MOVED to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda. At their meeting on July 30th, they learned that the Community Development Program was in a very bad condition personnel-wise. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider an item not on the agenda. The Chair was in doubt of the results of the voice vote, and called for a Division, using the Machine. The request was DENIED by a vote of 17 Yes, 16 No, and 4 Abstentions. The rules will not be suspended.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES

MR. BLUM MOVED to Suspend the Rules to take up an item out of order on the Agenda. He said there are people in the audience who have been waiting quite some time for this item to come up. He proposed that the CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE be considered at this time. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Suspend the Rules as requested. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

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

- (1) TO CONSIDER AND ACT UPON THE FINAL PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENTS AS SUBMITTED TO THE 16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES BY THE 12th CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION.

MR. HOGAN: As you recall, at the last meeting of this Board of Representatives, there existed some question as to whether or not there was in existence a list which, in effect, designated the financial institutions, or money houses, in which the monies of the Classified Employees Retirement Fund could be and should be invested. In view of this doubt, and seeking further information, the Board, in its wisdom, voted to return the proposal to the Charter Revision Commission for its clarification and/or possible deletion. On July 13th of this year, a joint meeting was held in accordance with the provisions of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut between the Charter Revision Committee of this Board and the 12th Charter Revision Commission.

It was during this meeting that the Charter Revision Commission reported that they had contacted the Deputy Treasurer of the State of Connecticut and he had informed them, the Commission, that there was not a list in existence of restricted securities in which the Trustee Funds had to be invested, and further that the controlling Section in this case is as contained in Section 45-88 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut.

Under date of July 20, 1981, the Commission did forward to this Board their Final Report, which can be summed up and condensed by saying that, quoting from their Letter of Transmittal, "After reviewing the statutory provisions regarding the investment of Trust Fund assets in the State of Connecticut, we are content that the original language submitted to your Board adequately accomplishes the goals sought by this Commission and your Board."

On July 30, 1981, the Charter Revision Committee met and discussed the Final Report, and voted unanimously to accept this Report as submitted and recommends it in its entirety for its adoption to the entire Board for inclusion on the ballot in the Municipal Election to be held November 3, 1981 in Stamford, and Mr. Hogan so MOVES. SECONDED.

MRS. GUROIAN said she would like to preface her remarks by saying that this revision to the Charter which they are entertaining tonight is of prime importance. As probably everyone here tonight knows, it is probably the only piece of legislation we will be voting on which demands final approval by the taxpayers of the City in a referendum in November. Possibly, it would therefore be in order to explain to the Board members as well as to some of the people who might be listening, as to what exactly the changes incur. The original request for this consideration came from Commissioner Hoffman, who met with our Committee to propose that we recommend a Charter Revision Commission be set up in order to

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GUORIAN (continuing) - make this change. The reason for the original request was because it was felt by the Commissioner and many other people that the approximately Twenty Million Dollars in the fund was not getting an adequate return in terms of investments. It was also felt that if more latitude were given to the Trustees as to the types of investments they could make, that the return could be increased.

Now why is it important for the return to be increased? It is important because.. you have to know first that the employees contribute 5% of their salaries into the Fund. But in order for the Fund to be adequately funded, the City has to match those funds equally, if not more. So that if the Fund engenders more revenue, the contribution by the taxpayer is reduced by that amount. What does that mean? It means that with \$20,000,000 involved, if you can engender even 1% more in yield, it means a saving of \$200,000 that year to the taxpayer. So it is an important consideration, even if for just that point. The two ancillary changes which came up because of the hearings that the Commission held, involved (1) a change in the composition of the members of the Trustees which presently are three elected officials: The Board of Finance Chairman, the Finance Commissioner, and the President of the Board of Representatives; and (2) two members elected by the member participants. That has been changed in this proposal to be three representatives from the City, which remains the same; and three from the City employee member participants who are elected.

The Commission held two hearings: one before its deliberations, and the other after it put together a recommendation. The Committee also held a hearing which was very, very well attended, surprisingly so. Many people spoke in support of the proposal. At that hearing, there were two people who spoke against the proposal, and Mrs. Guroian thinks it incumbent for the Board members to know what they said.

The first one being the Chairman of the Board of Finance, Mrs. Margaret Nolan, who objected on two scores, and the objection was to the change of the composition of the Trustees to three and three. The argument she made was that the City was contributing more than the employees and therefore was entitled to more representation. This was answered by the statement from the Commissioner that, in fact, at the present time, the City is contributing more to the fund, but in reality it is only because the City has not met its obligations in the past and is embarked on a course of catch-up, and in order to catch up with our contributions, we are forced to contribute more. However, if the Fund engenders more revenue, our participation will be equally reduced.

Mrs. Guroian said the second objection that Mrs. Nolan made was that a composition of three-and-three was unwieldy and would lead to problems. That was answered by the fact that the Board of Finance, of which she is Chairwoman, at times is itself at three-and-three and there has never been any problem with that before, or very little problem.. And one of the funds in the City also has equal composition, and the Finance Commissioner advised us there seems to be no problem there. Mrs. Guroian personally feels, and she believes it is the feeling of the Committee as a whole, that the objections raised to this revision were adequate, and the revision as submitted to us, is a valid one for our consideration and merits our support.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN said the other ancillary change that was made is at the end of the proposal. In the past, the participants of the Fund were not ever apprised personally, or in any manner to which they had direct access, of the year-by-year condition of their Fund; and so the Charter Revision Commission also included a change which mandates that each and every employee get a report from the Trustees annually, as to the condition of the finances of the Fund, which, she, personally, and which she believes it was the feeling of the Committee, believes this was a much needed change and addressed to in this proposal. She would urge that the Board members support this proposal. It is a needed one. It was an excellent Commission that worked on it. Every member has an expertise which involved itself in the final decision, and each and every one worked well with one another, so that this Board can be proud of its appointments. They were good ones, and she believes they did a good job, and she would like to, as Co-Chairman of the Committee, to commend them. The Chairman was Gerald Fox. Lillian Filardo, Mr. Grinnell, Mr. King, and Commissioner Hoffman were on the Commission. Mrs. Guroian also wishes to thank the secretary, who served them, Mary Holahan, who did an exemplary job, in helping the Commission members in routine work that had to be done. She urges all of the members to support the revision and vote for it for referendum on the November ballot.

MR. CORBO MOVED the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Moving the Question. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to accept the recommendations of the Charter Revision for Charter amendment to Section 746 entitled "Trustees" and for inclusion of these amendments on the ballot in November. The vote necessary for passage is 21 affirmative votes. APPROVED: 34 Yes votes, Zero no votes, and 3 Abstentions.

MR. HOGAN said he, too, would also like to thank the members of his Committee who worked very hard on this: Mrs. Guroian, Co-Chairlady, Mrs. McInerney and Miss Rinaldi, also Mr. DeNicola, and Mr. Blais. He would also like to thank the office staff, who, when we called upon them, did not hesitate to lend all their efforts to our Committee work.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM URC FOR "REALIGNMENT OF A PORTION OF GREYROCK PLACE" requested by Mayor Clapes 6/25/81 and John P. Condlin, Asst. Dir., Urban Redevelopment Commission 6/22/81.

