

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 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 WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1981, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:33 P.M. by President Sandra Goldstein after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Given by Pastor Richard C. Hintz, Zion Lutheran Church, Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, 132 Glenbrook Road, Stamford, Connecticut 06906.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Sandra Goldstein led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL: Clerk Annie M. Summerville called the Roll. There were 35 present and 5 absent at the time of Roll Call. However, 3 members came in between 8:45 and 8:59, making the attendance 38 present and 2 absent. The absent members were Reps. Bowby and Boccuzzi.

The President declared a QUORUM was present.

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

PAGES: None.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late ROY WILKINS, requested by Rep. Annie Summerville. Mr. Wilkins was a great man and a great leader of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for 46 years, and was its director for 22 years before he retired in 1977. He will be remembered by both black and white for what he accomplished in Civil Rights Movement. Roy Wilkins fought a good fight, always keeping the faith. He did what he could for others, in his own way. His death is ironic, as many of his civil rights endeavors are being eliminated by the present Administration, especially Affirmative Action policies. He symbolized the passing of an era during which great strides in racial equality were achieved in this country. We are all saddened by this loss. We will miss you, Roy, but we will never forget what you did and what you stood for.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE (continued)

For the late ALEXANDER JOHN KOPROSKI, a life-long Stamford resident, and a member of the Stamford Police Department for 32 years. He was named "Man of the Year" by both the Holy Name of Jesus Church and the Polish American Business and Professional Club. He was treasurer of the Police Anchor Club for 20 years. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski.

For the late ROY WILKINS, Rep. Audrey Maihock would like to second Anne Summerville's tribute to Roy Wilkins. He was a most honorable, respected American, who believed in our Country's constitutional processes to accomplish significant reforms.

For the late LOWELL THOMAS, Rep. Audrey Maihock, who was a very special man, and who, through his communication skills, opened up the windows of the world to us all.

STANDING COMMITTEES

A Motion was made to WAIVE the Reading of the STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT. Seconded. Carried.

HMM

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, August 24, 1981 in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. at which time a Quorum was present. Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairperson
Annie Summerville
Michael Wiederlight
John J. Hogan, Jr.
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca
Robert Fauteux
Lathon Wider, Sr.
Handy Dixon
Jeremiah Livingston
Mildred Perillo

Jeanne Lois Santy
Donald Donahue
John J. Boccuzzi
Barbara McInerney
Richard Fasanelli
David Blum
Fiorenzo Corbo
John R. Zelinski
Anthony Conti

(1) APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were nine names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were the remaining names: (1) Ronald J. Wagner, Fair Rent Commission - Alternate; (2) Sybil Taccone, Human Rights Commission; (3) Meg Kimmel, Welfare Department; (4) Ervin Steinberg, Urban Redevelopment Commission.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(2) FISCAL COMMITTEE

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

Two MOTIONS were made to place on the Agenda a \$90,000 appropriation for the Public Works Department for a Solid Waste Study - contingent upon Board of Finance approval. DEFEATED.

(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

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

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were: (1) For publication, prop. ord. creating a water pollution control authority; (2) For publication, prop. ord. for sale of City-owned property on east side of Hurricane Barrier, south of Seaview Avenue to Ocean View Construction, Inc.; (3) For publication, prop. ord. requesting tax abatement for the Nature Conservancy; (4) For publication prop. ord. regarding non-liability of Municipality for ice and snow on public sidewalks; (5) Request from the Stamford Ambulance Corps for a reimbursement of \$1,200.00 for building permit.

(4) PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was one item regarding Ratification of Fact Finder's Report RE: MAA and the City.

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and one item not appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda being Acceptance of General Waterbury Lane as a City Street.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

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

(7) HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE

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

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were: (1) Report on Creation of Emergency Medical Service Department; (2) Report on Dolphin Cove Water Supply; (3) Status Report - Fire Task Force; (4) Matter of Agent Orange Victims; (5) Matter of Possible Health Hazards of Microwave Transmitters for Cable TV.

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was the Use of Police Target Range by City Residents.) (Public Hearing held 8/31/81)

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was one item regarding the Inquiry into the Past Functioning of the Smith House Nursing Facility.

(10) SEWER COMMITTEE

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

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was an item regarding Problem of Run-off Water Flooding, 191 Prudence Drive.

(11) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item not appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; Prop. Resolution RE: Personnel Policy for Community Development Office.

(12) URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda being Proposed Resolution Concerning Approval of a Contract for the Sale of Land in the Southeast Quadrant (Extended) Urban Renewal Project for Private Redevelopment to David Murray, Samuel Berman, Henny Murray and Eva Berman.

(13) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

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

(14) CHARTER REVISION & ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

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

(15) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two Sense-of-the Board Resolutions appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(15) NEW BUSINESS

ORDERED OFF THE TENTATIVE STEERING AGENDA was one item To Perform a Marriage Ceremony Between Rep. John R. Zelinski, Jr. and Joan McGrane.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

AK

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, Chairperson
Steering Committee

REQUEST FOR SUSPENSION OF RULES

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED to Suspend the Rules to bring Item #9 of the Legislative and Rules Committee out of order and to be presented now. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mrs. McInerney's Motion. DEFEATED with 21 Yes votes, 10 No votes, and 4 Abstentions. Needed two-thirds.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Chairman Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON said the Appointments Committee met on August 27, 1981 at a Special Committee Meeting called for the purpose of interviewing of MR. JOHN T. CONSIDINE for the position of POLICE CHIEF. Except for Mrs. Barbara McInerney, who, at that time, had to take one of her children away to college, the Committee had a full complement of members present, and a number of other Board members who had also been invited.

The Committee met again on September 3, 1981 at 8:00 P.M., in what was considered its regular scheduled meeting. Present were Reps. Mildred Perillo, Anne Summerville, Barbara McInerney, John Boccuzzi, Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Ralph Loomis, and Handy Dixon.

MR. DIXON MOVED to the CONSENT AGENDA those appointees who received an unanimous vote of approval from the Appointments Committee: #3, and #7.

E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COMMISSIONTerm Expires

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| (1) <u>THOMAS F. LANGAN</u> (R) | Replacing V. Ottaviano | December 1, 1984 |
| 77 Prospect Street | whose term expired. | |
| Held in Committee 6/22, 8/3/81. | | |

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED to Return to Committee, Items 1, 2, and 4.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Fauteux to make that Motion individually, when Mr. Dixon brings them up, at which time such a Motion would be very much in order.

MR. DIXON said Item #1, Thomas F. Langan, was Held in Committee without prejudice last month pending response from the Golf Authority and the Golf Commission to an inquiry from the Appointments Committee as to their policy on free play. The Committee has received the required information, which reveals that an established policy regulating free play does exist by both the Golf Authority and the Golf Commission. During the interview with Mr. Langan, he made an excellent presentation on his interest and concern for improvement of our golf facilities. He has an abundance of knowledge and expertise resulting from his activity as a golf player, together with his affiliation with the United States Golf Association, the Westchester Hills Golf Club, E. Gaynor Brennan Men's Club, and various tournaments. The Committee voted for confirmation 3 in favor, 2 against, with one abstention. However, he wishes to state for the record, out of a firm belief that Mr. Langan would be an asset to the Golf Commission, Mr. Handy's vote was in the affirmative. He Moved for approval of Mr. Langan's appointment. Seconded.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX Moved to Return Item #1 to Committee, pending other business in front of the Board. Seconded.

MRS. MCINERNEY said Mr. Dixon alluded to the fact that in interviewing and examining of the people who are applying for the Golf Authority and Golf Commission, that we have found free golf privileges. Since the last meeting, it has been found that there are not only free golf privileges for Commission members of their respective clubs, they have reciprocal services. They have paddle tennis. Mrs. McInerney learned that morning that the manager and some of the employees have free use of the Golf Authority. She thinks that one dollar lost by this City where a privilege which is not allotted to other Boards and Commissions, such as Zoning, Planning, etc., this is an abuse; it is unfair. Mr. Langan indicated if there were a law, he would abide by it. Mrs. McInerney is of the opinion tonight that all of the people who were interviewed, indicated that if there were an ordinance, they would respect the ordinance and follow law. She feels they should be held until such time as action can be taken on the Legislative and Rules Item #9.

MR. WIDER said he spoke to all three candidates. They are as upset as the Board members are at the dual standards of public servants. They would like to see some correction on this. Mr. Wider is a firm believer, and he promised them that he would not vote for anyone to go on either of those golf facilities until such time as the Board has completely cleared up the dual standards of public servants, which is, we have some people who are using City facilities in return for their service, and others do not have that opportunity. Mr. Wider said that is wrong and he cannot sit here and legislate for the people who elected him, when he allows people to use facilities in this manner. Mr. Wider is of the firm belief that an ordinance should be in place before any one is put on a Golf Commission or Authority. He seconds the Motion to Return to Committee.

MR. FASANELLI does not feel Mr. Langan's name should be Held in Committee any further. The whole committee believed he is an amply qualified person and a concerned person who is willing to serve Stamford. Mr. Langan stated he could afford to pay to play golf. This is his first time to be appointed to the Commission. Why should he be penalized for the previous sins of the past policies of past golf commissions. His name should not be held.

MR. LOOMIS agrees with Mr. Fasanelli. There is no purpose in holding these names hostage, Mr. Langan being one of them. If the Board wants to pass an ordinance, that's fine, but it should not be mixed up with holding up these people because of some ordinance, is something Mr. Loomis fails to understand. Moreover, Mrs. McInerney's ordinance would prohibit this activity that is being objected to on the floor right now. These people have agreed to comply with this, so we accomplish nothing by holding the names. They have agreed to abide by the laws of the City, so innocent people should not be penalized.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD agrees with Mr. Loomis and Mr. Fasanelli inasmuch as he feels Mr. Langan would be a great asset. He is upset to learn again, after three or four years of the Board letting its views be known, and known very strongly, that freebies won't be tolerated, if some of these applicants are going to be confused with other issues, that we should pass on these people, and at the same time vote favorably for Item #9 under Legislative and Rules.

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Return to Committee, Item #1. DEFEATED, with 17 Yes, 19 No. Mr. Livingston and Mr. Loomis have joined the meeting, making two additional members present. On the vote on the motion, there was one abstention.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the appointment of Mr. Langan to the Brennan Golf Commission. APPROVED with 26 Yes, 5 No, and 6 Abstentions.

E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COMMISSIONTerm Expires

(2) <u>MARIE PATTERSON</u> (R)	Re-appointment	December 1, 1985
907 Long Ridge Road		
Held in Committee 6/22, 8/3/81.		

MR. DIXON said Mrs. Patterson feels that after putting in many hours of hard work, she has gained much experience in the operation of the golf course. She is a semi-retired real estate broker and is desirous of utilizing her time in service to the City. The Committee vote on a Motion to approve, was 2 in favor, 2 against, with one abstention, which Mr. Dixon feels is a vote of denial; and he, therefore, as is the Board's custom, makes a positive motion of approval. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Dixon was correct that a tie vote does defeat a motion. It is also quite proper to proceed, as is custom on this Board, to frame the Motion in the positive sense.

