

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1981

16th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

City of Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 16th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 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 8:55 P.M. by the President, Sandra Goldstein, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Given by CHARLES F. MAGISTRO, Pastor of the Unitarian Universalist Society of Stamford.

"Waiting to do an Invocation at the Board of Representatives, is like waiting for a bride.

"On November 1st, the Mayoral candidates and the candidates for the Board of Finance participated in a forum at my church. I would like to take a few minutes of your time to share with you what I said on that occasion.

"As you probably know, there is an organic relationship between the rise of the city in history and the birth of civilization. Literacy, art, music, systemic thought, science, technology are, to a degree that we often fail to appreciate, the products of urban life.

"When the Roman Empire in the West fell some 1,500 years ago, its great cities declined and finally died, and Greco-Roman Civilization died, too. We call, although not quite accurately, the period between the fall of Rome and the Renaissance, the Dark Ages, because free thought and learning, the creative spirit that expresses itself in cultural activity, no longer defined and informed European society.

"The re-birth of Greco-Roman civilization, of high culture by Western standards, in the Fourteenth Century, was made possible, to no small degree, by the re-emergence by the city.

"Last year, my congregation committed itself to remain in its present location. We are now in the process of putting our buildings in good order. I both urged and applauded those decisions; and not just because we are in a propitious location for growth, or that our space is adequate to our needs, or that our building is an historic landmark that makes an aesthetic contribution to the City of Stamford. As important as these considerations are, there is one of even more fundamental importance, namely, that as Stamford has the potential to be a great city, and as the city is the vehicle of civilization, to be located in the heart of a city is to share in the work and the fruits of civilization.

INVOCATION (continued)

"However, a caveat needs to be added. A city isn't synonymous with tall buildings, and well-trafficked streets. A true city has an ethos, a spirit, a soul, that gives it identity and cohesion. It both demands and receives the love of its citizens. It inspires hope, encourages creativity, and exudes a sense of purpose. It's the place where people of different races, colors, religions, and social classes meet to hammer out a shared identity.

"Is Stamford a city in the best sense of the word? In the opinion of many, the answer is "Not yet, not yet". One of the challenges, therefore, that faces not only Mayor Clapes, but you, as well, you who make decisions that affect our common life is how to civilize Stamford. That is, how to make it a true expression of the highest human values and capacities.

"Thus, as Leaders, you must not only understand the technical ramifications of the problems and challenges we face and be willing to expend great energy in the pursuit of their solutions. You also must exercise imagination.

"Unless you have a vision of what Stamford could be, and the ability to articulate that vision so as to motivate the citizens you represent, to make it real, this City could grow more like a cancer than an embryo.

"For, as Will Durant has pointed out, civilization is order and freedom promoting cultural activity. Order and freedom promoting cultural activity. Civilization begins with order, grows with liberty, and dies with chaos. Chaos doesn't mean just crime in the streets. Chaos has many faces.

"The tension between seniors, whose security is threatened by increasing taxes, and young parents who demand more and more of the schools, threatens chaos. The decline of manufacturing jobs that steal from the traditionally deprived the opportunity for advancement threatens chaos. The inability to live in the community in which one works; the separation of one's workplace from one's play-place is a form of chaos. The bifurcation of qualitative and quantitative growth threatens chaos. And the tendency of each of the sections of the City, and each of you represent just a section; and the tendency of each of the sections of the City to see the part as the whole, the particular interest as the common good threatens chaos. For chaos, on the most basic level, is alienation. It is separation. It is division. It is a tear in the weave of the fabric of community. It is the unwillingness or inability of citizens to see their city as a living organism that depends upon their sense of oneness, their common commitment to a common vision or purpose for its well-being.

"Thus it is that the life of a city is the life of its people. It's a place to live, work, and play; to share, learn, and grow. If it allows one aspect of life, whether it be work or play or whatever, to overwhelm the other aspects, it becomes shallow and either loses its spirit or fails to cultivate it.