MR. FASANELLI said the URC Committee met last Thursday, July 30, 1981, on item #1 and approved this 3 in favor, none opposed, and he Moves for approval. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for vote on Item #1, and it was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) REQUEST OF REP. DAVID BLUM 7/14/81 WHETHER THE URC DEVELOPER CAN LEGALLY USE VETERANS PARK AS AN ACCESS ROAD FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A BUILDING IN THE TOWN CENTER; ALSO HAS FIRE TRUCK ACCESSIBILITY BEEN CONSIDERED WHEN THE PROPOSED RETAIL STORE IS COMPLETED.

MR. FASANELLI said on Item #2, the Committee sent a letter to the Chairman of the URC, and were answered by the Director of URC, Ken Faye, and the response was satisfactory to the Committee. If there are any questions, or any further inquiries, they will be glad to entertain them.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

No Report.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Chairman Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON: The Appointments Committee met Thursday, July 30, 1981, at 7:30 P.M. in the Republican Caucus Room. Members present were Reps. Mildred Perillo, Anne Summerville, Barbara McInerney, John Boccuzzi, Robert DeLuca, and Handy Dixon. A second meeting was scheduled for July 31st and that meeting had to be cancelled as they were unable to have a quorum present. This is offered as an explanation for holding most of the names on the Agenda in Committee. Of those interviewed and voted on by the Committee, Moved on the Consent Agenda is #8, Mr. Theophilus Blackshear, Sr. for the Planning Board. This is a re-appointment for a term which will expire December 1, 1985.

FAIR RENT COMMISSION - ALTERNATE

- | | | <u>Term Expires</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| (1) <u>RONALD J. WAGNER</u> (R) | | |
| 202-28 Soundview Avenue | Replacing Craig Koester | December 1, 1985 |
| Held in Committee 7/6/81 | whose term expired | |

MR. DIXON said #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE for the second time because of his failure to appear for an interview.

PLANNING BOARD - ALTERNATE

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| (2) <u>JOHN ORDWAY</u> (R) | | |
| 65 Glenbrook Road | Replacing M. Young | December 1, 1981 |
| Held in Committee 7/6/81 | who resigned | |

MR. DIXON said #2 is being appointed to fill the unexpired term of Mr. Young. Mr. Ordway has met the approval of this Committee by a vote of 4 in the affirmative and 2 against; and he Moves for his confirmation. Seconded.

MR. JOHN BOCCUZZI, ACTING PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Ordway. APPROVED with 26 Yes votes, 2 No votes, and 9 Abstentions.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COMMISSIONTerm Expires

- (3) THOMAS F. LANGAN (R) Replacing F. Ottaviano December 1, 1984
77 Prospect Street whose term expired
Held in Committee 6/22/81

MR. DIXON said #3 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE pending a response to an inquiry made by this Committee made July 8th concerning the policy of the Commission and the Golf Authority regulating free play and other special privileges granted to the Commissioners. The decision to hold was made without prejudice and is not meant to reflect in any way on the character or qualifications of Mr. Langan.

E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COMMISSION

- (4) MARIE PATTERSON (R) Re-appointment December 1, 1985
907 Long Ridge Road
Held in Committee 6/22/81

MR. DIXON said #4 is also being HELD IN COMMITTEE for the same reasons as #1 above.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

- (5) LOUIS LEVINE (R) Re-appointment December 1, 1983
2677 High Ridge Road
Held in Committee 6/22/81

MR. DIXON said Items #5, #6, and #7 are being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY

- (6) PETER STEKLA (R) Re-appointment January 1, 1984
31 Elmcroft Road
Held in Committee 6/22/81

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY

- (7) KATIE JANNICKY (D) Replacing A. Ferri January 1, 1983
96 Alexandra Drive

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PLANNING BOARD

- (8) THEOPHILUS BLACKSHEAR, SR. (R) R-appointment December 1, 1985
12 Green Street
Held in Committee 6/22/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, (with 1 abstention, Mrs. Ann King Saxe)

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DIXON said Items #9, #10, and #11 are being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PLANNING BOARD - ALTERNATETerm Expires

(9) <u>CAROL ERICSON</u> (R)	Replacing R. Meno	December 1, 1985
10 Cady Street	whose term expired	
Held in Committee 6/22/81		

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

ZONING BOARD - ALTERNATE

(10) <u>ALVIN J. SIEGARTEL</u> (R)	Replacing R. Montaine	December 1, 1981
91 West Hill Circle	who resigned	
Held in Committee 6/22/81.		

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

HEALTH COMMISSION

(11) <u>DR. BERT BALLIN</u> (D)	Re-appointment	December 1, 1983
Stone Hill Drive		

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. DIXON MOVED for confirmation of #8, Mr. Theophilus Blackshear to the Planning Board, on the Consent Agenda. Seconded.

MR. JOHN BOCCUZZI, ACTING PRESIDENT, called for a vote on Mr. Dixon's Motion. APPROVED with one Abstention, Ann King Saxe, by voice vote.

MR. DIXON said Items #12 and #13 appear on the Agenda for the purpose of correcting an error in the date of term expiration; and he Moved to correct this error in expiration date of Item #12 for Mr. Norman Raymond. Seconded.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONTerm Expires

Note: To correct typographical error in expiration date on term from
Dec. 1, 1983 to August 7, 1983:

(12) <u>NORMAN RAYMOND</u> (R)	Replacing B. Friedman	August 7, 1983
36 Crestwood Drive		
(approved 6/1/81)		

MR. JOHN BOCCUZZI, ACTING PRESIDENT, called for a voice vote on Item #12. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD OF RECREATIONTerm Expires

Note: To correct typographical error in expiration date of term from Jan. 1, 1983 to December 1, 1983:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| (13) <u>PAUL WOODARD</u> (D) | Replacing Edw. Rauh | December 1, 1983 |
| 2339 High Ridge Road | whose term expired | |
| (approved 4/ 6/81) | | |

MR. DIXON also Moved for same correction as #12 for #13 for Paul Woodard for the Board of Recreation. Seconded.

MR. JOHN BOCCUZZI, ACTING PRESIDENT, called for a voice vote on Item #13. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DIXON said that in response to a question from Mr. Zelinski, that the Appointments Committee has experienced many problems with the appointees and with the Mayor's Office, too, for that matter, in receiving resumes. It is very important that they receive resumes because it gives them ample time, when received on a timely basis, to make certain checks and do a bit of research work prior to interview. Mr. Dixon said they have changed their procedure to a great degree which he feels will help to correct the mistakes that they have had to live with in the past. They have set up two sets of forms now. One set is to be sent out to the appointee immediately after the name comes down from the Mayor regardless what time of month that may be. Together with this form will be the questionnaire and any other additional forms necessary to complete the transaction. And a request for a resume. When this is returned to the office, it will be put on file. After the Steering Committee meeting decision on what and who goes on the Agenda, then the second form will be sent out informing the appointee as to what time he or she should appear for an interview. He thinks this will be a lasting solution to the problems with which the Committee has been faced for many years.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito

MRS. HAWE said the Fiscal Committee met on Thursday, July 30, 1981. Present were Committee members: Betty Conti, John Hogan, Bob Fauteux, Burt Flounders, and Marie Hawe, as well as many members of other committees, who were members of secondary committees on many of these items. Mrs. Hawe MOVED the following items to the CONSENT AGENDA: Item #3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Where required, the secondary committees concurred, or proper motions were made to suspend the rules where necessary to waive a secondary committee report.