MRS. MCINERNEY said Mrs. Patterson stated she bought her permits for both Hubbard Heights and Sterling Farms, and she pays to play golf on the weekends. By her permit, she is a senior citizen and is entitled to free golf on weekdays, which is normal for every senior citizen in Stamford. Mrs. McInerney feels Mrs. Patterson has done a good job and should be commended for paying her way when she plays.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she concurs with Mrs. McInerney.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on confirmation of Mrs. Patterson. APPROVED with 23 Yes, 2 No, and 12 Abstentions.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARDTerm Expires

(3) <u>LOUIS LEVINE</u> (R)	Re-appointment	December 1, 1983
2677 High Ridge Road		
Held in Committee 6/22, 8/3/81.		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITYTerm Expires

- (4) PETER STEKLA (R) Re-appointment January 1, 1984
31 Elmcroft Road
Held in Committee 7/22, 8/3/81.

MR. DIXON said Mr. Stekla has served a full term plus, and is presently Chairman of the Golf Authority. He has been engaged in many activities of the Authority, as well as the Brennan Golf Commission, for a number of years. He feels he can be a great asset and contributor to the growth and stability of Sterling Farms. Mr. Stekla has been a resident of Stamford since early childhood, and is presently a retired die casting engineer from the Mt. Vernon Die Casting Corporation. The Committee voted 2 in favor, 2 opposed, with 3 abstentions. Mr. Dixon Moved in the affirmative to approve this appointment. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA said approval of this appointment tonight will also be approval of a person who, since his term on the Authority, had three occurrences, two of which resulted in apologies being made to people. His attitude, at times, has been arrogant, over-abundant use of power. As recently as several months ago, there was an incident where a golf tournament was going on, and a prominent husband-and-wife team won the tournament with a score that was considered low, if you play golf; and he made the comment about how could they shoot so low a score. The people were deeply hurt because their integrity and honesty were questioned. Yet, tonight we are considering voting approval of this person. Mr. DeLuca said he can just imagine, considering the instances where apologies were called for, that we are just saying go ahead and do your thing. We highly approve of it wholeheartedly. Mr. DeLuca urged the Board members to reject this appointment.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said they interviewed Mr. Stekla for about two hours. She was satisfied with Mr. Stekla's responses to Mr. DeLuca's questions. She said he explained, to her satisfaction, and she is not a golfer, that it is impossible. You can't be liked by everyone. She is not disputing what Mr. DeLuca said, but she feels Mr. Stekla's explanations were satisfactory and she accepts them. She urges the Board members to trust her judgment and vote for Mr. Stekla.

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a Division by machine as the voice vote was not conclusive. DEFEATED with 12 Yes, 20 No, and 6 Abstentions.
The question is not Moved and discussion will continue.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he could not attend the meeting, but from ^{what} Mr. DeLuca has said, Mr. Livingston feels that if we were to use that gauge in judging people, and if we were to use a simple statement like, how did you do this; sometimes you know, we look around this room and we wonder just how did some of us get elected. Mr. Livingston thinks we should confirm this name, because from the positive things that have been said versus the negative things that Mr. DeLuca has said, he does not think that Mr. DeLuca is giving a strong, legitimate reason why this person cannot serve on that Board.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER thinks they are going completely wrong tonight. He must speak in favor of Mr. Stekla whom he has known for quite some time and who is in his district. He seems to be a very nice, ambitious person, and Mr. Wider can see no reason why he should not continue to do a good job at Sterling Farms.

MR. POLLARD favors Mr. Stekla's appointment. Members might recall that not too long ago, we put Mr. Stekla in a very difficult situation, moving into the Golf Authority with all the problems that existed at that time. Mr. Pollard has worked fairly closely with him since that time and found him to be very cooperative, indeed very, very helpful. He urges his appointment.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Stekla's confirmation. APPROVED, with 20 Yes votes, 4 No votes, and 13 Abstentions.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITYTerm Expires

(5) KATIE JANNICKY (D)
96 Alexandra Drive
Held in Committee 8/3/81.

Replacing A. Ferri

January 1, 1983

MR. DIXON said the interview with Mrs. Jannicky was quite successful, in his opinion. The members of the Committee were satisfied with the answers to the questions they put to her. She has been a Stamford resident for 11 years and wants to utilize part of her time in service to the City. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of this appointment, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said Ms. Jannicky was a fantastic person and would do well among the men on the Authority, having been interviewed at length, and she handled herself in a very nice way. Ms. Summerville asked the Board, without her prolonging her discussion, to trust her judgment again; that they will not be embarrassed by her sitting on that Board. She is a fantastic lady.

MR. BLUM said they considered this evening several appointments to the Golf Commission and now they are on the Golf Authority. He would like to ask what type of questions are asked of these candidates for the simple reason that many years back, one of the things the Boards had made sure that the Appointments Committee should ask was in regard to the freebies. Were these questions asked of the previous candidates, and this particular candidate?

MR. DIXON said he does not wish to be redundant, but the questions they asked of all of the appointees who were interviewed, are those related to the position that they wish to be appointed to. On free play, he does not believe it was one that was asked directly of Mrs. Jannicky because she will be a new-comer to Sterling Farms Authority. She has absolutely nothing to do with any policy that has been pre-set by the Authority, but Mr. Dixon is quite certain that she is an honest person and is willing to abide by any rules, regulations, or laws that are passed.

MR. FLOUNDERS MOVED the Question, Seconded. Carried unanimously by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mrs. Jannicky. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, Zero No votes, and 6 Abstentions. She said there are 38 members present. Mr. Joyce has joined the body.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)PLANNING BOARD - ALTERNATETerm Expires

- (6) MS. CAROL ERICSON (R) Replacing R. Meno December 1, 1985
10 Cady Street whose term expired.
Held in Committee 6/22, 8/3/81.

MR. DIXON said the Committee felt Ms. Ericson is a very qualified person, and is deserving of the opportunity to demonstrate some of her expertise and knowledge in serving on the Planning Board as an Alternate. She received an unanimous vote of approval by the Committee and he Moves for her confirmation. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked what was the connection between Carol Ericson and the building business, if there was a connection.

MR. DIXON asked Mrs. Maihock to be more specific.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked for some of the resume relating to her background.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said Ms. Ericson works for a building firm and is the office manager of six persons in the office. She explained she had no connections with anything that the City is doing; and being an office manager does not mean that she will be going out and getting bids from the City. At this date and time, her company is not doing any work for the City.

MRS. MAIHOCK said Ms. Summerville mentioned this date and time. She asked if the company had previously done work for the City.

MR. LOOMIS said although Ms. Ericson is a resident of Stamford, she works for a firm that is based in Greenwich, and the firm essentially is a cement contracting firm that will bid on jobs that are ready to go out, that are being put out by development outfits that have already done all the work in developing a property or a parcel of land. They have nothing to do with development per se. They are simply going in to help in the development process, once everything has been laid out. They would have nothing to do, actually, with the nuts and bolts of development.

MRS. PERILLO agrees with Mr. Loomis and said there is no conflict-of-interest. They are subcontractors only in the masonry line.

MRS. CONTI said while there may not be a direct conflict-of-interest, there is certainly, here, an appearance of conflict-of-interest, being this individual is an executive with a contracting firm, and we have a Land Use board. Mrs. Conti would be forced to vote against this.

MRS. MCINERNEY questioned Ms. Ericson as to the type of business her firm did in Stamford and if she felt that she would be placed in a position of conflict-of-interest. She indicated, as Mr. Loomis said, that her firm has not done work in Stamford, and it is a small contracting firm. Initially, Mrs. McInerney hesitated on approving this appointment, but she changed her mind based on the fact that she is an Alternate, and Mrs. McInerney intends to send her the recently-passed Code of Ethics so that she will know from the onset what is considered in conflict and what is not. It is to be assumed she would follow the Code of Ethics and therefore comply with the laws of Stamford.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. POLLARD said he knows Ms. Ericson and he thinks she brings a substantial background that would be very useful to the Planning Board, particularly in those areas in which we find ourselves lately, where the City has nearly sold land for far below its market value. Her background and the resources she has available will help her to determine what the proper values for land are.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Ms. Ericson. APPROVED with 30 Yes votes, 2 No votes, and 6 Abstentions.

ZONING BOARD - ALTERNATETerm Expires

- (7) ALVIN J. SIEGARTEL (R) Replacing R. Montaine December 1, 1981
91 West Hill Circle who resigned
Held in Committee 6/22, 8/3/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Rep. Patrick Joyce abstaining.

HEALTH COMMISSION

- (8) DR. BERT BALLIN (D) Re-appointment December 1, 1983
Stone Hill Drive
Held in Committee 8/3/81.

MR. DIXON said Dr. Ballin is a charter member of the Health Commission. He was first appointed back in the early 1960's, and has been a faithful servant to that Commission since that time. He is anxious to continue his service to the City. Evidently, he gets a lot out of it, and Mr. Dixon knows that he has a lot to offer to the Health Commission. His in-put is tremendous and has been so right down through the years. Had it not been for Dr. Ballin, Mr. Dixon feels sure that the Health Commission would not be where it is today. The Committee, recognizing all these good qualities in Dr. Ballin, has, as always, voted unanimously for another term for him. He moved for his confirmation. Seconded.

MRS. SANTY wishes to thank Dr. Ballin for his 19 years of service on the Health Commission. As Chairman of the Health and Protection Committee of this Board, every month some one appears, invariably every month, with a complaint about the HEALTH DIRECTOR and the HEALTH COMMISSION, being frustrated, aggravated, upset. She receives phone calls. She thinks it is time for a change, for new, fresh ideas. We cannot hold any members of the Health Commission responsible for the Health Director's actions and attitudes, his behavior, but certainly they have to bear some of the responsibility; and although it hurts Mrs. Santy deeply to say No to Dr. Ballin, this is the prime reason she is saying No. She thinks we need some other direction on that Health Commission and this is where it has to start.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she agrees with Rep. Santy and she is very sympathetic to what she is saying, but they did interview Dr. Ballin and he explained, illustrated some of their problems and which we are having. We know, all of us, what the problem is. But we also have to realize there is a certain amount of intelligence along with that problem. We can't all be calm and cool. Some of us don't know how to approach people. He explained, and Gabe really quizzed him to the point, what happens when the Public is turned off by an intelligent, bright person, who does not really know how to say "Good Morning" to you. Well, Dr. Ballin explained to the Committee that sometimes the person

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE (continuing)...is not aware of this, but they are working on that problem. All right? And that is the truth as she is quoting what he said. She concurs with Dr. Ballin in what he says. He is a slow-moving person. She likes his style. One thing Dr. Ballin said during the interview that stuck in Ms. Summerville's mind was that we are the people who get the complaints because we are the elected officials. Quite naturally, we are going to hear the complaints. He said that they get as many people saying good things about this particular problem, as we get complaints. Now you have to take a person's word. We are the elected officials. Ms. Summerville does hear complaints. You only hear from people when they want something, and complaints. She took Dr. Ballin at his word; she knows him as a very respectable person, and she respects his judgment, and she hopes the Board will vote for Dr. Ballin and not hold that problem against him.