INVOCATION (continued)

"It seems to me, therefore, that the major challenges facing you, as well as our Mayor, in the immediate future, are first, the enhancement of life for one and all; and second, the nurturing of our civic identity: E PLURIBUS UNUM. And third, and perhaps most important, the breathing of a soul into the structure of our common life. This, I dare suggest, is as religious as it is political and social; for when all is said and done, it is the human spirit that gives life and sustenance to community. I pray that you, as individuals, and as a body, may be worthy of the problems and the opportunities you face. Thank you.

"If I took a little longer than I ought to, remember I waited a long time for you."

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

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN: Before we begin the Roll Call, I would like to mention that we are going to be using our new voting machine for the second time, and I would like to thank Ed Kivell of the Personnel Department, and Bob Thomas of Data Processing, for all the help through all these weeks in getting this machine de-bugged, so to speak; and they are here tonight to help once again, and they really deserve a round of applause from us. Just prior to the Roll Call, I have to do some fixing on the machine and then we will begin on the Roll Call.

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville Called the Roll.
Present were 38 members, with 2 absent (Everett Pollard who was excused due to business out-of-town) and John O'Brien.

The President declared a QUORUM was present.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN: Let me remind the members of the Board that we now have three switches to concern ourselves with. We have our normal up-and-down switch, and don't touch this yet; we have our normal up-and-down switch; and we also have an Abstention switch which is on the side of the switch box.

Now the first thing we are going to do is to vote up for YES. Right now when you see those numerals cycling, it is checking the whole system for its accuracy; and then we will be able to check the YESSES. Have all members who are present voted? Now, please vote down for NO. All members are requested to vote. Now, at the side of your machine, press the switch for ABSTENTION. It is down for Abstain, but it is the side switch.

The machine is in good working order.

PAGES: Miss Virginia Hawe - 7th Grade student at St. Gabriel's School
(daughter of City Rep. Marie Hawe)
Miss Amybeth Woodtke - 8th Grade student at Our Lady Star of the
Sea School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE: The late MRS. KATHERINE KAMINSKI, who was the first Democratic woman to serve on the Board of Representatives. She was also a member of the Holy Name of Jesus Church. This by Rep. Annie M. Summerville. Rep. David Blum added that Mrs. Kaminski had resided in the Twelfth District, who helped and guided a representative in 1975 in his election, who took everyone under her wings and guided them. He said we will miss Katherine Kaminski in the Twelfth District. Rep. Jeanne-Lois Santy said by profession, Mrs. Kaminski was a registered nurse, graduating from Stamford Hospital School of Nursing, and very much loved by the whole School of Nursing.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before we proceed to the Steering Committee Report, I would just like to say that it is almost impossible to believe that this is the last Board meeting of the 16th Board. I'd like to say that it was a Board of which we could be very proud. The Board handled thousands of fiscal, legislative and rules, appointments, planning and zoning, and personnel items. I would like to give my personal thanks first to Annie Summerville the Clerk of the Board, without whom my job would have been much ^{much} more difficult. To John Boccuzzi, Jerry Livingston, Barbara McInerney, and Lois Santy, the Majority, Minority Leaders, and Assistants, who also helped me make my job much easier. And to all the Board members, the wonderful chairmen, the City indeed owes you a debt of gratitude. Thank you.

I will now accept a Motion to Waive the Steering Committee Report.

STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED to WAIVE the reading of the STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT. Seconded. Carried.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, October 26, 1981, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to Order at approximately 7:35 P.M., when a Quorum was present. President Goldstein called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
John J. Boccuzzi
Barbara McInerney
Jeanne-Lois Santy
Annie Summerville
Donald Donahue
Lathon Wider, Sr.
Richard Fasanelli
one unidentified lady

Robert "Gabe" DeLuca
Anthony Conti
Alfred Perillo
John Zelinski
Paul Esposito
Peter Blais
Audrey Maihock
Paul Dziezyc