- (1) \$ 77,730.00 - HOUSING SITES DEVELOPMENT AGENCY - RESOLUTION AMENDING 1981-1982 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET by adding a project "#727-077 PURCHASE OF NORTH STREET ELDERLY HOUSING PROJECT SITE financed by withdrawal of funds from CAPITAL NON-RECURRING FUND. Total purchase price \$570,000. \$380,000 to be State-contributed and \$110,000 by Community Development. Mayor's letter 6/1/81. Board of Finance approved 6/11/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE said Item #1 was held last month pending EPB's decision. Fiscal Committee voted 8-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE for another month pending further investigation and discussion with the EPB, the Board of Education, the Housing Sites Development Agency, and everyone involved about the possibility of re-evaluating the conditions set forth by the EPB concerning the footbridge into the Hart School playground, and hopefully coming up with some kind of alternative to that.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE HOUSING SITES DEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO MAKE APPLICATION TO STATE FOR \$380,497 FOR NORTH STREET HOUSING SITE. Margot Wormser, Housing Authority, submitted request 6/16/81. Held in Committee 7/6.

MRS. HAWE said Fiscal voted 5 in favor, one opposed and two abstentions, and she Moves for approval. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Item #2. The voice vote was not definitive and the President called for a Division by machine. APPROVED with 25 Yes votes, 9 No votes, and 3 Abstentions. Mrs. Signore wished to be changed to NO, and Mr. Stork wished to be recorded as YES.

MRS. SUMMERVILLE Moved that the Fiscal Committee would ask the Environmental Protection Board to hold a meeting jointly, and this entire Board would be invited, along with a staff person to tape the minutes of that meeting to resolve the problem that the Fiscal Committee is having with the site itself.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Ms. Summerville's Motion. Seconded.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

- (3) \$466,026.00 - BUREAU OF DATA PROCESSING - NEW COMPUTER - #245.071 - RESOLUTION AMENDING CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1981-1982 - to be financed by TAXATION. Mayor Clapes' letter 5/5/81. Board of Finance approved 6/11/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Reps. Blais and Pollard Abstaining.

- (4) \$ 82,838.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - PROGRAM #66 - DEPT. #810.0000 - to fund INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE for two non-public schools (Holy Name of Jesus and Sacred Heart) for fiscal year 1981-82 - to be reimbursed by State of Connecticut in fiscal 1982-1983, per 6/24/81 request of Asst. Supt. B. R. Reed, Board of Education. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Reps. Betty Conti and Donald Donahue Abstaining.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) \$ 21,416.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - Code 281.5560 - CONTRACT - PARKING GARAGE (contracted garage services and elevator maintenance in garages) - per Mayor's request 6/29/81. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (6) \$ 1,868.00 - ZONING BOARD - Additional Appropriation to increase salary of Zoning Analyst from contracted \$22,000 per year to \$23,540, retroactive to April 20, 1981, as below, per Mayor Clapes' request 6/29/81. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

Code 107.1180 Retroactive Pay	\$ 308.00
Code 107.1110 Salaries	<u>1,560.00</u>
	<u>\$1,868.00</u>

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWK said Item #6 covers a 7% salary increase for the temporary position of Zoning Analyst. This job will be phased out within two years when the comprehensive re-zoning is finished. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed, and she Moved for approval. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved to Waive the Secondary Committee report as they did not have a quorum. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Blum's Motion. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MRS. HAWK said the Zoning Board originally requested \$3,000 increase, but the Mayor changed that to 7%, which was less than Mr. Martin Levine asked for the Zoning Analyst's increase.

MR. BLUM said he was not present so could not ask the many questions that bothered him on this item. The Zoning Analyst's contract is less than a year old, and here we are talking about a renewal of contract and giving her retroactive pay. A contractual worker, especially a professional, does not generally get retroactive pay. This is not a union job, and therefore there should be no retroactivity. When was she first hired? What is the exact term of the contract? What is the renewal date?

MRS. HAWK said the Zoning Analyst was hired on April 20, 1980, and on April 20th of this year is the start of her second year. At its March 2nd meeting, the Zoning Board agreed to a new one-year contract, at which point they asked for an increase for her. The retroactive part, therefore, is only that part since the expiration of the first year's contract.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he, too, was unable to go to that meeting. Is this a contract renewal? He understood that this increase was to bring her up to MEA standards.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE said we are not approving her contract renewal, only the funding of the salary increase. Also the Zoning Board had asked for a greater increase, but the Mayor cut it down to correspond to the 7% that the MEA received.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said this situation is not as simplistic as it appears on the surface. First, it is said "Let us bring them up to union standards", but this is a contractual employee. Either you are a union employee, or you are a contractual employee. And being a contractual employee does not entitle you to the same rights and benefits as being a union, civil service type employee. Now this person has taken a job at a stipulated salary, knowing full well that there are no fringe benefits available. This is the job, and to say that we are going to give them a raise just because there are no fringe benefits, well, that comes with the job, no fringe benefits. That is part of the contract. In addition, this business about attending meetings and getting no over-time. Again, that is part of the job. In a middle management job, you do attend meetings and get no over-time payment. There are many, many City employees in this type of situation that do not get over-time. It is said that the Zoning Board extended her contract for another year. Well, sometimes contractual arrangements are a way to abrogate the Civil Service responsibilities of the City. I wouldn't say this is always the case, but how many people have applied for this job for this year? Do we know that? Did they advertise for this job again? Has somebody else come in and said they would like to apply for this job? These are questions which I feel we have a responsibility to get answers to, and I think just to blatantly approve ^{an} \$1,868.00 raise without getting any answers is wrong, and I can't go for it.

MRS. McINERNEY made a Motion to Move the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote, but the voice vote was not definitive, and the President called for a Division, using the machine. Motion DENIED with 17 Yes votes, 13 No votes, and 7 Abstentions.

MR. CORBO said he believes this request is in order. He spoke to Martin Levine recently who convinced him the Zoning Analyst was very capable and deserved this.

MR. FAUTEUX supports the increase for Mrs. Brady, and said the 7% is actually a merit increase, nothing more than that. Her outstanding performance and education call for it.

MR. DONAHUE said it is common practice for the City to give contractual employees compatible salary increases to the those employees at the same level who work within the Civil Service System. Mrs. Brady's work is excellent.

MR. FLOUNDERS agrees with Mr. Fauteux and Mr. Donahue, and also he feels it is refreshing to see someone rewarded for a heck of a great contribution to the job. He has been told she prepares full reports with the advantages and disadvantages, the history of the property, and brings a whole new dimension to Planning and Zoning that we have never had before.