MR. LOOMIS concurs with Ms. Summerville. There are two things here. One, you would have to look at Dr. Ballin's record and it is a very distinguished one. He has given a lifetime of service to this community in many capacities, not only on the Health Commission. He is one of those rare individuals who knows the history from the very beginning of the Commission, so he can speak with great confidence and authority on matters that come before the Commission.

The second issue, obviously, is the one that Mrs. Santy raises, and is the one dealing with Dr. Gofstein. He, too, was concerned about this, and he thinks everybody was, and that is why Dr. Ballin was there in the Committee meeting for about an hour and a half. Every single person had a different concern addressed to the same issue, essentially. Mr. Loomis was persuaded, after hearing Dr. Ballin, that Dr. Ballin is very sensitive, very concerned, and very alert to that problem. Indeed Ms. Summerville makes a good point, that we are aware of a certain side of Dr. Gofstein. We are not aware, however, of the many things that are said about him, about the many dealings that he has that are successfully concluded, and those are the things that the Commission have a much better understanding on than we have. Dr. Ballin has a greater sensitivity to this issue as a result of our hour-and-a-half interview. Mr. Loomis does not think it is wise to take this issue out on Dr. Ballin because in fact, Mr. Loomis thinks Dr. Ballin agrees with us, and would probably be willing to help the Board and work with them on this issue.

MR. LIVINGSTON said we cannot judge one individual because of the actions of another. At some point, and if we are talking about Dr. Gofstein, it should be said. But at some time, Dr. Gofstein comes up for re-appointment himself and that would be the time that we address this to Dr. Gofstein.

MR. RYBNICK will vote for Dr. Ballin this time. He voted for him when he first came on, and every time when he came up for re-appointment. He served the Commission very well.

MR. ROOS has known Dr. Ballin for quite a few years and the City has been fortunate to have his services all these years and Mr. Roos would like to see him confirmed.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. PERILLO said we should not punish the Commissioners because they are very limited in their powers. Jerry Livingston stole her line; that the man that they dislike is Dr. Gofstein; we'll let our voting do the talking for us then, when his re-appointment comes up if we are dissatisfied with him.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Dr. Ballin's appointment. APPROVED with 26 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 6 Abstentions.

CHIEF OF POLICETerm Expires

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| (9) <u>JOHN T. CONSIDINE</u> (U) | 10-year appointment accord- | Sworn in by Mayor |
| 31 Sutton Place | ing to Charter Sec. 401.1. | Clapes on 9/12/81. |

MR. DIXON said his report on Item #9 is somewhat unique, but it is quite relevant and to the point of business. It contains a little story that I personally made up. I would ask your indulgence only for a moment. If it appears to deviate from the Order of Business, I would just simply ask you to bear with me for, as it unfolds, I am sure you will see that it is quite in line with the Order of Business. The little story unfolds as follows:

" TO REPLACE A FALLEN TREE
by Handy Dixon

"Once there was a King who resided in a huge castle situated at the edge of a small forest. In the midst of the forest, stood a tall tree that watched over the castle by night, and provided shade for the King's terrace in the heat of the day.

"One day, the tall tree, which the King had planted some few years earlier, fell to the ground. When the forest keepers saw what had happened, they ran and told the King the tree had fallen. The King was troubled and considered this a great loss, because he had imported the tree from a foreign land and saw much difficulty in replacing it. Nevertheless, he set out immediately to find a replacement, for the nightwatch was imperative, and the hot sun on the terrace was unbearable.

"The King took his huge microscope and set it in the window on the west wall of the castle. And through it, he searched the hillside until he saw a tree which he thought could be used to replace the one that had fallen, but he wasn't sure. At that time, one of his forest keepers said, 'But, your Majesty, we have--'. 'Don't bother me!' interrupted the King. 'I must search for a replacement, for there is no other tree in the forest that stands so tall.'

"The King moved his instrument to the north window and then to the window on the east wall of the castle. There he adjusted the lens on the microscope to magnify 1,000 times, and continued his search until he found what appeared to be a tall, beautiful tree that would stand head and shoulders over any other tree he had seen. Before he could utter a single word, one of his keepers said to him again, 'But, your Majesty, we have found a--!' 'Say no more to me,' said the King, 'for I am King!' And I have found a replacement for the fallen tree!'

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)Continuation of story "To Replace A Fallen Tree" by Handy Dixon:

"Now, after many months had passed and the heat waves rolled upon the King's terrace, he called the forest keepers and commanded them to go forth into the hills, on the east side of the castle, and fetch the tree he had seen through his microscope that he may replant it in the midst of the forest.

"So, as loyal servants, they went forth and as they drew near to the tree, they found it to be only a shrub. Then, suddenly, they remembered the King had magnified it to appear 1,000 times its natural size, so they left it standing.

"When the keepers returned to the castle and reported their findings to the King, he was so dismayed and, in a loud voice, he cried, 'I must go back now and reconsider the tree I first saw in the west!' Again, one of his keepers said, 'But, your Majesty, there IS A TREE in the For--!' 'Speak not to me again,' the King interrupted, 'I will find a replacement tree even if I have to search in a foreign land.'

"So the King moved his microscope again toward the west window, and, as he was passing the opened window on the south side of the castle, he saw, from the corner of his eye, a huge, tall tree standing in the midst of the forest. He stopped in amazement and gazed upon it momentarily, and asked, 'Where did that tree come from? And why have I not seen it before?' Then the spokesman for the forest keepers said, 'Your Majesty, that's what we've been trying to tell you.'

"'That tree,' said the Spokesman, 'is the one we planted over 25 years ago. Its view was cut off by the fallen tree that stood before it. It has grown up among the other trees of the forest and its roots are deeply imbedded in the ground. Its trunk has grown large and tall, and, as you can see, its branches are very wide-spread. So, your Majesty, it is quite obvious that it is capable of watching over your castle by night, and providing shade for your terrace in the heat of the day. Furthermore, your Majesty, I know of no other tree that can stand head and shoulders over it.'

"'You are so right, my loyal servant. Take me to it and I will stamp my Royal Seal upon it.'

MR. DIXON went on to say that the Committee has voted unanimously for approval of MR. JOHN T. CONSIDINE for our next Chief of Police in the City of Stamford. Seconded.

MRS. McINERNEY: We have listened to the Dixon Fable Story Hour for about ten minutes. I think it is totally unfair to relate a man's character to a tree. I think there is no doubt in anyone's mind that this Board has favorable opinions of Mr. Considine. I think it was a political maneuver on the part of the Chairman. It was not a committee report, and I thought it was out-of-order and should have been called out-of-order.

MR. DeLUCA: It's a Point of Personal Privilege. I had to sit here for ten minutes. At least with a juke box, you can always pull the plug out. I came here tonight because I had the privilege and the honor of interviewing a man, who I think is going to be a terrific Chief of Police. I think it is an embarrassment to Chief John Considine to sit here and listen to a fable that is nothing but political. It is a rap at Mayor Clapes and it is uncalled for. If he wanted to air his fable, he could have done it someplace else and not subject us to this kind of nonsense.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. SANTY: I am very embarrassed for Chief Considine, who is sitting in the audience tonight. He is a man far above any of the others, and we know that. But what we are doing tonight is playing politics, and I don't think this Board is above politics, especially tonight, when we are honoring a man; and to bring in petty politics tonight and play that game, I think it is discouraging; I think it is a disgrace, and I think we owe Chief Considine an apology.

THE PRESIDENT said they will proceed to the issue, which is on the confirmation of John Considine.

MR. ZELINSKI said he recently conducted a survey in his district to determine whether his constituents wanted a local police chief or one from out of town. The result was 8 out of 10 wanted a local candidate. He is extremely pleased that the Mayor changed his mind and selected our own local Deputy Chief John T. Considine from the Stamford Police Department. Mr. Zelinski sincerely and strongly believes that Deputy Chief Considine will be an outstanding Chief, and probably the finest Chief of Police that Stamford has ever had. He is the man for the job. Deputy Chief Considine is held in high esteem and greatly respected by the police officers of our Police Department, as well as a large segment of the residents of this City. Mr. Zelinski believes some 5,000 residents signed a petition in favor of Mr. Considine. Our Stamford residents will be the beneficiaries of this Board's affirmative vote this evening in favor of Chief Considine.

MRS. CONTI said she is speaking for Grace Guroian and herself, and in support of the many constituents who called them, it is a great pleasure to second the nomination of John Considine as a permanent Police Chief of Stamford. They are very proud to have Chief Considine as a neighbor and as a constituent in the 7th District. He is a fine and capable man, and eminently well-qualified to serve as Police Chief. Even if a more extensive search had been made, no better Chief could be found than John Considine, nor a finer gentleman, for that matter. An unanimous vote is urged for his confirmation.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she wants to thank John Considine very much for his service to our City during a most difficult transitional period. Her district has always been interested in adequate police coverage and a professional police department. They are interested in having the police force utilized to its fullest, delegating more possible ancillary jobs to others. She hopes that Chief Considine will exercise all efforts to introduce innovative, new plans whereby our police can be preserved for law and order, and that we can delegate other jobs to civilians or other persons. She wishes him well.

MR. FAUTEUX said he respectfully Moves the Question. Seconded. Carried with three Nay votes.

THE PRESIDENT then called for a vote on the confirmation of Mr. Considine as Police Chief.

MRS. PERILLO asked for a Roll Call vote. Seconded. Carried.

MS. SUMMERVILLE, Clerk of the Board, called the Roll, and the vote was 37 Yes, 1 No (Mrs. Ann King Saxe), no abstentions. John Considine is the Police Chief of Stamford. (Roll Call is attached at the end of the Minutes). (Mr. Boccuzzi and Ms. Bowlby were absent this evening.)

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. PERILLO: A Point of Personal Privilege. Now that Chief Considine has been confirmed, on behalf of the Board, I would like to present him with the letter submitting his name for Chief of Police. May I go a step further. John Considine is only the second man appointed Chief from the ranks since 1926. At this time, I would like to congratulate him and his wife, Doris. May I make a Motion to have a short recess to celebrate this happy occasion with the Chief, his family and friends, and have some refreshments.

Motion Seconded. Carried Unanimously.

RECESS lasted 19 minutes, from 9:49 P.M. until 10:08 P.M.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Marie Hawe and Paul Esposito, Co-ChairpersonsREQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES

MRS. SANTY Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the Agenda, for \$90,000 for a Solid Waste Study in the Dept. of Public Works. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mrs. Santy's Motion and it was APPROVED by a vote of 28 Yes, 3 No, and 7 Abstentions. The rules are suspended.

- (10) \$ 90,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Phase II, Solid Waste Study - Addition to the Capital Projects Budget 1981-1982 - #343-0958 - to be financed by TAXATION - CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF FINANCE at their 9/10/81 meeting.