(1) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item on Tentative Steering Agenda, that of Raymond Humiston for re-appointment to the Board of Ethics.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the 23 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(3) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda: (a) Tax abatement ordinance for Nature Conservancy; (b) Ordinance concerning free use of municipal recreational facilities; (c) Ordinance concerning sale of City-owned property to Ocean View Construction; (d) reimbursement of building permit fee to Stamford Ambulance Corps. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were eight items: (i) Liability for snow and ice on public sidewalks; (ii) Ordinance concerning annual pick-up of household and yard debris; (iii) tax credit for refuse collection to owners of residential units in multiple unit residential complexes; (iv) ordinance re noise pollution; (v) obligation to collect garbage and refuse in garbage collection districts and areas serviced by City sewers; (vi) creation of a water pollution control authority; (vii) repeal of ordinance #343 for separation of newspapers and magazines from putrescible garbage, etc.; (viii) amending the Code of Ethics, Ord. #445.

(4) PERSONNEL MATTERS

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

(5) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; also the one item on the Addenda to the Steering Agenda, being acceptance of Lighthouse Way as a City street. Also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the Acceptance of Outlook Street, West Avenue, and Winsted Streets, as City streets.

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

One item was Ordered Off the Agenda, being flood conditions in the Glenbrook Road-Crescent Street area. The other item was Ordered Off the Agenda but Held in Committee, being discontinuance of City Garbage Collection Service to Commercial Properties in Stamford, inquiry by Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi. Also Off the Agenda but Held in Committee was the matter of purchasing trucks with front-end loaders to pick up dumpsters at condominiums, by Rep. Blum, from the Addenda to the Agenda.

(7) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first two items on the Tentative Steering Agenda: (a) proposed regulations to restrict water useage during water shortages; (b) Status report on Fire Task Force. Ordered Off the Agenda but Held in Committee was the matter of possible health hazards of micro-wave transmitters for cable TV. Ordered Off the Agenda were the four remaining items on the Tentative Steering Agenda, as well as the two items listed on the Addenda to the Steering Agenda.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(8) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were all the items on the Tentative Steering Agenda with the second item being divided into three separate items.

(9) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

The one item on the Agenda was ordered moved to RESOLUTIONS and placed on its Agenda.

(10) SEWER MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items addressing the Sewer Project 17-2A. Ordered off the Agenda was the problem of run-off water flooding 191 Prudence Drive.

(11) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

Ordered off the Agenda and Held in Committee was the one item on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being the matter of personnel policies of Community Development Department.

(12) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

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

(13) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

Ordered off the Agenda and referred to the Environmental Protection Board was the one item on Tentative Agenda, being proposed ordinance to control and regulate excavation, filling and grading.

(14) CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items relating to Reapportionment. Ordered off the agenda was the item regarding deletion of certain ordinances.

(15) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item transferred from EW&G, commending students of Class of '82 for outstanding academic achievement.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion duly made, Seconded and Carried, the Meeting was Adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

SG:HM

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Chairman Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON said a meeting was scheduled for November 12th, but unfortunately they had no quorum for that meeting, so as a result he did not have a report for tonight.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider the name of Raymond Humiston for the Board of Ethics this evening.

THE PRESIDENT said all that was necessary was to make a Motion to take that name out of committee.

MRS. McINERNEY so Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on taking Mr. Humiston's name out of committee. Carried Unanimously.

BOARD OF ETHICSTerm Expires

(1) <u>RAYMOND HUMISTON</u> (R)	Re-Appointment	June 30, 1985
71 Strawberry Hill Ave.		

MR. DIXON said that in spite of the fact that there were only four members present in the proposed Appointments Committee meeting, and he might say that they were 4 DEMOCRATS, they did proceed with an unofficial interview with Mr. Humiston; and he is in a position, as a result of that interview, to speak, not report, but speak very favorably on him. Mr. Dixon thinks Mr. Humiston is a very conscientious and concerned person, and Mr. Dixon feels he will continue to do justice to the Board of Ethics as he has done during this expired term that he is presently serving.