MRS. GUROIAN strongly supports this appropriation. Mrs. Brady has more than proved her worth, and has become an almost indispensable adjunct to the Zoning Board. Every employee, whether he is contractual or union, is entitled to an increase, and 7% is certainly not exorbitant. She urges passage of this item.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLAIS said in response to those who said a contractual employee should not be given a raise. If one works out the numbers for a standard work year of 2,080 hours, this person is getting less than \$12.00 an hour. If you take a standard fringe benefit rate from that of 30%, her actual remuneration is around \$9.00 an hour. That is a pretty good deal for somebody with those credentials, even if the performance is not a super-star. He would like to remind the Board members that cheap can be dear.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Item #6. CARRIED with 28 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 4 Abstentions.

- (7) \$ 18,543.00 - DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE - CONTROLLER'S OFFICE - GROUP #21-1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request 6/29/81. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

1981-1982 Payroll Obligations	\$ 3,543.00
To hire Property Account Analyst effective 9/1/81	<u>15,000.00</u>
	\$18,543.00

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE said Fiscal voted four in favor and one opposed, and she Moved for approval. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved to Waive the Report of the Secondary Committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Blum's Motion. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MRS. GUROIAN Moved to vote separately on each of the two items as she does not feel they should be lumped together. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mrs. Guroian's Motion. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote with one No vote, Mr. Fauteux.

MRS. HAWE said the \$3,543.00 is to pay current payroll obligations in the Controller's Office. Commissioner Hoffman told them at budget time when his department was cut to reflect the deletion of an accountant, a few thousand dollars too much was cut and he is going to be that much short by the end of the fiscal year, and thus would not be able to pay some people. Fiscal voted 4 in favor and one opposed. She Moved to approve \$3,543.00. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said here we are July 31st, last Friday, and we're barely into August, and we are already talking additional appropriations in one of the departments. Let us go along. If at the end, or almost at the end of the fiscal year, the Commissioner feels he is going to be short, then would be the proper time to come in for an additional appropriation. Isn't it kind of early at this time, when we just voted in May on a budget commencing July 1st? The taxpayers were stuck with a higher mill rate. We've talked about this from Board to Board. It is time to stop and try to live under the budget at least for the early part of the fiscal year.

MR. FLOUNDERS objected to Mr. Blum's remarks and said the money should be approved.

MRS. HAWE said there are no vacancies in this department and she urged approval.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said that Mrs. Hawe is a co-chairperson of the Fiscal Committee who worked very hard on this budget in May, and that Mr. Flounders is a member of the Fiscal Committee and he, too, participated in the budget procedure. Mr. Blum hoped that both Mrs. Hawe and Mr. Flounders were aware of what they were doing. If they felt at the time, when they were going through this Group 21 salary account, and the personnel in that department is stable and not subject to any anticipated attrition or vacancies or job eliminations, how in the world did they come to cut \$3,543 out of this salary account? Why was this done? Was it just to show their constituents that they were cutting?

MR. BOCCUZZI said the cut was made at his request; and at the time, he was trying to work out something to get to a position where no new positions could be proposed without first getting approval of this Board and we had a handle on it. He felt that when this cut was made, he thought it might have to be restored, but he had to cut this one in order to stay consistent with all the groups. However, the group he wanted most to stay with, was lost in the second night of the budget meeting, and there were no more cuts after the first few he was able to effect. Since this was a cut that he proposed and was able to put through, Mr. Boccuzzi said he is now in favor of restoring it, as he has no intention of keeping that figure for the entire fiscal year.

MR. CORBO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on \$3,543.00, the first part of Item #7. Seconded. APPROVED with 29 Yes votes, 2 No votes, and 4 Abstentions.

MRS. HAWE said on the second part of Item #7, for \$15,000 to hire a Property Account Analyst effective September 1, 1981, a full-time person is needed to maintain the Fixed Asset Accounting System which has been newly-installed. Fiscal voted four in favor and one opposed, and Mrs. Hawe Moved for approval. Seconded.

MR. CORBO Moved the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said the Chair is in doubt of the voice vote and called for a Division by machine. The Motion is DEFEATED with 19 Yes, 15 No, and 2 Abstentions. (Mrs. Santy voting No) Two-thirds need for passage to Move the Question.

MRS. CONTI said she is opposed to adding this new position to the budget, and it will be there forever. We cannot afford to keep adding new staff members and raising taxes. We paid \$70,000 for a consultant to prepare an initial list of Fixed Assets of the City. There is no reason why each department head cannot keep track of the new assets that are purchased, and the old assets that are disposed of. Not every purchase is a Fixed Asset. Your Fixed Assets are your buildings, your large equipment, and there should not be more than four or five entries for each department in a year's time. This position is really not necessary and she is opposed to adding this to the budget.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA said he is not opposed to the position, but he is opposed to the salary, because he is involved in Fixed Assets with his employer. They had an opening for a Fixed Asset Accountant and eight different applications came in, people with bachelor's degrees in accounting and some with two or three years' experience, and the salary they were requesting was \$15,000 to \$16,000 per year, and our fringe benefits are 17%. We hired one fellow with a bachelor's degree and two years of experience for \$15,000 per year. Looking at this request, the whole trouble with the City of Stamford is that it is on a giveaway program with salaries. He therefore Moved to reduce this from \$15,000 to \$12,000 for the nine-month period, and the person would therefore be coming in with approximately \$15,000 per year rather than the \$18,000, and when you figure the fringe benefits of 27%, it is substantial. Seconded.

MRS. HAWK wished to remind the Board that if they reduce this by \$3,000, to a net of \$12,000 for nine months, the department can spend this as they will. They could hire someone at a lower salary or they could wait a couple of months and hire them at the salary they intended to in the first place.

MR. DIXON asked what will happen to the \$15,000 if they can't hire anyone at all for it.

MRS. HAWK said if the money is put in their account and they hire no one at all, at the end of the year, they can go to the Board of Finance and have it transferred to some other account, or it will go back to the General Fund.

MR. FAUTEUX said this job would be at the accountant level. There is more to this job than meets the eye. The Assets of the City which this individual will keep track of are over \$250,000,000. The buildings are worth over \$200,000,000, and the machinery, equipment, trucks, and all the other assets that are not nailed down, so to speak, are in excess of \$50,000,000.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to cut the \$3,000. The Motion is DEFEATED with 8 Yes, 21 No, and 5 Abstentions.

MR. FAUTEUX explored the need for this position. It is needed to maintain the integrity of our accounting system, and to properly account for our Fixed Assets. The Risk Manager will make good use of this program in his job. Items which are easily pilferable must be accounted for in particular. Where do items go when they are transferred? The records do not now reflect transfer between departments.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the \$15,000 part of Item #7. APPROVED with 27 Yes votes, 1 No vote, and 6 Abstentions.

- (8) \$123,000.00 - DEBT SERVICE - Code 900.8300 - BONDED DEBT EXPENSES - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' and Commissioner Hoffman's requests of 6/29/81, advising it is necessary to make commitments now to be ready to sell bonds in the late Fall if market conditions will allow a sale. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (9) \$274,255.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - GROUP #41.1413 POLICE PENSION - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request 6/29/81 to meet required funding level of 55.8% of covered payroll of Police Department - City's contribution. Board of Finance approved 7/9/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (10) \$254,531.00 HEALTH DEPARTMENT (ALSO WELFARE) - Additional Appropriation to fund salary increases and related benefits for period July 1, 1980 to June 30, 1982, per LABOR CONTRACTS:

(A) Dental Hygienists Association.