MRS. SANTY Moved for this appropriation of \$90,000.00. Seconded by Mr. Blum. She said on the third of August, this Board approved a resolution and sent it to the Mayor asking him to re-submit this Capital appropriation. He approved it on the 10th of August. It was sent to the Planning Board, who unanimously approved it on August 11th. Every month lost from this point onward, decreases the chance that appropriations needed for this project can be included in the 1982-1983 Capital Budget. It is almost too late now. If the \$90,000 is passed by the Board of Finance tomorrow night, and if the contract is speedily completed, then there should be enough work completed by December to give some idea of the Capital requirements for this project. The engineering team which is able to competently complete this project is receiving requests from many towns that are interested in solid waste to energy projects. One just has to read any paper and see where everyone is trying to covert their garbage into fuel, and know that there is competition. We want the best firm possible. We do have that firm committed to us. They want a full commitment and they certainly want the total amount. When the original \$50,000 was appropriated from Public Works Department with Commissioner Hoffman, they had no idea of the cost of it. Now they now, and they need this to complete the study. It is essential that we do this. We sit here month after month and we complain about the incinerator, and the odors, and the garbage and what is going on. Now is our chance to act. Now we can take a position, a step forward. Let us not delay this any further and go on record that this Board is approving something that we need so desperately in this town.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he doesn't think we should circumvent the system, that system being that the Board of Finance must approve something before the Board of Representatives, which is a fiscal item. He believes doing this is setting a bad precedent and this situation will constantly keep arising. The system is in place for a reason, and it should be followed. It works. In addition, this item came before us at budget time. We sat and we deliberated and we voted against it at that time. Now it seems that somebody is playing the same game all over again. If we don't get it in the front door, we get it in the back door. If that is going to be the case in all these additional appropriations, why don't we just forego budget time and just go on from there and save ourselves two nights til three o'clock in the morning.

MRS. CONTI said circumstances alter cases. There is a very serious situation at the incinerator. There is only one working incinerator, and it can go at any time. It is past the age of what municipal incinerators are supposed to last. They are only supposed to last about ten years, and it is about on its tenth year. Many things can wait, but garbage cannot. One or two days of garbage piled up can create a serious health hazard. This project will give proper incineration for garbage. It will cut down the haulaway costs because the garbage will be incinerated properly and it will also save a great deal of money because electricity will be generated with the incinerator. Mrs. Conti is highly in favor of this and she urged a vote of approval.

MRS. McINERNEY said she certainly would urge support of this fiscal request made by Mrs. Santy because it is extremely important to realize the scope and the depth of this project. You must have project continuity. Without it, we are lost. She really thinks this Board would be making a mistake if it, in fact, decided to hold this item and wait until next year. It is imperative for the City. It is imperative for the citizens, and it is imperative to save tax dollars.

MR. BLAIS pointed out that the members of the Public Works Committee have already considered this proposal and studied it, and already determined that the Motion was not worth passing.

MRS. GUROIAN said she is a member of the On-Site Garbage Committee, which has studied this question not at one meeting, nor at two meetings, but for a solid two years, meeting after meeting, and she thinks, although she started as a neophyte and did not know what garbage meant except to dump it in the garbage can, that they have become pretty knowledgeable in the field. Her committee is not only in support of this expenditure, but they are very much aware of the necessity to proceed as fast as possible, because an incinerator is not decided upon and built within months. It takes years. This is only the Second Phase. There are many more phases after this, and it is imperative at this time that we start at least to consider the type of incinerator we are going to have. That is what this Study will bring forth: proposals of different types, fitting our present facilities, so that it will be possible to not only dispose of our garbage, but to create power which can be used in our own City facilities and save in excess of hundreds of thousands of dollars by doing so. The entire Committee feels it is imperative at this time to move forward on this, and every member is urged to support this. It is true that at the time of the budgets, this was passed over and refuted, but if you think back, the members of the On-Site Garbage Committee who, at the time, decried the fact that it was passed over without hearing what that Committee had to say on this proposal; And done so fast as not to give it the time that it deserved to be considered. Mrs. Guroian said if the members feel that garbage disposal is important to this City, that you move ahead and approve this appropriation at this time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER said no one feels the need for this any more than the people in the South End. Nevertheless there is a little problem with turning people down with various things that have not gone to the Board of Finance first. He remembers a few years ago, we had before us something known as CRRS for the Board to consider. We rejected it. It was for something like half a million dollars. And then all of a sudden, we find out it was bankrupt, gone out of business. Mr. Wider is not so sure that this On-Site Garbage problem is going to save us what we think it is going to save us. He is also not so sure that the Board of Finance is going to work on it tomorrow night. If we pass this before the Board of Finance does, we will be putting pressure on the Board of Finance which they may not appreciate. Mr. Wider is not so sure our timing is right. The project is right, but he questions our timing. He would much rather see the Board of Finance consider it first and then have it come to us, if they approve it.

MR. BLUM speaks as a member of the On-Site Garbage Committee, which was thought to be a nothing. What can they do, study garbage? Well, today, garbage is worth money. Garbage that we burn, that goes up the chimney, goes for naught, and we have so many BTU's that are lost. Can you realize that we are burning, with the amount of garbage that we have, like we would be burning 6,489,000 gallons of oil with this garbage every day. Mr. Blum has many times talked of energy recovery. It is time we realized something has to be done with the City's incinerators, not coming here each time to put a Band-Aid to make temporary repairs each time a problem occurs. These incinerators are now reaching the point that they have to either go over, or we have to have a new incinerator. They have had their time. These refractory bricks can only last a certain length of time. There is now in place a Sewage Treatment Plant in the same place that gives us water. We have an Incinerator burning garbage giving us heat. We can put the two together, with a study, an engineering study, so electricity can be generated, the same as is being done in Europe, in Japan. We can save close to One Million Dollars on our electric bills at the Complex where the Incinerator is today. Time is of the essence tonight and the Board should vote on this item.

MR. DeLUCA said he would be brief. Unfortunately, he does not feel this Board should compound the error that they made at budget time by holding this item for another month. If memory serves him correctly, this Board has voted on other items which the Board of Finance had not yet approved. We created a fire by delaying this item, and the fire should be put out now. We have an On-Site Refuse Committee which did a great deal ^{of} research and study, and they recommended that we go ahead with this proposal. He recommends approval tonight. Time is of the essence. Landfill sites are becoming extinct. This is a necessity. We are elected to save money for our taxpayers and this would be one of the ways of doing it.

MRS. HAWES said this Study is desperately needed because the Incinerator is in dire straits and could break down any time, and then we would really be in trouble. She also wished to re-emphasize what Mr. DeLuca said. In the past, quite a few times, passed fiscal items contingent upon the Board of Finance's passage. It is not something we should do all the time for no reason, but this is something definitely worth doing in that manner.

MR. FAUTEUX wished to reiterate the sense of urgency that is facing them, and also make an observation about the state of technology in handling solid waste and garbage. In the last five years, there has been such a revolution in (1) the experience with the sites that are in operation; and (2) with some of the advances on how to handle garbage. Also that this Study is going forward with a number of checkpoints that

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX (continuing)....can be utilized to stop the project if it is not feasible or economical. We are at a great decision point here, all the signals are positive. There was a quality report from the On-Site Study Group. He said he has never seen such unanimity in a recommendation come out of a Task Force as was seen here. It should be strongly indicated to the Board of Finance what the feelings of this Board are on this subject.

MR. CORBO said, as Chairman of the On-Site Refuse Committee, he is very glad that this Board has come to a turning point where we are going to agree to launch this program. As Mrs. Guroian, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Blum, Mr. DeLuca, and others mentioned, the Committee did a great amount of research on this program. The project itself is so desperately needed that he is pleased that we are nearing the point of some definitive action toward solving the problems of garbage disposal.

MR. FLOUNDERS stated he wholeheartedly supports his colleagues who favor the approval of this plan tonight. Phase I was approved previously, but it is academic without Phase II. He thinks that many of the people who voted against this at budget time will agree that, in retrospect, perhaps we, as a Board, made a mistake. It is one of those critical and expensive problems of waste disposal that we have in this City. In fact, it is a problem that even transcends politics. There is nothing wrong, as Rep. Conti suggested, with taking practical steps to expedite this project which, as Rep. Wider suggested, is a right problem. He urged approval.

MR. ROOS said evidently we approved Phase I and put \$50,000 into it, and the Board of Finance did approve this at budget time. He fails to understand why we approved Phase I if we are not interested in seeing this thing through. It is sorely needed and we should not procrastinate any longer. We should get on with it as fast as we can.

MRS. SAXE said she has written something which she would like to read. "It is time to be affirmative on this project, and it should be a bi-partisan issue. It should be a means to draw the talents of this Board and other Boards of the City to help this new-forming City to grow with pride, to establish a model of cooperation on a project that affects each and every one of us; and it also affects those who live in Stamford, come to Stamford, visit in Stamford, and work in Stamford. I do hope that we get full cooperation of this Board and all other Boards affecting this."

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the Question. Seconded. Carried with a few No votes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Main Motion of \$90,000 for Phase II of the Solid Waste Study. APPROVED with 31 Yes votes, 2 No votes, and 5 Abstentions. Mr. Roos said his light did not come on, but he voted Yes.

MR. BLAIS said now that the Commissioner has his \$90,000 for a study of Solid Waste, he would like to see him request \$90,000 to restore garbage collection.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to the CONSENT AGENDA, Fiscal Items #2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9.

- (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 - to be 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 Clapes' letter 6/1/81. Board of Finance approved 6/ 11/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81 and 8/3/81.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #1 is BEING HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) \$249,690.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - STAMFORD ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS - Additional appropriation required to grant salary increases and related benefits to the School Administrators as a result of the contract which has been negotiated between the Board of Education and the Stamford Administrative Unit, covering the period July 1, 1981 through June 30, 1983. See letter from Benjamin R. Reed, Asst. Supt. for Business Affairs, 7/15/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with 4 Abstentions: Maihock, McInerney, and Wieder-^{light}
also Donahue abstained./

- (3) \$100,000.00 - SEWER COMMISSION - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - by adding a project to be known as #112.079 WINDELL PLACE, which project is to be financed by the transfer of the sum of \$100,000 from project #112.428 16-1 PEPPER RIDGE AND VINE, which has been completed. The remaining balance of \$59,926.11 remaining in the Pepper Ridge & Vine account is to be retained to cover pending claims. Mayor Clapes' letter 7/27/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

Above also referred to SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) \$ 1,339.00 - SEWER COMMISSION - Code 112.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation required to re-classify a Clerk Typist I (Grade Step S-4-E) to Clerk Typist II (Grade Step S-7-E). Mayor's letter dated 7/28/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) \$ 10,294.33 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.1110 SALARIES - Additional appropriation required to employ an Account Clerk (Step 3). Mayor Clapes' request 7/28/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

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

- (6) \$ 57,246.00 - STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - by adding a project to be known as #481-894 SAC Headquarters Building. Planning Board letter 7/11/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (7) \$ 34,000.00 - STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET by adding a project to be known as #481-895 SANITARY SEWER AND STORM. Planning Board letter 7/11/81. Board of Finance approved 8/13/81.

Above also referred to SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said on Item #7, Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed and he MOVED for approval. Seconded.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the Sewer Committee concurred with 3 in favor, none against.

MR. DeLUCA said no one seems to be really sure about the rock that may be there, that it is a probability but no one knows for sure, or just what the figure is or how much it is going to be, or if we don't spend the money, will it go back into the General Fund. In view of all the answers that have come forth yet, he Moved to reduce this by \$25,000, and then if they ever do find rocks, he is sure they will come back for more money. This would be approving \$9,000.00 at this time. Seconded.