MRS. McINERNEY urged support for Mr. Humiston. She has seen him in action on the Board of Ethics during the past two years. She thinks he, along with the other two members, did an outstanding job, and she feels he is worthy of re-appointment to this commission.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Humiston's appointment to the Board of Ethics. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Paul Esposito and Marie Hawe

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal had two meetings this month, one being held on Tuesday, November 10th, and present at that meeting were Mr. Esposito, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Flounders, Mr. Hogan, and Mrs. Hawe. Also, this evening, Nov. 16th, at 6:45 p.m., present were Mrs. Hawe, Mr. Esposito, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Fauteux, and Mr. Hogan.

MR. ESPOSITO said he would first like to deal with the items on CONSENT. Before he begins that, just so that there is no confusion, he will be referring the Agenda items and the dollar amounts from the NEW AGENDA that was sent out to everyone, so if the members want to be able to follow him, they will have to follow the NEW FISCAL AGENDA, and he will wait until members have a chance to get that before them.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said everyone should have received in the mail, an Agenda with the proper dollar amounts in it. If you do not have it with you, we have additional agendas that Mrs. McEvoy will distribute to those members who do not have it.

MR. ESPOSITO said the CONSENT AGENDA items are #5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18. Where there was no secondary committee report, the proper motions were made and carried so the item might properly be before the Board.

MR. JOYCE called for a Point of Personal Privilege, stating that he has an agenda which does not have the dollar amounts on it, and there are no more copies left of the new agenda, so he considers it very important that whoever is raising these matters, state the numbers, starting with 12, 14, 15, 18, 19...

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said that Ms. Summerville will run off a few additional copies now, so that he may have a copy.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT WITH CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PURSUANT TO PUBLIC ACT 79-607 FOR THE PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF BUS SHELTERS (State Grant approved for \$25,000), per Mayor Louis A. Clapes' letter 9/15/81. Held in Committee 10/5/81.

MR. ESPOSITO said this item is for bus shelters to be installed on the West Side of Stamford. Fiscal voted 2 in favor, 3 opposed, and in keeping with the Board's tradition, he will phrase the Motion in the positive, that they vote to approve in light of the fact that Fiscal voted to turn down the request. This is an 100% reimbursable grant. There are no City funds involved in this. It is totally to benefit the West Side. Seconded.

MR. ROOS MOVED that this be RETURNED TO COMMITTEE for further consideration. Seconded.

MR. ROOS said his Motion is with the understanding that they consult with Wright Technical School about constructing the shelters. The objection seems to be using plexiglas and Wright Tech did construct some.

MR. ESPOSITO said that issue came up at the Fiscal Committee meeting. As some people may know, Wright Tech did construct a number of wood frame bus shelters a number of years ago, and one of them is on East Main Street in front of Fairlawn, and one is by Stamford Hospital. That was by special arrangement between the Department of Transportation and Wright Tech. It was a very special program, a trial program, that has since been abandoned. Now in order to do that again, you would have to have, the number of shelters we are talking about, and to meet the City's needs in general, you would have to have a continuing program at Wright Tech, and it is our understanding that Wright Tech is not equipped to be able to provide that many shelters; and the second problem that once those shelters are accepted by the City, it becomes the problem of Traffic and Parking to maintain them. They do not have a staff to maintain these shelters. They have taken it upon themselves to try to maintain the few shelters that do exist now, but they wouldn't be able to maintain a large number of shelters, the wood frames being susceptible to vandalism. These shelters would be maintained as part of a contract with a Charter Oaks bus shelter company which is also installing a number of other shelters for the City as well.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MCINERNEY said this matter was discussed in the caucus with Mr. Esposito, and perhaps Mrs. Hawe could shed some more light on this, so she would yield to Mrs. Hawe at this time.

MRS. HAWE said she was not going to say anything in terms of Wright Tech building them, but she did wish to say that even though this is a grant, the maintenance contract to clean them is \$40.00 per month per shelter. Now the Transit District is going to pay for this from now until the end of this fiscal year, but after that it will probably fall upon the City to pay for this.