(B) Local 465, Council #4, AFSCME, Registered Nurses.

to be allocated as follows:

	<u>1980/1981</u>	<u>1981/1982</u>
<u>SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY</u>		
Code 520.1110 Salaries	\$ 12,710.	\$ 27,193.
Code 520.1122 Differential	455.	1,525.
Code 520.1201 Over-Time	770.	1,604.
Code 520.3480 Uniform Allowance	550.	1,100.
<u>HEALTH DEPARTMENT</u>		
Code 550.1110 Salaries	15,766.	34,157.
Code 550.1230 College Tuition	-0-	2,467.
<u>PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM</u>		
Code 560.1110 Salaries	23,866.	50,238.
Code 560.1220 Car Allowance	-0-	1,590.
Code 560.3480 Uniform Allowance	1,275.	2,150.
<u>HEALTH PROTECTION FOR PRIVATE & PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS</u>		
Code 561.1110 Salaries	-0-	30,046.
Code 561.1220 Car Allowance	-0-	10,501.
Code 561.1310 Social Security	-0-	2,013.
Code 561.1330 Medical and Life	-0-	2,195.
Code 561.3480 Uniform Allowance	-0-	1,575.
<u>GROUP 29 - FRINGE BENEFITS</u>		
Code 29.1310 Social Security	3,590.	7,686.
Code 29.1410 Classified Employees Pension Fund	-0-	19,509.
TOTALS	\$58,982.	\$195,549.
GRAND TOTAL 1980/1981 + 1981/1982	\$254,531. . .	

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Fiorenzio Corbo abstaining.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (11) \$ 5,030.00 - MAYOR'S OFFICE - Code 201.1201 OVER-TIME - Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request to cover work to be done specifically for commercial relocation for the URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION and will be 100% reimbursed by URC to the City of Stamford. Approved by Board of Finance 7/9/81.

Above also referred to URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (12) RESOLUTION CONCERNING PURCHASING PRACTICES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 484.1 "DUTIES OF PURCHASING AGENT" - limiting to \$3,000 for which no contracts or bidding procedure is required. Board of Finance enacted their resolution on 7/9/81. This is an annual procedure.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (13) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A BUDGET APPLICATION FOR THE STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM for the sum of \$140,588 for Title XX Supplementary Day Care and Assistance Agreement for the fiscal year commencing October 1, 1981. Submitted by Mayor Clapes 7/10/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (14) \$ 20,000.00 - RE-APPORTIONMENT COMMISSION - Code 133.3509 - 1981/1982 EXPENSES - Additional Appropriation requested by Co-Chairman Daniel M. McCabe, his letter 7/14/81, asking this item be considered at 8/3/81 Meeting.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. HAWE Moved for the approval of the CONSENT AGENDA for Fiscal items #3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Seconded. APPROVED with Peter Blais and Everett Pollard Abstaining on Item #3; Betty Conti and Donald Donahue Abstaining on Item #4; Fiorenzo Corbo Abstaining on #10.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Consent Agenda, which was APPROVED with the Abstentions as above.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Anthony Conti & John Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI said his Committee met on Monday, July 27, 1981, at 7:30 P.M. in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present were Co-Chairmen Anthony Conti and John Zelinski, and Reps. Blum, Corbo, and Pollard. Absent were Reps. Wiederlight, Fasanelli, Donahue and Loomis. Also present was Rep. Jeremiah Livingston. Mr. Zelinski Moved to the CONSENT AGENDA, L&R Items #2 and #7.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING THREE-YEAR LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN COMMITTEE ON TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT (CTE) AND THE CITY FOR THE SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTER. Mayor Clapes' letter 4/30/81. Board of Finance approved 6/11/81. Approved for publication 7/6/81.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Committee voted to amend the ordinance from a three year to a one year lease and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI said everyone received a letter from Rep. Livingston regarding this amendment, stating he made this recommendation due to the uncertainties of the economic conditions both in Washington and Hartford; and rather than tie up the City for an extended period of three years, it would be better on a year-by-year basis. With that, and other reasons, the Committee voted to amend this, and if this passes, the Committee also voted to ask for Waiver of Publication.

MRS. MCINERNEY commends the Committee for change the term from three years to one year, but there were certain things that came up in the lease itself that she would like to speak to. Paragraph 2 indicates that the landlord, which is the City, will be responsible for utilities in the amount of \$30,000 cu. ft. of water, 180,000 kwh of electricity per year, and 55,000 cu. ft. of gas per year. She called John Strat to see if she could get a dollar amount as to what was included or meant by this. He did not have that information available and he would do some research on it. She asked Mr. Strat also about major repairs at this facility and was told that they were completed to the roof, and had been completed to the toilets and the sinks. He also indicated there were four items that would have to be addressed. One was on the east wall of the gym facing the playground area where the graffiti had to be removed. Another was that the playground area needs resurfacing. Another was the chain-link fence around the property needs repairs, and parts of the guard-rail barrier were damaged and needed to be replaced. She asked Mr. Strat who, in effect, would be responsible for the expenditures which would be incurred for these four items, and he said he did not know. He wrote a letter to Mr. Spaulding about it and was waiting for a response. Mrs. McInerney said it is her feeling this month we have this South End Community Center lease before us, and they have also anticipated a lease with Community Return on the old West Main Street Community Center property. Before we proceed with any of the leases based on the shaky Federal and State funding that will be coming down in the future, we should ascertain the expenditures which the City will be obligating itself to in the future; and based on the fact that she does not have these particular answers right now, and Mr. Strat would be agreeable to getting them, she MOVES to HOLD IN COMMITTEE until the information is available. SECONDED.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said she would take discussion on Mrs. McInerney's Motion to Re-commit this item to Committee.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he concurs with this Motion although his reasons are somewhat different from Mrs. McInerney's. He and Mr. Brown had a very interesting conversation regarding this lease and the amendment for one year with one year option. Mr. Brown pointed out a new direction which he would be willing to move in with regard to CTE's involvement with the community, and he recommends sending back to committee.