He said his rationale for this reduction at this time is because if the contractor does hit rock, he will not complete the job within a week's or two weeks' time. He can always come back for the money later on. There is no reason to approve expenditures in anticipation of an unknown quantity such as this, and then have to wait until the end of the fiscal year to get the money back, if this rock does not materialize.

MR. FAUTEUX said approval would be just an obligation and the money would not leave the General Fund until it was spent. By doing this, we cast a great air of suspicion over this project, and this is not necessary.

MR. WIDER agrees with Mr. Fauteux. There is such a thing as stopping a project in the middle of the stream. This is a fine project and should be able to move ahead.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA said he does not see where a cloud of suspicion is being cast on anyone. Nor does he see where we are stopping any project. What we are doing is voting on possibilities. This is poor budgetary practices, to vote on possibilities. There are all kinds of unknowns here. To begin with, the Ambulance Corps changed the design of the building without coming to the appropriate Boards, or even to the Building Department. Granted they have carte blanche as it is. It is ludicrous to appropriate \$25,000 for an uncertainty.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion to reduce item #7 from \$34,000 to \$9,000. Someone doubted the voice vote and requested a Division by use of the machine. DEFEATED with 8 Yes votes, 23 No votes, and 6 Abstentions.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on approval of \$34,000 for Item #7 for the Ambulance Corp. APPROVED by voice vote with 3 NO votes (Santy, Signore, and DeLuca), the rest being YES votes.

- (8) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION TO FILE APPLICATION FOR 50% GRANT IN THE SUM OF NINETEEN THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$19,800) FOR THE "HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROJECT." Mayor's letter 8/14/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

- (9) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING STATE PAYMENT-IN-LIEU-OF-TAXES FISCAL YEAR 1981-1982. (PILOT) for State-financed moderate rental housing. Mayor's letter 8/19/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Ms. Summerville Abstaining.

- (10) \$90,000 for Solid Waste Study -- see pages 16-19 of these minutes.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to approve the CONSENT AGENDA for Fiscal items #2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9. Seconded. CARRIED. (Ms. Summerville abstained on #9; Mrs. Conti abstained on #8; On #2, the abstentions were Mr. Wiederlight, Mrs. Maihock, Mrs. McInerney, and Mr. Donahue.)

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES

MR. BLUM MOVED to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the Agenda, which is \$237,100 for the Perfect Attendance Bonus for the Stamford Teachers. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Blum's Motion to Suspend the Rules. APPROVED with 23 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 6 Abstentions.

- (11) \$237,100.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - To fund Teachers' Attendance Bonus. Contingent upon the Board of Finance approving same at their 9/10/81 Meeting.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said the Board of Education changed its request to fund the Teachers' Attendance Bonus from \$251,200 to \$237,100 which represents the total of checks prepared by the Payroll Department and is in the amount set aside by the Finance Department in the 1980-1981 budget, prior to the close-out. Mr. Blum MOVED for approval of the \$237,100, CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF FINANCE at their 9/10/81 meeting. Seconded.

MR. BLUM summarized the Law Department's opinion, which mentioned the Court action that was involved, and which resulted in a decision that the teachers were entitled to this bonus. Even though there are some Board members who are, in principle, against this, it is a matter of the State law. The account is now in escrow, and payments will be made according to an arrangement made between the Board of Education and the Finance Department. He urged passage.

MR. ESPOSITO said he hoped that the many Board members who voted for Suspension of Rules will also vote favorably and pass this appropriation, as two-thirds are needed for approval. We have come full circle now, having taken this issue as far as it will go legally. There is no reason to wait until next month. These people have waited patiently, and have gone through the appropriate channels for four months and he feels strongly they should get their money as soon as possible, which means voting for it tonight, contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

MRS. MAIHOCK still feels an attendance bonus is counter-productive to providing the highest quality education for the children. Rewarding just attendance and not merit is certainly not in the best interests of teachers either. It is not her choice to fund this Attendance Bonus, but rather she will vote for it because the Court decision has made no choice possible. She is supportive of giving teachers in our school system raises for performance, and she thinks the time is long over-due that they receive a raise for that purpose.

MS. SUMMERVILLE agrees with Mrs. Maihock, as she, too, feels strongly about voting for this. She said Mr. Blum speaks of the law; well, the law is that this Board waits until the Board of Finance sends down the appropriations they have approved, and then we act on them. Let's go by the law, and if are going to do it right, let's do it right. She thinks the teachers will understand that.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he would not dare try to persuade anyone else to vote against this, or to abstain, but he wants the record to show that he is still opposed to this in principle, but he will not vote against it; he will abstain.

MR. STORK said this matter was before us back in June at which time he stated his position. He cautioned this Board that this would blow up in our faces, and it did. Let's get it over with, and move.

MRS. McINERNEY said it is obvious that the decisions of the Courts have ruled that we must vote on this and she hopes that we can move it tonight.

MRS. SIGNORE said she is voting for this tonight. She is against it in principle. It is a humiliation for every teacher in this town who considers himself or herself a professional. This should be in the paycheck and more should be added to it, to give them a decent salary. She is talking about the teachers who directly affect the lives of children. Don't hang a perfect attendance bonus in front of their noses like a gold star. She will vote for this tonight.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said his views have long been known publicly and by his peers on the Board. The views of this Board have been known to the citizens of this City that we are against this Perfect Attendance Bonus. Unfortunately, the law has decreed that we must pass this funding. We must uphold the law. That is what we are sworn to do. Unfortunately, we must vote for this, and he hopes that the people out there will realize that we are not voting voluntarily, and that they will go to the polls in November and pull the proper levers for the Board of Education members, or not for the Board of Education members, who voted for this \$231,000 appropriation.

MRS. CONTI said, after reading Corporation Counsel's letter which she does not have with her tonight, it is her understanding that the Board does not have to appropriate this money, that the Board of Education can provide this money out of the funds that it has available. Since we are only two months into the fiscal year, there is no reason why the Board of Education could not have transferred that money and paid those teachers that money when it was due to them, instead of making a political football and trying to blame this Board for it. She will still vote against it because they do have adequate money in the Board of Education budget to transfer and pay this bonus.

MR. CONTI would like to pose his remarks more as a question. The courts have decreed that we must pass this figure that we are discussing, yet many people on the floor here are saying that they are against it, in principle. Would it not be proper to uphold the law and still maintain our dignity rather than be rubber stamps, and let the Clerk of the Board cast one vote in the name of the whole Board.

THE PRESIDENT said that you do when you have unanimous vote, and there are people who have already indicated that they do not want to vote in favor of this. She does not think that Motion would be practical or in order. Or were his remarks rhetorical?

MR. CONTI said that was to circumvent the problems that are in existence.

MR. O'BRIEN was opposed to it from the beginning, he still is, and he shall either vote against it, or abstain. He sees no rush to approve this. Frankly, he is not concerned whether they get it this month, or next month. He finds it so distasteful that the longer they wait, the happier he will be.

MR. FLOUNDERS said this Board has eloquently expressed its opposition to the principle of the teachers' bonus even to the point of going to the trouble of getting sued for that point of view. There comes a time when reason must prevail and he submits that that time is tonight. He agrees with his colleagues who pragmatically support the approval of this. Let's get rid of it. He thinks the Board of Education has gotten this Board's message.

MR. DZIEZYC stated the Board of Education claims the absenteeism has been reduced drastically. Therefore, they must have saved a lot of money on the Substitutes that they did not hire to replace these teachers who were not absent. Therefore, the court says that the City has to pay the bonus. With the money that the Board of Education saved, as they said, they should use that money and we won't have to approve any additional.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER said he thinks we have informed the negotiator enough now, but we should better inform him by looking for another negotiator, as this should not have been in the contract in the first place. We ought to have a negotiator who is aware of these unnecessary things that should not be in a contract.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT made a Point of Information, responding to Mr. Wider's statement, stating that this was not a negotiated amount of money in the contract. This was an award of binding arbitration.

MR. JOYCE said perhaps he is a singular voice and vote against this blackmail, but he intends to vote against it. It is a disgrace. As a former member of the Board of Education, he cannot speak strongly enough against the performance of whatever members of the Board who were involved. It is unprofessional, and the fact that some local court judge has said that it is legal, and the fact that our local solicitor for the City has lacked the legal expertise to take it on appeal, is an insult to the taxpayers of the City of Stamford. Mr. Joyce does not intend to be intimidated by the teachers' union, nor does he intend to be intimidated by the pressure of a group of professionals who are acting more like politicians than politicians do. He intends, at the cost of perhaps losing an election, to vote against this very reprehensible and certainly illegal act. He is disgusted with their entire conduct in this matter. The fact that a certain small group have put pressure on the City council of this town and have frightened everyone like a group of sheep, who have followed, and run in fear. He even read a letter from some bureaucrat in Hartford who is threatening to impose penal sanctions by way of doubling the award. This is nonsense. The whole matter has been conducted in a category of utter incredibility. The fact that we would dare to fall down shows that we ^{give} little or no response whatsoever to the people who put us in office in the first place. He is truly discouraged, disgusted, and annoyed with the conduct of this Board, also of the court, of the City administration in not going forward to take this on appeal.

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED the Question. Seconded. Carried.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to appropriate \$237,100, contingent upon approval of the Board of Finance. There are now 35 members present. Mr. Corbo, Mr. Zelinski, and Mr. Kunsaw have left. Two-thirds vote is needed. DEFEATED with 23 yes, 5 no, and 7 abstentions. 24 affirmative votes were needed for passage. (Note: This item was re-considered later in the evening and approved.) See Pg. 28 of these Minutes.)

MRS. SAXE said she would like to change her vote from Abstain to Yes.

THE PRESIDENT asked the PARLIAMENTARIAN for a ruling.

THE PARLIAMENTARIAN said that once the vote has been announced by the CHAIR, the vote is final.

MR. ESPOSITO said according to his calculator said 66%, or 2/3 of 25, is 23.1, which would be 23 votes.

THE PRESIDENT said that is not correct. If there is any remainder, it goes up. 24 was needed for that vote.

MRS. SAXE asked if the vote can be re-considered.

THE PRESIDENT said anyone voting on the Prevailing Side can make a Motion to Re-consider. In this case, the Pre-vailing Side would be persons voting NO.

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

MR. CONTI said Item #1 was voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE by L&R 5-0. He MOVED on the CONSENT AGENDA L&R items #4 and #5.

- (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's letter 4/30/81. Board of Finance approved 6/11/81. Approved for publication 7/6/81. Returned to Committee 8/3/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO ESTABLISH THE POSITION OF RISK MANAGER. Mayor's letter 6/18/81. Approved for publication as amended 7/6/81. Held 8/3/81.