MR. LIVINGSTON was going to speak in favor of this, but in light of what Mrs. Hawe is saying, really it makes him look at it in a different perspective at this time. He was one of those who requested that this be held in committee until it could be determined how the maintenance of those facilities would be handled. The truth is that if these facilities are properly taken care of, it would be a tremendous help to the people who ride the busses, and a number of these people commute from the West Side of Stamford to different sections of this City. However, he would be opposed, at this point, for City funds to have to take over the maintenance of these facilities a year later. He is going to join Mrs. Hawe and ask everyone to remember that these facilities are mostly going to be in the West Side area, of which he is one of the Representatives, but he would ask that this go back to committee unless there is a better explanation of the matter.

MRS. CONTI said she understood in Fiscal that a number of these shelters would be carrying advertising plaques and they would be maintained under this Charter Oaks plan, this lease arrangement, but those that do not carry advertising, would fall to the City to maintain. Now if that is an incorrect assumption, someone can correct it, but that was her understanding in Fiscal.

MR. ESPOSITO said the information is that the \$25,000 which is part of the State Grant will be for shelters that will not have advertising. Because they are State-funded, the State regulations prohibit us from getting any revenue out of them, so that the six to eight shelters that are to be constructed out of this Grant money, would not contain advertising. The City would hope to be able to get advertising from other shelters to be able to get the money to maintain all of the shelters as part of the Transit District, and that is something that the Transit District would be looking into as a general policy.

THE PRESIDENT said they were getting a little far afield. Members should remember the Motion is to recommit, and that is what should be addressed right now. If it is not sent back to committee, then the actual appropriation itself can be addressed.

MR. BLUM said he is against the re-committal of this item for the simple reason that for those who ride the bus have been out in the weather, supporting mass transit for some time. If there is a grant which will put some people in from outside the weather, to attract more people to ride the bus, he favors that. After all, it might be after this next session of the General Assembly, this City might have to pay the full fare of mass transit in the City of Stamford.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said she attended the Fiscal meeting when this was discussed, and she recall hearing that the wooden ones that Wright Tech did produce were very attractive, and she understands the plexiglas ones are hard to maintain, and probably have traits for destruction also. She would like to speak in favor of re-committing this and giving a little more attention to it before it is discussed further on the Board.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Re-commit Fiscal #1 back to Fiscal for further study regarding assignment to Wright Tech....

MR. BOCCUZZI said did he understand Mrs. Goldstein to say that this is being sent back to committee to see if Wright Tech can do it....

THE PRESIDENT said that was Mr. Roos' proviso, that was one of the matters he wanted discussed when it went back to committee. There can be many other things that can be discussed also, but the Motion was to refer back to committee..

MR. ZELINSKI called for a Point of Information. He said in essence if this is put back in committee, this is the last meeting of this Board; it is going to die anyway, because it would have to be resubmitted by the Mayor for the new Board, correct? So actually we are not voting to put back into committee, we are voting to either approve it, or to disapprove it, in essence, are we not? Am I right or wrong?

MRS. GUROLAN called for a Point of Information, asking if they have already commenced with the vote, as she sees votes on the Tally Board, and are still discussing the issue?

THE PRESIDENT said you may see the votes, but the vote is not being registered yet, and she wants to clarify what is being voted on. If this matter is sent back to committee, the new Board will take this up, if it so chooses, at its Steering Committee meeting. We have a whole slew of items that the Mayor has requested that we take up. This, too, may be one of those items, so that certainly if we wish to refer it, it goes to the next Board. Please vote up for yes, down for no. The vote is 24 in favor, 10 opposed, with 4 abstentions. This matter has been SENT BACK TO COMMITTEE. The print-out will come out now. This will take some time to get used to.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if this new machine would make the meetings longer.

THE PRESIDENT said not once they are used to it, not really.