THE PRESIDENT called for voice vote to Re-commit L&R #1. CARRIED with one No vote, Ms. Summerville; and one Abstention, Mrs. Saxe.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX EXEMPTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 12-81 (15) and 12-81 (b) OF THE GENERAL STATUTES FOR TRINITY EPISCOPAL CHURCH at 20 Brookdale Road. Submitted by Atty. Dichter of Brennan, Dichter, Brennan & Comerford 5/27/81. Approved for publication 7/6/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO ESTABLISH THE POSITION OF RISK MANAGER. Mayor Clapes' letter 6/18/81. Approved for publication as amended 7/6/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Committee voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE as some questions had been raised as to whether this should be a Civil Service position or a contractual position, and also that the Personnel Committee should be the secondary committee.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REPEALING SECTION 8-18 OF CODE OF ORDINANCES ENTITLED "ANNUAL PICK-UP OF HOUSEHOLD AND YARD DEBRIS". Submitted by Rep. DeLuca 5/18/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL MANDATING DEBRIS PICK-UP NINE (9) TIMES A YEAR. Requested by Rep. DeLuca 5/18/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

MR. ZELINSKI said the L&R Committee voted to combine Items 4 and 5 into one item, which deals with the same topic. He would like to add to it, the incorporation of the full ordinance and the full section when it is voted for publication, and he therefore will do that now: "Section b, there shall be an annual City-wide pick-up of leaves, yard and garden debris only, which pick-up shall be in the Fall of each year." And "Section c, there shall be adequate public notice in advance of said pick-ups." That would be one amendment to correct the change, and he so Moves.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT asked if there were a Second to the Amendment to include the whole ordinance in the publication. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said it must be clearly indicated that (a) will be deleted, and the new (a) will be substituted.

MR. ZELINSKI said he would see to that.

MR. WIDER said he is confused, since he voted on an ordinance two years ago for two annual pick-ups, and that was not carried out. Now here we come up for one with nine pick-ups. What kind of games are we playing? Are we playing some political games with the people out there who are looking for these things to be done. He doesn't see in any of these, requests for any money to implement these pick-ups, so he is wondering if we are building up some false promises. The people out there are fed up with them and he does not blame them.

MR. ZELINSKI said Mr. Wider made an excellent point, and if this were to pass, he would propose another amendment which would do just that, which would require in writing and in this ordinance, specifically, that the Mayor shall ask for the funds necessary to do this. If the first amendment passes, he will ask for the second one.

MRS. GUROIAN asked how do you put that in an ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI replied that you can put anything you want in an ordinance.

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED to RETURN TO COMMITTEE until the full cost implications are determined as it would be precipitous to go forward with publication with all these loose ends hanging out, particularly the dollar ones. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote to RETURN TO COMMITTEE items #4 and #5 (which have been combined) on the L&R agenda. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING REPEAL AND REVISION OF SECTION 8-2 OF CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING GARBAGE COLLECTION IN CITY-SEWERED AREAS AND AREAS THAT BECOME SERVICED BY CITY SEWERS. Submitted by Corporation Counsel Leonard Cookney 6/15/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

MR. ZELINSKI said his Committee voted 4 in favor to DENY this, and one against, and he Moves for publication. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI said the majority of the Committee felt that this was not something they should publish inasmuch they had denied a request several months ago dealing with an abatement for condominiums, and in that was the repeal of this particular ordinance. Also, as they have heard earlier this evening pertaining to Commissioner Spaulding not wanting to pick up the garbage in the commercial establishments in the City; that was the rationale.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI said she does not read anywhere in this amendment anything that denies garbage collection to condominiums, as he just mentioned.

MR. ZELINSKI said that was just a point of information that this was before the Board earlier and the ordinance that was defeated that dealt with condominiums, also incorporated this in that ordinance, which was to repeal this, so this is just coming before us a second time in a different way.

MRS. CONTI asked what was the rationale for the L&R Committee turning this down.

MR. ZELINSKI said he would speak for himself, and the other Committee members can speak for themselves if they wish. He did not feel it was proper for the City government to deny the pick-up of garbage for commercial establishments within the districts that were sewered and which this ordinance does provide for. They pay taxes and he feels they are entitled to garbage, and basically that was it.

MR. BLUM said this ordinance is nothing but a continuation of the Public Works Commissioner, or whoever it might be, in his opinion to eliminate garbage collection within the sewered areas. Mr. Blum believes eventually that this City, if it continues in the same vein, is looking for means to get out of garbage collections. He voted against this ordinance as a representative of an A district and CS district; that is one of the services the people pay for and are entitled to.

MRS. CONTI wished to straighten out a misconception that she has heard here several times tonight. Whether or not the City picks up your garbage, you are still getting the services of the incinerator because regardless of who picks it up, it winds up down at the incinerator and that is what you are paying for in your Public Works. You are not so finely assessed as to how much it costs to pick it up, and how much it costs to incinerate it and dump it and haul it away. The fact is that whether the City takes it or not, you are still receiving the services of the incinerator, so you cannot say that you are paying for something that you are not getting.

MR. BOCCUZZI said Mrs. Conti said we are getting the services because the garbage eventually ends up in the incinerator. How about what it costs you to get the garbage from your house into the truck. Is not that an extra cost? What Mrs. Conti is telling him is they are going to burn his garbage, but I've got to pay to put it in the truck, so I am getting taxed twice. I pay to get it out of my backyard, and I pay again to have it burned. If the City picked it up, I would be paying once, just to have it burned. That's where the paying comes in; that's where the assessment comes in on your tax bill.

MRS. GUROIAN said she thinks she had belabored this point before, but there is a connection, but it's a very slight connection between the taxes you pay and the services you get. The connection is that the taxes pay for the services, but the determination as to what services you are entitled to, is made by the legislative process. There are a lot of services that you pay taxes for, and which you don't get any at all. You pay for welfare.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN went on say that if you don't have any small children, you pay for the school expenses. There are a lot of services the taxpayer pays for, to which he is entitled, maybe, but which he does not get. The very fact that you pay the taxes does not mean that you have to demand to get the service, otherwise you're not going to pay the taxes. This Board determines who will get services and what services they will get. And that is exactly what we are talking about. If it is the wish of the Board that the A district, including condominiums and commercials, etc., are entitled to garbage collection, then it should so say; but the very fact that they pay taxes does not entitle them to the garbage collection. It is the determination of this Board whether they want to give them the garbage collection or not. So don't mix the two up.

MR. BLAIS views this particular proposal to go hand-in-hand with an earlier issue that we dealt with tonight, and that is getting Commissioner Spaulding to fulfill his duties, as some members of the Board of Representatives, see it, in collecting garbage. If we pass this, we must have a re-vote on an issue that we discussed earlier tonight regarding the meeting with Commissioner Spaulding. If we pass this, he is getting a fait accompli in that we are accepting his position in refusing to pick up garbage. Therefore, he urges the Board to deny this proposal.

MR. BLUM has always believed, and we have been told this, that as the sewer system comes into being, then if you've a single family house, and you comply with Section 8-4 and you have the proper size container, you will get garbage pick-up. It is logical to assume that that is part of the service for which you pay taxes. It is said here if we pass this ordinance regarding garbage collection in City-sewered areas, and areas that become serviced by City sewers, that's what we're voting on, we would be saying to Mr. Spaulding, you are right, the Rock Spring Road Terrace does not need garbage. There are people on Glenbrook Road in apartments, they don't need garbage either. Pay for it with a private carter. Eventually, the private carters will take over the whole garbage system. Then we will be in the same situation as the condominium people. We voted on this Board about that tax abatement, but they went to the Courts, and the Courts are now re-assessing, re-evaluating their property because they are not getting the services.