MR. CONTI stated Mr. Canino had been to the meeting and spoken on it, and the salary has gone up to \$29,000 that will be paid to the Risk Manager, and L&R approved by a vote of 5-0. He Moved for approval. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said he was late getting to the L&R meeting and arrived after they had passed on this item. He tried to ask some questions but was told they were finished with the item and that was that. He said he would then have to bring his questions up at the Board meeting tonight. He had asked for this to be held before, and he now asks how is this Risk Manager to be employed? Is he a term manager? What is the length or period of employment? Is it contractual? Who is to do the appointing? Mr. Blum's feeling is that this Board is not going to be a rubber stamp for this administration to take certain jobs out of Civil Service, make them non-Civil Service employees on term policies; in other words, that they are here for three years, such as a contract for three years, or five years, or whatever. If we are to have a Civil Service System, then we should go through that process. This job should be advertised. Were all these things brought out by Mr. Canino at the L&R meeting?

MR. CONTI said he, too, was a few minutes late and arrived just as this item was being discussed.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said they did not discuss this ordinance in any depth at the L&R meeting as they had all done their homework and read it. Most of the questions that Mr. Blum has asked are already outlined in the ordinance. The position is a contractual position; there is a stated period of time that the job is for; there is a thirty-day period during which it must be advertised; etc., etc. All of this is explained in detail in the ordinance.

MR. BLUM said he does not see the contractual period of time that this job is to last. Is it to be advertised? Is there going to be testing?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said to look a little harder. It is three years, he believes. It must be advertised for 30 days. He does not know if there will be testing.

MR. BLUM said that in his discussions with Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Canino, as far as he knew at the time, no decision had been made as to if this job was supposed to be advertised or not. When Mr. Blum came to the meeting, it seemed

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM (continuing)...that no one wanted to talk about this particular item, only to rush it through, that we need a Risk Manager, that the program is so important that we must get this Risk Manager on line. He thinks we are doing things in haste and making this ^{vet} another unclassified position. At this rate, all jobs will eventually be unclassified, to be filled at the whim of the administration; all this while we are supposed to be working with the Personnel Commission to see if we can bring other people who are now on line in the unclassified jobs. If you look at the Charter, this is the only way that they can make an unclassified position, only through the Board of Representatives. Please think about this before you vote Yes, because there have been many, many jobs here, such as the Fair Rent Commission Director, that they thought would go by the wayside; also the Commission on Aging who have unclassified workers, which Commission when it came into being, was thought would not last long and would be around only for a few years' duration. Let's not make any more unclassified positions.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said as far as unclassified positions versus classified positions go, there obviously are some jobs which must be in the Civil Service System which must be classified. This does not happen to be one of them. A job like this, with a three-year term, is an extremely good trial period. He, being in the insurance industry, knows it is a generally-accepted term of office, or if you will, of employment. If, after three years, Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Canino, should they be in the positions that they're in, after three years, are not pleased with the performance of this individual, there is no responsibility, no reason to hold on to this individual. They can go into the job market and get a new person with a higher skilled level, whereas if it was a classified position, they would no doubt be locked in with somebody who would be considered "dead wood". Certain positions should not be classified. This is one of them. As far as a study group that was formed approximately 20 months ago, that has been a big regret on the part of the Personnel Committee inasmuch as the Chairperson of the sub-Committee did not push this, did not coordinate this and it fell by the wayside. Had this come to fruition, we might not be sitting here and talking about classified versus non-classified. But let us not take it out on the Risk Manager position now. Let us give Mr. Canino and Mr. Hoffman the person that they need, whomever that person may be, and let them get on with managing the multi-million dollar insurance contract...

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Blum if he had been slandered in any way?

MR. BLUM said he has a Point of Personal Privilege that Mr. Wiederlight gave the impression that Mr. Blum was the chairman of the so-called sub-committee. Mr. Blum was not the chairman. Moira Lyons, who is no longer with us, was the chairlady.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT continued on, stating he felt they should ^{go} ahead with the insurance program. It is going to save many thousands of dollars, and we should not proceed in the Dark Ages and in an archaic way, and give Mr. Canino and Mr. Hoffman the authority and the individual that they need.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on L&R #2, which requires 21 votes. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, one No vote, and two Abstentions.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - TO AMEND SECTION 8-18 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, "ANNUAL PICK-UP OF HOUSEHOLD AND YARD DEBRIS".
Submitted by Rep. Robert "Gabe" DeLuca on 5/18/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81. Returned to Committee 8/3/81. (New text submitted 7/28/81.)

FISCAL ITEM

MOTION TO RE-CONSIDER ITEM #11 FISCAL FOR THE TEACHERS' PERFECT ATTENDANCE BONUS by Rep. John J. O'Brien who voted on the Prevailing Side (NO).

MRS. CONTI asked if this Motion had to be Seconded and the President said it did not; also that the Motion can be made at any time, and it is a debatable motion.

MR. DZIEZYC asked if Mr. O'Brien would tell them why he changed his mind after he gave such a nice speech against it.

MR. O'BRIEN had a discussion with several other Board members and at their request, since he was on the Prevailing Side, he agreed to make the Motion. However, he does intend to vote against it again.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Re-Consider, which needs a majority vote. APPROVED with 23 Yes, 6 No, and 5 Abstentions.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED for the approval of \$237,100 for the Teachers' Bonus, contingent upon Board of Finance approval. Seconded.

MR. FASANELLI MOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT said there were 35 members present. After Mr. Esposito said Mr. Hogan had left, then the President said we have 34 present, and 23 votes are required for passage. She asked the members to vote. APPROVED with 23 Yes votes, 6 No votes, and 5 Abstentions. Item #11 for \$237,100 for the Teachers' Bonus has been approved. (For previous discussion, see Pgs. 23-25 of these Minutes)

THE PRESIDENT said they would now return to the business of the LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE, and consideration of Item #3 is next.

MR. CONTI said the new text would be amending Section 8-18(a) "There shall be nine (9) annual City-wide pick-ups of household and yard debris each year."

MR. CONTI said Section 8-18 now reads "There shall be an annual City-wide pick-up of household and yard debris, which pick-up shall be in the Spring of each year. (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. (c) There shall be adequate public notice in advance of such pick-ups."

MR. CONTI said the L&R Committee voted 4-1 to pass this and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT asked if they made amendments to the ordinance as it was presented to the Board.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. CONTI said this is a new text that has been presented from the L&R Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said in order to pass this, they must have the entire text of that Section included as part of the ordinance, and as she reads the copy just given to her by Mrs. McInerney, she finds that it is not so.

MR. CONTI said they substituted Section 8-18, and are deleting the (a), (b), and (c), and putting in the amending Section.

THE PRESIDENT said so that Section 8-18 will only be "There shall be, et cetera". And that Section 8-18 will be deleted.

MR. CONTI said that was correct.

MRS. CONTI asked if the Committee considered how payment was going to be made for these nine pick-ups a year since we voted against one pick-up in the annual budget. How are we going to pay for nine?

MR. CONTI said this was not discussed.

MRS. MCINERNEY said, if her memory serves her correctly, and she would yield to Mr. Fauteux, she thought he had asked that a cost factor accompany this item this month.

MR. FAUTEUX said yes, he did ask for that specifically, and they wanted to put a price tag on this to see how much it is going to cost.

MR. WIDER said in view of the fact that this seems to be incomplete and no cost analysis has been provided, he MOVES this be RETURNED TO COMMITTEE. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI said she would like to reiterate Mr. Fauteux's previous request that when it returns to committee, that a cost factor be secured and brought back to the Board members.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion is to Re-commit to Committee with instructions for a cost factor. She called for a vote. APPROVED with 27 Yes and 7 Abstentions. The item is RETURNED TO COMMITTEE.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTING TAX EXEMPTION FOR PROPERTY SITUATED AT 690 PACIFIC STREET AND OWNED BY THE CHURCH OF GOD OF STAMFORD. Submitted by Atty. Edward J. Zamm 7/23/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO AMEND SECTION 21-49 & ORD. NO. 338 SUPPLEMENTAL ENTITLED "DEPOSIT OF SLUDGE, ETC. INTO DISPOSAL PLANT - PERMIT TO COVER ONLY OPERATION NAMED THEREIN: PERMIT FEE: ADDITIONAL CHARGE. Submitted by Corporation Counsel Leonard Cookney 6/15/81. Held in Committee 6/22/81. Approved for publication 8/3/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING A TAX CREDIT FOR REFUSE COLLECTION TO OWNERS OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN MULTIPLE UNIT RESIDENTIAL COMPLEXES. Previous ordinance re-submitted by Rep. D. Blum 8/12/81.

MR. CONTI said Mr. Spaulding was present and they discussed it, but they did not have the complete text. In fact, on the members' desks tonight, there is something from Mr. Spaulding, but the vote was 5-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE and he so Moved.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL RE: NOISE POLLUTION IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by Rep. Sandra Goldstein as per petition received in Board Office 7/22/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REGARDING CITY'S OBLIGATION TO COLLECT GARBAGE AND REFUSE IN GARBAGE COLLECTION DISTRICTS AND AREAS SERVICED BY CITY SEWERS. Submitted by Rep. John J. Boccuzzi 8/19/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REGARDING FREE USE OF ANY MUNICIPAL FACILITIES BY ANY MEMBERS OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, OR ELECTED OFFICIALS. Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney 8/19/81.

MR. CONTI said this was HELD with the idea of referring it to Corporation Counsel by a vote of 7-0.

MRS. HAWE Moved to take this out of committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Motion to Take Out of Committee. APPROVED with 2 in opposition. L&R Item #9 will now be considered.

MRS. McINERNEY said that the conversation that went on earlier in the night was quite clear as to the reasons for requiring this ordinance to be passed. She wishes to offer amendments. The ordinance should read: "There shall be no free use of any municipal recreational facility ('recreational' being the new word) by any appointed Board, Authority, or Commission member, any elected official, or City employee of the City of Stamford where a user fee is charged." Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to insert the word 'recreational'. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MRS. McINERNEY said her second motion to amend was inserting the word, after appointed Board, 'authority' is the new word. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to insert the word 'authority' after appointed Board. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said her third amendment is after any elected official, 'or City employee'. Or City Employee is the amendment. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to insert the words 'or City employee' after elected official. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MR. LOOMIS said that Mrs. McInerney knows, as a former member of the L&R Committee, as a matter of course that these proposed ordinances are committed to the Law Department to get their O.K. and review to make sure that they conform to what we already have on the books. It appears to Mr. Loomis now that this is not going to be done, or at least from what Mr. Conti said, they are in the process of doing this. His question is why ^{is it} that we are neglecting to do this, and why are we being stampeded in a hurry to pass this at this moment. Thirty days would be a period of time in which they could review it, and then brought before this Body for action. In the past we have done these things and found out we have had to revise or change them because they might not have conformed to other ordinances.

MR. CONTI said, as he stated before, they voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE and refer to Corporation Counsel.

MRS. McINERNEY said to Mr. Loomis that in the past, not all ordinances have gone to Corporation Counsel; and certainly if publication is approved this evening, the ordinance could automatically go tomorrow morning to Corporation Counsel and there probably would be a public hearing on it as well.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked what happens if a person violates this ordinance, as nothing is stipulated in the proposed ordinance of the repercussions that the person might be subject to if he should happen to violate the ordinance.