MR. ZELINSKI said he is worried.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A COASTAL ENERGY IMPACT PROGRAM GRANT IN THE SUM OF \$20,000.00. PURSUANT TO PUBLIC ACT 96-464 (Federal Coastal Zone Management Act). Submitted by Mark Lubbers. Exec. Dir., City's EPB, and Rep. John Hogan 8/27/81 and 9/16/81. Held in Committee 10/5/81.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #2 received the vote of the Committee with 4 in favor, and one opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK requested a Motion to Waive the Report of the Secondary Committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Esposito if this was for the monetary amount or for the resolution. He responded it was for the resolution. The President said that in that case, they do not need a secondary committee report on it.

MRS. CONTI said she wanted the Board members to realize that this is an expenditure of taxpayers' money to study a piece of privately-owned property, the property being owned by HELCO, who is robbing so many of our constituents blind with its high rates. She cannot see us giving such a gift to HELCO, and if they want to have a study, they should pay for it themselves, and it should not be the taxpayers who pay for it.

MR. ESPOSITO said originally last month, Fiscal had many of the same concerns Mrs. Conti has expressed, and that is why they held it. This month, John Smith, the Planning Director, came in and gave us his side of the story. As far as the proposal dealing with private development, Mr. Smith's contention is that most of his job deals with planning in the City, and a lot of that planning and zoning has to do with private property. But that is the nature of the job. That the purpose of having this study done is not to benefit HELCO directly, although it might in the end benefit HELCO, but it is not a study that has been commissioned by HELCO. As a matter of fact, SEAC has helped write the proposal for the grant and supports the grant. The purpose of the proposal is so that the City can get some information as to what possible uses this land can be put to. First of all, to find out if the land, the total amount of land that HELCO now owns is all needed for the purpose of generating; and if it is not needed for generating purposes for the next 20 or 30 years, what use can it be put to. This is an important piece of information. In case the owner, which is HELCO, wants to develop the land, the City at least has some information with which to respond to any requests from HELCO, that they might make. This is an opportunity for the City to have this information provided by the Federal Government through this funding, and that's exactly why the City is looking for the approval of this resolution, so that they can have some information about how the important South End land is going to be used, or could be used.

MRS. HAWES said, just to follow up on what Mr. Esposito said, any planning that is done by the Planning Board or the City of Stamford, has an effect on privately-owned property. The HELCO site is a huge part of the South End. It encompasses 37 or 40 acres, and what happens with that property will have a great effect on how the South End is developed. The City, rather than just reacting to some project that goes in, for instance, as an example the Harbor Plaza project where the City, after it was all in place and after construction had begun, then we had to react and try to solve the problems that it brought. This way we can look at a site ahead of time, and she only wishes that something like this had been done with regard to the Harbor Plaza site. But we can look at this site ahead of time and see what is the best possible use for it, and then perhaps if a zoning change is warranted, that can be done. And if it really could benefit HELCO, it actually would have much more benefit for the residents of Stamford, and particularly of the South End.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER said, following up on Mrs. Hawe's statement, the fact was that he was a part of Coastal Area Management's organization, when they were looking around the total northeastern course, and one of the things they were concerned with, and it's too bad they didn't get these regulations before Harbor Plaza came in, plus the fact that not enough of the coast line is open for public use. Now, this property is a part of Mr. Wider's district, and he is concerned with the way it goes; and the only way any of us can know the way it's going, is by having a study made of what it can go for and what it can't go for, so he would be in favor of appropriating this little bit of money so maybe we'll save and see about this approximately 40 acres of land.

MR. BLUM said as a matter of correction to Mr. Esposito, generation of electricity is long gone from the gas HELCO property. The only thing we have on the property now is the storage of gas. We don't even have the gasification plant, thank God for that! Because all I remember years ago when we went down there, that's all we used to smell was coal gas, and the people lived with it. Let's hope, and I do favor this grant, but not only that grant. There are other grants that are very much needed besides the HELCO property. I hope that SEAC would take the same interest as to what they can do with some of the railroad property sitting alongside of the rivers.

MR. FAUTEUX said he was not at the meeting at which this item was discussed, so he would like Mr. Esposito to respond whether Mr. Smith indicated to the committee how the property would be treated if the grant was not forthcoming, and it had to become part of the normal course of the business of the planning group.