MR. ZELINSKI said to clarify something that Rep. Betty Conti said, ironically tonight when we got here, we found the Real Estate on the Grand List as of Oct. 1, 1980, and on Page 3, it mentions that District A receives all services, which include Police, Fire, Sanitary Sewers, and Garbage Collection. So that is a service, the collection of the garbage; it does not say the incineration of the garbage only.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on L&R Item #6, reminding the Board members that the Committee voted to DENY, but she will entertain the usual positive Motion when voting, keeping in mind the disposition by the Committee. Mrs. Perillo asked that the record show that Alfred and Mildred Perillo are not voting or participating on this item. MOTION DEFEATED with 5 Yes votes, 20 No votes, and 9 Abstentions. The ordinance will not be published.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO AMEND SECTION 21-49 AND No. 338 SUPPLEMENTAL ENTITLED "DEPOSIT OF SLUDGE, ETC. INTO DISPOSAL PLANT - PERMIT TO COVER ONLY OPERATION NAMED THEREIN; PERMIT FEE; ADDITIONAL CHARGE. Submitted by Corp. Counsel Leonard Cookney 6/15/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA. (Mr. Zelinski said they will be holding a public hearing on this if publication is approved.)

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CREATING A WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STATE SUBSTITUTE HOUSE BILL NO. 5840 - PUBLIC ACT NO. 78-154. Submitted by City Rep. Fiorenzo Corbo 6/15/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

MR. ZELINSKI said the Committee voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE as they did not receive the text. Mr. Corbo will be working with Corporation Counsel on this.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED Items 2 and 7 for approval on the CONSENT AGENDA. SECONDED. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) REPORT REGARDING THE CHANGE OF JOB SPECIFICATIONS AS RELATING TO OUTSIDE PRACTICE FOR POSITION OF DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL. Submitted by Rep. John J. Boccuzzi 6/5/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

MR. BLUM said he has a very short report. Personnel met Thursday, July 30, 1981. Present were John Hogan, Michael Wiederlight, Paul Dziezyc, Philip Stork, and David Blum. The meeting was called for 7:30 p.m. in the Main Room, to vote on item #1 of the Agenda. They discussed the questions that he had written, as per a work session, to the Corporation Counsel's Office and the Personnel Department. Today, he received the questions and all the correspondence from the Law Department. To this date, he has received nothing from the Personnel Department. They voted to wait until Wednesday of this week. He will send a letter to the Personnel Department again, asking for the material. If the Committee does not receive it, they will bring it up again at the Steering for further action.

MRS. GUROIAN asked how many people remain, as so many have left, and the PRESIDENT said there are 32 members left.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee met on Thursday, July 30, 1981. Present were Reps. Guroian, Stork, Fasanelli, Wider, and Donahue. He MOVED to the Consent Agenda, Items 1, 2, 3, and 4.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) ACCEPTANCE OF STREETS - BUTTERNUT LANE as a City Street. Submitted by City Engineer William Sabia 5/14/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81. City Engineer's letter of certification 7/7/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF STREETS - MALIBU ROAD as a City Street. Submitted by City Engineer William Sabia 5/14/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81. City Engineer's letter of certification 7/7/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) ACCEPTANCE OF STREETS - CHATHAM ROAD as a City Street. Submitted by City Engineer William Sabia 5/14/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81. City Engineer's letter of certification 7/7/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) ACCEPTANCE OF STREETS - NORTHWOOD LANE as a City Street. Submitted by City Engineer William Sabia 5/14/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81. City Engineer's letter of certification 7/7/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO CONTROL AND REGULATE EXCAVATION, FILLING AND GRADING. Submitted by City Rep. McInerney 6/16/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #5 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (6) REQUEST TO REVIEW OFFICE PROCEDURES OF CITY AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR ISSUING BUILDING PERMITS. Submitted by Rep. Fiorenzo Corbo 6/17/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81.

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee has met with ^{Mr} Sotire, the Chief Zoning Enforcement Officer and Building Inspector for the City. Mr. Sotire explained in great detail the steps which are necessary to obtain a building permit. In his presentation, Mr. Sotire indicated that no less than eight City agencies must review each set of proposed plans for any building in the City, and must sign off on a departmental approval form before a Building Permit is issued. Some of these departments include, but are not limited to the Assessor's Office, Environmental Protection, Fire Marshal, and Traffic Director. There also seem to be sufficient checks on this system to guarantee compliance. During the summer, the Office of Community Development is employing a law student who is reviewing procedures for the issuance of all permits in the City in order to help those who will seek permits in the future, and make their efforts just a little easier and certainly less confusing.

PLANNING AND ZONING (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said in a related matter, the Committee discussed penalties for zoning violations. And the request for this was submitted by Reps. Santy and Signore. Mr. Orval Stamm also attended. After discussing the current zoning regulations with Martin Levine, Chairman of the Zoning Board, and Margaret Brady of the Zoning Department, Mr. Sotire, and Mr. Stamm, it was the consensus of the Planning and Zoning Committee that State law currently provides more than adequate remedies for enforcing zoning regulations. It had been suggested that a tax surcharge could be levied on buildings that do not comply with local zoning, and also on buildings that are to be constructed under variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. This procedure would be both cumbersome and would appear to allow developers to buy a variance, or the ability to construct buildings that do not comply with Zoning Regulations. In closing, Mr. Sotire feels his department is more than able to cope both with the issuance of building permits and zoning enforcement.

MR. DONAHUE said that one other issue was discussed was the suggestion that the Zoning Enforcement Officer should report to the Zoning Board rather than to the Public Works Commissioner. This is an issue that would require Charter Revision, and thus there is not enough time to begin the process within the life of this Board. There seems, however, to be general agreement that there is now more than better cooperation between the Board and the zoning enforcement agency. While the Committee will continue to explore various suggestions along with this one, that have been made during our discussions, this will conclude our report at this time.

MR. DONAHUE MOVED for acceptance of the Consent Agenda for P&Z items #1, 2, 3, and 4. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Donahue's Motion. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. She said there are now 30 members present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby

THE PRESIDENT said every member received from Mr. Rybnick an extra medallion for his or her car, and she wished to thank him for the work that went into that.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

MS. RINALDI said no report.

ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman Fiorenzio Corbo

- (1) COMMISSIONER SPAULDING'S PROPOSED RESOLUTION STATING THAT THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES REQUESTS THE MAYOR TO RE-SUBMIT AN ADDITIONAL CAPITAL APPROPRIATION FOR \$90,000.00 IN ORDER TO RETAIN A CONSULTING/ENGINEERING FIRM TO PERFORM SECOND PHASE OF SOLID WASTE PLAN TO INCLUDE DESIGN OF FACILITIES RESULTING FROM FIRST PHASE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE FUNDED BY TAXATION, 1981-1982 Fiscal Year. Submitted by Rep. Fiorenzio Corbo 7/20/81.