MRS. McINERNEY said the Charter clearly states that if you are derelict of duties, you can be removed from office; and every ordinance in the City has got a fine of \$100 attached to it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the L&R Committee gave this ordinance some thought. They did not just pass it by with a 7-0 vote. They felt it would be prudent to pass it on to the Corporation Counsel's Office to see if there were any other ordinances on the books which could be used for the purpose that this was being proposed, or if it would be in conflict with any other ordinances. Now, apparently, the L&R Committee is being pushed aside and this is being brought out of committee. 7-0 was certainly an unanimous vote and he feels the floor should respect the vote of the L&R Committee. They certainly did not lag on this. They acted with alacrity on it. "Fools rush in where wise men fear to tread." We should wait and get Corporation Counsel's ruling before we move on this.

MRS. PERILLO said she, too, feels that Corporation Counsel should go over this first. There is no fine attached to this ordinance that Mrs. McInerney wants a vote ^{on} tonight. Who is going to be the watchdog to see that all these people are following the law. We have many ordinances that are not enforced. Let's not put another one on unless it is going watched closely and something get done about it when it is being violated.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said we are going too fast on this issue. It should be looked at by Corporation Counsel first, as the L&R Committee voted 7-0 to do. There is no penalty here. It can be considered dereliction of office. What about if it is an employee? It should be looked at carefully before we even get to the point of publication. There is no enforcement agency for this ordinance. You could be opening the door for a lot of unattractive actions by different members of different places that you might not want to deal with in this manner. There may be other ways to handle this in a better way.

MR. FASANELLI asked if this ordinance might not be duplicated by an existing ordinance or ordinances on the books.

MRS. McINERNEY said this was not the case, and if there were anything on the books that would have served the purpose, there would have been no merit to passing anything to control the free use of facilities now.

MR. FAUTEUX said what we are seeing here now is the difference between a sense of urgency that certain members see, and the differing opinion from the L&R Committee. It will only be resolved by a final vote on whether it should go for publication. His personal feelings are in the sense of urgency. We have seen where we have had a number of appointments come up tonight where this particular item became a very critical, very pivotal matter. The sooner we address this, and hopefully there will be coincident consideration of this ordinance and advice from Corporation Counsel as to any possible conflicts that may arise, at the same time we go forward with publication. It should be addressed immediately and it does have a sense of urgency. Let us publish.

MR. BLUM stands against bringing it out of committee. If we are just talking of the Golf Authority and the Golf Commission, this particular ordinance can be broader. Many previous Boards took up the question of freebies at the golf courses. This ordinance can go beyond the golf question. It can affect the Sterling Theatre where, at certain time, government officials are sent free tickets for rehearsals or opening nights. Or a ticket to go to the Museum, are we entitled to them? People pay to see the plays at Sterling Farm Theatre. Why are we any better, or should we be any better than those authorities? If we are a VAC organization, and in a sense we are a voluntary action group, we come here and we are supposed to volunteer our services. And, really, for the time we are here, and it is now a quarter to midnight, aren't we entitled to anything? Aren't we entitled to maybe a free ticket see...(there were some people calling out "No!")...No? Then maybe we should pass this, so that we can't even see a free show at Sterling Farms.

THE PRESIDENT said she assumes that is why this is on the Agenda.

MRS. GUROIAN said she is going to vote for publication. However, she is going to voice on the floor the objections she voiced in caucus. First, since this largely fringes on an ethical matter, she does not see why it is not being proposed to include it in the Code of Ethics, where it could be better monitored and there are specific things which can be done if the resolution is violated. She agrees with Mrs. Perillo as to who is going to monitor and what are they going to do with it when they find out about it. Who is going to enforce it? If it were in the Code of Ethics, it would better be enforced. Mrs. Guroian was against the Code of Ethics, part of the reason being things like this.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN went on to say that now we find the Code of Ethics not sufficient to cover this kind of a matter, so instead of including it in the Code of Ethics we passed, we are now going to make a separate ordinance out of it. She will vote for it because she believes in it somewhat in principle, but she said if it does go back to committee, the L&R Committee should entertain the feasibility of including it in the Code of Ethics rather than as an ordinance.

MRS. SANTY MOVED the Question. Seconded. Carried with one or two No votes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the ordinance as amended, for publication. APPROVED with 22 Yes votes and 11 No votes.

MR. CONTI MOVED the approval of the Consent Agenda items #4 and #5. Seconded. CARRIED 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. Report made 8/3/81.

MR. BLUM said Personnel has no report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE said the Planning and Zoning Committee met on Sept. 1st and again on Sept. 3rd. Item #4 is placed on the CONSENT AGENDA. #1 is being Held in Committee.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL TO CONTROL AND REGULATE EXCAVATION, FILLING AND GRADING. Submitted by Rep. B. McInerney 6/16/81. Held in Committee 7/6/81 and 8/3/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) REFERRAL OF PLANNING BOARD'S ACTION DENYING AN AMENDMENT TO MASTER PLAN APPLICATION MP-249, MICHAEL AND ELIZABETH ZEZIMA, TO AMEND THE MASTER PLAN FROM "RESIDENTIAL, SINGLE FAMILY PLOTS LESS THAN ONE ACRE" TO "COMMERCIAL, NEIGHBORHOOD OR LOCAL BUSINESS" PROPERTY ON THE EAST SIDE OF HIGH RIDGE ROAD, NORTH OF VINE ROAD. (Transcript not yet received.)

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee met on Sept. 1st and on Sept. 3rd, with Reps. Fasanelli, Wider, Guroian and Donahue in attendance. He wished to state for the record that the Committee did not in any way consider the suggestion that the applicant would place certain deed restrictions on the property in question. They, instead, considered the merits of the requested change alone. The property in question is located near the intersection of High Ridge Road and Vine Road, and is adjacent to Turn-of-River Hardware, which is owned by the applicants, Michael and Elizabeth Zezima. The applicants seek to provide 49 parking spaces in close proximity to their store, and basically that is the reason for bringing their application. While the Committee is aware, if this

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE (continuing)...change is allowed, there is the potential for future commercial development of this property. The Committee agrees that any possible development would not severely impact the area in question. If a parcel were to be assembled under current zoning for the site, that is the C-N or Commercial Neighborhood Zone, there would be a two-story height restriction with a maximum of 50% coverage of the property. Parking requirements may dictate that any building would have to be built on stilts to allow ground-level parking. With this in mind, and the knowledge that the site is not appropriate for housing, and that there was no area opposition and that the applicant must still apply to the Zoning Board for a change in zone, it is the recommendation of this committee, by a vote of 4 in favor, and none opposed, that the decision of the Planning Board be over-turned.

MR. DONAHUE will read the Motion into the record in a positive form and add that the Planning and Zoning Committee is recommending approval in light of the denial already ruled upon by the Planning Board:

"I, therefore, MOVE to amend the Master Plan, to change the Master Plan Category designated 'Residential, Single-Family Plots Less Than One Acre' to the Master Plan Category 'Commercial-Neighborhood, or Local Business' for the property described in Application MP-249 and owned by Michael and Elizabeth Zezima."

Seconded by Rep. Lathon Wider.

MRS. HAWE asked Mr. Donahue to briefly outline the Planning Board's reasons for denying this application.

MR. DONAHUE said basically in reading the material submitted by the Planning Board, there appeared to be a great amount of support for the approval of this application. However, they got themselves into a box. They wound up negotiating a deed restriction on the property. That deed restriction, while it may have been suggested in good faith and negotiated in good faith, was the subject of an opinion by Corporation Counsel which said the Planning Board cannot enter into negotiations for a deed restriction; that is called "contract zoning". Based on Corporation Counsel's opinion, they decided to deny this application.

MRS. SAXE asked what the deed restriction was all about.

MR. DONAHUE replied that the Planning Board asked for a permanent deed restriction; and in the records that this Board received, it was first suggested that a ten-year restriction be placed on that property. They finally negotiated a 15-year restriction. However, the reason that Mr. Donahue stated for the record that the Planning and Zoning Committee has considered this application based on its merits alone and in light of future development possibilities of that, we should not be considering the deed restriction. A deed restriction can be placed on a piece of property today by a property owner and removed tomorrow. When you vote on this, you should know that it could, in fact, be developed at a future date in a different way than we are looking at it today, but we still recommend, based on that, to over-turn the decision of the Planning Board.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said in keeping with Mr. Donahue's comments, she wishes to advise the Board of a letter received from Mr. Ford, the Director of Traffic and Parking, dated Feb. 9, 1981. Mr. Ford states "the construction of a large, major traffic generator at this specific location would not be desirable."

MR. DONAHUE said there is no application to construct "a major traffic generator" at this site at this point. As he stated, this must also go to the Zoning Board for their approval. Also, in the future, if any kind of development is placed there, including the driveway that must come out into the state highway, the State Traffic Department would review it. The Committee felt that there are sufficient safeguards in that alone. He would also state that part of the problem for a tremendous amount of congestion in that area is the traffic that is looking for a parking space to be able to shop at the Turn-of-River Hardware.

MR. DeLUCA said he attended the hearing at which Atty. Zezima made his presentation on behalf of this application. The applicant has submitted a deed restriction that is already in the land records whereby the land would be restricted for 15 years, and also that once the parking lot is completed, the City at their discretion, can remove the deed restriction from the land records and convert this land right back to residential zoning and the applicant would not object if they did so. Based on this firm commitment by the applicant, and the fact that all the applicant wants and needs is a parking lot, that once they had their parking lot, they would have no objections to the City reverting the property back to residential zoning. We should follow the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Committee.

MR. ROOS said in this particular situation, he thinks that a parking lot in the back would relieve a dangerous situation that exists there now traffic-wise. When you try to enter or leave Turn-of-River Hardware, it is rather a dangerous maneuver. It borders right on the main road. When you back out, you are immediately on the main road. It is a rather dangerous situation now, getting in and out there, especially if there are other cars coming in or out. The parking lot would actually relieve the traffic situation there.

MR. FLOUNDERS MOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Item #2 of the Planning and Zoning Committee. A Yes vote over-turns the Planning Board's decision. A No vote confirms it. APPROVED with 26 Yes votes, 6 No votes, 1 Abstention (7 members absent). The Planning Board's decision has been over-ruled.

(3) AREQUEST FOR ACCEPTANCE OF SCOTT PLACE AS ACCEPTED CITY STREET AS OUTLINED IN CHAPTER 64 OF THE CHARTER. Petition submitted 8/7/81.

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee approved this with 3 in favor and none opposed. The reason it was not on the Consent Agenda was because the wording on the Agenda was improper. It should read "A Resolution to begin Chapter 64 proceedings to accept Scott Place as a City Street". It is merely the first step in a number of steps that have to be taken to accept Scott Place, and he so MOVES. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on P&Z Item #3. APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (4) ACCEPTANCE OF GENERAL WATERBURY LANE AS A CITY STREET - submitted by City Engineer William Sabia 7/28/81, Letter of Certification.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for the Approval of the Consent Agenda. Seconded. Carried Unanimously.

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

- (1) THE MATTER OF DISCONTINUANCE OF CITY GARBAGE COLLECTION SERVICE TO COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN STAMFORD. Requested by Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi 7/8/81. Held in Committee 8/3/81.

MR. POLLARD said there is no report as they have been unable to schedule a meeting with the Commissioner.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

- (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 in Committee 7/6/81 and 8/3/81.