MR. CORBO said he has sort of a report. The Committee met July 23, 1981. In attendance were: Grace Guroian, Betty Conti, David Blum, Commissioner Bruce Spaulding, and himself, Fiorenzio Corbo. After one-and-a-half or two years of work, study, and trying to explore the system that they would like to introduce down at our Incinerator in order to produce some kind of energy through conversion, the Committee decided, in order to proceed with the study and the design, to propose a resolution to this Board which will express the intention of this Board to do so; a sort of petition to the Mayor to request \$90,000 which will pay for the study and design of a conversion system that will consist probably, after the study is done, of a type of furnace which will produce some energy, electricity, which will eventually save between \$600,000 and \$800,000 for the taxpayers of Stamford. According to the preliminary estimates of the potential energy which will be produced from the incineration, there will be enough energy to sell a portion back to the utility company, after we have supplied the needs of our plant down there. At this point, Mr. Corbo yielded the floor to Mrs. Betty Conti if anybody has any questions. Mr. Corbo Moved to approve the resolution. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI supports the resolution, and while she would have liked to study a few other systems, but quite frankly, the time is growing short and the Incinerator is in deplorable condition. It has a very limited life, and something is going to have to be done, and it should be done very soon. She recommends passage of this resolution in order to get the design phase under way, so that there will be something to take care of our garbage needs. At the same, we will be able to generate power which will save a great deal in HELCO bills.

MRS. GUROIAN, as a member of the Committee, urged adoption of this resolution. This Committee has had quite a few meetings and has looked extensively into the options available to them in order to alleviate the problem existing in waste disposal. This City is not unique. Everybody knows that virtually every city in the United States, small or large, has a waste disposal problem. In some respects, the Committee has discovered in their deliberations, that we have a lot of things working for us such as locale, the fact that we have a process whereby we burn our sludge, etc. But, looking at it short range, we are wasting a lot of energy which can be utilized by the City itself. Long range, we have to eventually replace the incinerator. Mr. Spaulding has assured us that the plan we are contemplating in purchasing with these dollars will come in phases. The first phase should be before our Board in three months, whereby certain recommendations will be made in order to address itself to the two problems that she mentioned. She urged the Board to vote for this as the time is short, as Mrs. Conti said. The Committee has done a lot of study and have come to the conclusion that the City cannot afford to waste any more time. A decision must be made and something must be done about the problem. It is hoped that this will point the way to some kind of solution as to waste disposal in this City.

ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE said she agrees with this Committee, and something must be started in terms of planning and design, because the complex down there is really a mess. In a way, it is on its last legs. She urged passage of this resolution.

MR. BLAIS said he was under the impression that the Public Works Committee already considered this measure and defeated it. The incinerator that was built in approximately 1972 should not be on its last legs.

(There was an exchange of conversation between Mrs. Guroian, Mr. Blais, and some other Board members but they were not recognized by the President and were not speaking into the microphone, and as a result, did not come through on the tape

THE PRESIDENT asked if anyone could answer Mr. Blais' question.

MRS. CONTI said among the many things they learned on this Committee, one was that the municipal incinerator only has a life span of 8 to 10 years, so even though it was built in 1972, it has really reached its lifespan as it now nine years old.

MR. BLAIS said his question was whether the Public Works Committee already took this up.

MRS. PERILLO said if the Commissioner feels this is urgent, why doesn't he go before the Board of Finance with it, and then it comes to us. Why should it come to us first, as that is reverse procedure.

MR. BLUM said he speaks as the minority member on that Committee, the On-Site Refuse Conversion Study Committee, and it means exactly what it says: conversion of garbage to energy. He said we have been converting garbage to energy, but wasting it. There is energy being burned up every day, being wasted, down at the incinerator complex, and for years, Mr. Blum has been asking that we take this and make electricity out of this. We have a situation where we have a Sewage Treatment Plant sitting not too far from the Incinerator. Every day 18 Million gallons of water, clean water, is pushed out into Long Island Sound. Every day, so many thousands of BTU's go up into the smokestacks at the incinerator. One of the plans that have been talked about is reconvertng or getting these two plants together, putting in dynamos where the steam from the waters that will come over the pipes of the garbage, or the incinerator, will produce steam in order to turn dynamos over, in order to turn generators over, to produce energy to save close to \$800,000 in electricity bills that is used at that complex every year. That is quite a savings. After all, that is what the taxpayers want: a saving of over half a million dollars in the utility bill down at the incinerator complex.

MR. ROOS does not think many of the members would want to hinder this very necessary waste energy plan. Disposal of solid waste efficiently and locally is an item we cannot long ignore. Haulage costs and site location will continue to be an escalating problem. Our On-site Refuse Committee has been active and very practical. After many meetings and engineering consultations, this is what they recommend. Let us avoid political differences and fund this project as soon as possible.

ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD said the Public Works Committee voted unanimously against this resolution not because they were against a solid waste management program, but because the request for the funding should come from the Public Works Commissioner.

MRS. MCINERNEY said a couple of years ago the Planning Board wisely chose not to enter the Resource Recovery Program operating in Bridgeport. It chose at that time to explore new ways in which to address the problem in Stamford. Unfortunately, things did not really get off the ground. She thinks this On-Site Garbage Committee has done a job that was very good. (Tape not intelligible here, so some of Mrs. McInerney's comments lost.) We must not be blinded and not look at the problem that is happening down in Shippan.

MR. FLOUNDERS said that he, as a member of the Public Works Committee, voted against this resolution. Subsequently, after further investigation, he decided he made quite a mistake. He, now, therefore, supports the Committee's recommendation to approve it. This has already been approved by the Planning Board and the Board of Finance. There is \$50,000 in the 1980-1981 budget for the Planning Phase which absolutely should be followed up with the \$90,000 for the Design Phase.

MR. DONAHUE MOVED the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Donahue's Motion to Move the Question. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Main Motion to approve the Resolution. APPROVED with 21 Yes votes, 8 No votes, and 1 Abstention.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR - None.

RESOLUTIONS - None.

PETITIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

June 1, 1981 Regular Meeting.

Moved for Acceptance by Mr. Boccuzzi. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK said on Page 46, Line 6, it should read: "Does this mean that this person can have 5 years' experience as a teacher and 5 years as an administrator and then claim"(instead of 10 years and 10 years).

MR. BLUM asked that his remarks regarding the Traffic Director be included verbatim.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES (continued)

The June 1, 1981 Minutes will be amended to include Mr. Blum's remarks, as requested.

A Motion was made to accept the June 1, 1981 Minutes as amended. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

(NOTE: Mr. Ford was approved at the July 6, 1981 Meeting, not June 1st, and those Minutes will be amended as requested by Mr. Blum. See next page.)
July 6, 1981 Regular Meeting

Moved for Acceptance; Seconded; APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE PRESIDENT said the first Monday in September is Labor Day, and she requested a Motion to change that meeting date to Wednesday, September 9, 1981. Moved. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALSOLD BUSINESSNEW BUSINESS

THE PRESIDENT requested that her No vote be changed to a Yes vote on the Resolution appearing on the On-Site Conversion Committee agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon MOTION made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the Meeting was ADJOURNED at 1:35 A.M.

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

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

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
16th Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Connecticut

HMM:MS
Encs.

DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

The following information is being released to the public under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

This document contains information that is exempt from public release under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

The following information is being released to the public under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

This document contains information that is exempt from public release under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

The following information is being released to the public under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

The following information is being released to the public under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

CONFIDENTIAL

The following information is being released to the public under the provisions of the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964, and the President John F. Kennedy Library Act, 1964.

DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY

CONFIDENTIAL