MRS. SANTY said her Committee met on September 1st with all members present. Mr. Joyce was forced to leave early because of a previous commitment. After 7 meetings and 2 public hearings, the Committee voted 4 in favor and one opposed to approve the ordinance which they feel represents the best interests of the public during an emergency water shortage. This ordinance will be sent to you within the next two weeks. It is in Corporation Counsel's hands now to verify the legal language.

MRS. SANTY said it is being, therefore, HELD IN COMMITTEE and will be acted on in October.

- (2) COMPLAINT REGARDING IMPROPER DUMP ON FAHEY STREET. Submitted by Rep. Everett Pollard 6/11/81. Held 6/22 and 7/20/81.

MRS. SANTY said this item was resolved by Rep. Pollard before the Committee meeting.

MRS. SANTY said the third thing which is not on the Agenda, but to which she wanted to bring the Board's attention which is still in Committee, there is a report of the Health & Protection Committee regarding PARK MANOR. You will find that on your desk tonight. It is not a resolution. It is a statement, and it finalizes that situation in the Committee.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked if the Park Manor Report could be spread over the Minutes of the Board.

MRS. SANTY said everyone on the Board has a copy.

THE PRESIDENT said it was not on the Agenda.

MRS. SANTY MOVED to take it out of Committee. Seconded. CARRIED.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. SANTY MOVED that this Report be a part of the Minutes of this Board. Seconded. CARRIED.

"REPORT OF HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE RE: PARK MANOR

"The Health and Protection Committee of the 16th Board of Representatives held at least seven hearings this past year for the purpose of investigating the damage done to the reputation of Park Manor. The accusations made by various City officials and City employees, we found, were based on hearsay and deliberate distortions of the facts. Many Stamford citizens came forward with testimonials at the hearings and presented evidence that disputed the accusations.

"After reviewing all that transpired between Park Manor and the City, our findings showed that all accusations made were unfounded. We came to this conclusion after seriously and thoroughly examining all the correspondence and listening to both sides at the seven hearings.

"The public should be well aware that for years the Fitzpatricks have unselfishly given of themselves beyond the call of duty in an effort to provide a solution for the benefit of senior citizens and the taxpayers of Stamford. It is our desire that Park Manor will shortly enjoy the excellent reputation that rightly belongs to it.

"Therefore, in order to help restore Park Manor's good name and excellent reputation, we are publishing this statement and making it a part of the public record."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA said his Committee met on Monday evening, August 31st, and in attendance were Committee members Perillo, Pollard, and Rinaldi. Item #1 was placed on the Consent Agenda.

- (1) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER STREET FROM THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH OF THE ARCHANGELS to advertise their annual Greek Festival on Oct. 16, 17, and 18, 1981. Submitted by Fr. George Poulos, 3rd & Bedford Sts.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONCERNING VETERANS' PARK - SAKS FIFTH AVENUE. Submitted by Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Chairman, Parks & Recreation Committee.

MR. DeLUCA said they voted 4 in favor, none opposed, and he so MOVES. Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she has no problems with the concept of the resolution, but she thinks it is something that should be digested and given to the Urban Renewal Committee to also vote on this particular item because it does involve them.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLuca said that Urban Renewal has been meeting on this, and so has the Planning Board. He thinks that by passing this Resolution, it will show the Parks Commission our support for their feelings. This is a park created for our veterans. It is a landmark. We have already paid for this park once. Therefore, we are going on record as supporting Mr. Sheck and his Parks Commission members on their stand that the City will not contribute one penny to this, and that the Park should remain; and if it is going to be disturbed, it goes right back to its original concept.

MRS. GUROIAN said she approves of the broad concept that is proposed in this Resolution. She has one hang-up about it. She has before her a statement from the Parks Commission stating "The Parks Commission does not support the re-designing and reconstruction of Veterans' Park" and it goes on "make it a front yard for an F. D. Rich Office Tower and Saks Department Store". The Commission thinks that the proposed changes will detract from the Park as an open space and a veterans' memorial. She rather agrees with them in that this particular re-design takes too much away from the Park. She and the Parks Commission are in agreement with "We recognize that the Planning Board has a legitimate concern for linkage between the Town Center Mall and Atlantic Street". She has a little difficulty with that part of the proposed Sense-of-the-Board Resolution which says "The 16th Board of Representatives endorses the plan recommended by the Planning Board, whereby the linking of the Old Town Hall to the new will become a reality". In view of the Parks Commission's statement on this particular part, she could not support that second statement. It should be either left out, or softened so as not to say that we endorse this particular plan. Perhaps a better plan can be devised whereby less of the park will be taken away. After all, that Veterans' Park was constructed not only with City funds. That was constructed with public funds as well, and after constructing it with public contributions to it, are we now going to tear down part of what they paid for. There is something a little bit wrong about that, too. Unless Mr. DeLuca can find some way to change that second WHEREAS, if it can be done, she would be in full support of the rest of the Resolution.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED that the second paragraph be deleted, as suggested. Seconded.

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

MR. DeLUCA MOVED for approval of the Resolution as amended. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion. Abstaining were Reps. Summerville, Wider, Rinaldi, Fasanelli, Blais, and Alfred and Mildred Perillo. The rest of the members voted YES. MOTION APPROVED.

- (3) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL AND WAIVER OF INSURANCE FEE FOR ROAD RACE SPONSORED BY THE HISPANIC ADVOCACY PROGRAM (COMPONENT OF CTE). Letter from Carmen I. Rivera, Director. Submitted by Rep. Lathon Wider, Sr. 8/19/81.

MR. DeLUCA said the date has been changed from Sept. 20th to Sept. 27th. The Committee voted 4 in favor, none opposed, for the date of Sept. 27th for the road race. However, they denied approval of the waiver of insurance fee for the road race because they checked with Corporation Counsel, and everyone received a copy of his recommendations tonight. We do not wish to set a precedent for all organizations by waiving any insurance fees.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA went on to say that the next day he telephoned Carmen Rivera of the Hispanic Program and recommended that she call Bruno Giordano and suggest that he co-sponsor the event with her, and he has agreed to do this. Mr. DeLuca then spoke to Mr. Canino, and because the Board of Recreation are co-sponsoring the road race, the insurance coverage will be by the Board of Recreation's insurance policy. He Moves that the date for this event be approved. Seconded by Mr. Wider.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on this item as Moved by Mr. DeLuca for Sept. 27th.

MR. LIVINGSTON said our records should reflect that Mr. DeLuca has done a fine job on this, and we all owe a debt of gratitude to him for this. He did a good job.

THE PRESIDENT said many who second those sentiments. She called for a vote again. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA said he would welcome anyone who wishes to come and campaign for votes in his district.

MR. DeLUCA Moved for approval of Consent Agenda Item #1 Seconded. CARRIED.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

NO REPORT.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chaurman Michael Wiederlight

- (1) INQUIRY AND REPORT ON THE FLOOD 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 8/3/81.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the Sewer Committee met last Thursday evening. All members of the Committee were present and accounted for. On Item #1 of the Agenda, they had Mr. John Canavan of Public Works Dept. come down to chat and explain that this is a storm drain problem and not a sanitary sewer one. He was very kind and generous with the time he spent with the Committee in explaining this. Mr. Wiederlight refers this to the Steering Committee to be placed in Public Works Committee for their scrutiny.

- (2) FOLLOW-UP ON EASEMENTS FOR 17-A SEWER DISTRICT. Submitted by Rep. Michael Wiederlight 7/17/81. Held in Committee 8/3/81.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said they had approximately 40 citizens come to participate in the discussion on Item #2. Corporation Counsel Cookney reported that he has secured all of the easements except for six. Six landowners' properties will have to be condemned. There are condemnation resolutions on the desks tonight. Unfortunately, they cannot be acted upon inasmuch as they are now in the hands of the Sewer Commission who are meeting tomorrow night. They must act first by having a public hearing to show cause for condemnation. Then if they act, this Board will be prepared to act one month from now. This will be kept on the agenda to keep all concerned informed as to what is going on in this sewer project. Item #2 being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Chairmen Lathon Wider and John Roos.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RE: PERSONNEL POLICY FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OFFICE - submitted by Rep. Lathon Wider 8/14/81.

MR. WIDER said they scheduled a meeting for Sept. 2nd. On Sept. 1st he received a call from the Mayor's Office stating that he had had a positive meeting with Mr. Bernstein and Mrs. Mitchell and asked Mr. Wider to take no action on the resolution until he had had a chance to do an evaluation.

BEING HELD IN COMMITTEE.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

NO REPORT.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

- (1) RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT CONTINUATION OF CITY OF STAMFORD IN COASTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM. Submitted by Mark Lubbers, Director, EPB, 8/19/81.

MRS. MAIHOCK said a meeting of the Committee was held on Thursday, Sept. 3rd. Present were Mark Lubbers, John Zelinski, and Audrey Maihock. Mrs. Maihock and Mr. Zelinski voted to approve the resolution to enable the City to obtain funds for the Coastal Management Program. She wishes to add an amendment to this resolution, and it should go after the sentence now ending with "and to provide for coastal site reviews." The amendment has been considered by the Republican Caucus, and it is as follows: "It is not the intention of the Board of Representatives in approving the Resolution to approve or endorse the creation of a proposed new permanent Civil Service position titled Coastal Site Planner. It is the Board's wish that this position shall be filled on a contractual basis for the term of the grant." Moved and Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amendment Moved by Mrs. Maihock.
APPROVED.

THE PRESIDENT then called for a vote on the Resolution, as amended. CARRIED.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Grace Guroian and John J. Hogan, Jr.

- (1) REPORT REGARDING ORDINANCE REVISIONS.

MRS. GUROIAN said they are approximately half-way through review of the Code of Ordinances. They will continue to work on recommendations and will distribute final recommendations to all members prior to the next Steering Committee Meeting. The Committee will meet again on Tuesday, Sept. 15th, at 7:00 P.M.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Doris Bowlby.

NO REPORT.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Patrick Joyce

NO REPORT.

ON-SITE REFUSE CONVERSION STUDY COMMITTEE - Chairman Fiorenzo Corbo

NO REPORT.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

NONE.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION OPPOSING CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER RATE INCREASES. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski 8/19/81.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED that this be adopted. Seconded.

MR. FAUTEUX said if Mr. Zelinski were here, he would like to ask him some questions about a certain section of the Resolution and the ultimate purpose of it, which is the second to the last paragraph. Since he is not here, Mr. Fauteux Moved to HOLD til next meeting. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said there are hearings going on before the PUCA, and holding until October meeting would negate our opposition to a rate increase. It should not be sent back to committee. If an amendment is needed, let it be discussed, and perhaps we can effect passage of a satisfactory resolution.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to amend the 4th paragraph to read: "WHEREAS this large utility rate increase would, if approved, hurt the people living in the City of Stamford." Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amendment, which effectively deletes the second sentence. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Resolution as amended. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING HARRY ROSENBAUM. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski 8/19/81.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED to approve this Resolution. Seconded. CARRIED.

PETITIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

August 3, 1981 Regular Meeting - Not Ready.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - None.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

NEW BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon MOTION made, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the Meeting was ADJOURNED at 12:22 A.M.

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

APPROVED:

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

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

HMM:MS

Encs.