MR. ESPOSITO said he would assume that HELCO would do as it pleased with the property. There is no immediate urgency there, but if HELCO decided in five years, they wanted to develop it according to their own interests, at that point the City would have no other in-put and would have to start from scratch.

MR. FAUTEUX said that was not an answer to the question. The question was that was it asked of Mr. Smith that if the study was not done, how would the property would be treated in the normal course of the planning activity. (some dialogue lost here)...grants that do special site activities, even though 37-40 acres is a great deal of land, it's not as great as all the other private property that is being considered for various zoning applications by the planning group, Mr. Fauteux sort of wonders if this isn't just sort of a "freebie" and an "add-on" and the planning group should be taking care of this in the normal course of their business.

MR. LIVINGSTON said at first he was somewhat undecided about this particular item, and he was glad to see that it was held in committee so that some of the information that was given to the Board, would be allowed to be given. First, as for the propertyowners themselves doing this study, he believes regardless of who pays for it, it's going to be the general public, the people of Stamford, in general, that are going to foot the bill; either we foot through this grant, or it is going to be done at the whim of HELCO through the money that we have to spend for the use of their utility service. One thing is for sure, and he is glad the Committee pointed this out, that this grant would give the City some extra leverage on how this property is going to be used; and at this point, he is in favor of it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI has one question and that is does this grant take in any other property than HELCO property. Everyone is talking about HELCO and it appears that is what the grant is for; is that correct?

MR. ESPOSITO said that it's exactly it. Yes, it is only going to take in HELCO property.

MRS. CONTI said she wished to correct a point made by the two co-chairmen of Fiscal. It is true that the Planning Board studies many private properties. But they study them because an application is brought before them, not because they are making a gift of the taxpayers' money to study the property. Now, we are setting a very dangerous precedent here, because now any other private corporation can come and demand the taxpayers' money be used to study their privately-owned property. It is a very dangerous precedent and Mrs. Conti is strongly opposed to it.

MRS. HAWE said this is being done in conjunction with the EPB, it is an energy impact grant; and this kind of planning would not be done by the Planning Department. The first phase of it, that Mr. Esposito mentioned before, but which she wishes to repeat, is to determine how much land HELCO will actually need for its energy uses over the next five, ten years, and how much will be surplus. Now this is not something that the Planning Board could ascertain on their own. They just don't have the expertise for that kind of study. The second part of it would be to develop the most appropriate use for the property and to determine that.

MRS. MCINERNEY said she appears to have mixed emotions on this, since nine times out of ten, we act out of emergency situations when a particular piece of property was in the City that is classified as "wetland" is threatened, and usually at that time we ask for a study of this nature to be done by normally a partial person who is the developer's environmentalist. However, I would like some more information as to whether or not, and it will be a two-part question to the Fiscal Committee, whether this is the only undeveloped land in that particular area, and then I would like to direct a question to the Environmental Protection Committee as to what is the status of their report.

MR. ESPOSITO said he does not have an answer to the first question.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she spoke with Mr. Lubbers about this because she attended the first fiscal meeting and she felt, much as Mrs. Conti did at that meeting, that we certainly didn't want to fund something that would enhance the individual property owner's planning. However, she spoke to Mr. Lubbers again after this last fiscal meeting, and he indicated that since this is a coastal plan, they already have a certain amount of money dedicated to the planning of some of the coast, and this would be in addition to what they already have, and perhaps give a larger perspective to the whole area.

MRS. SAXE asked if Mrs. Hawe, in her answer and her discussion a few minutes ago, does she feel that HELCO is thinking of giving this land to the City?

MRS. HAWE said she did not think they were thinking of giving this land to the City, no, no; but they have indicated a willingness to cooperate with the City in terms of determining of what would be the best use for the area of this land should it happen that they don't need it in the future, but it is not... she is sure they do not intend to give it away.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. SAXE asked of the Committee, does not HELCO have a five-year plan on what they're planning to do with their land and their budget?

MR. ESPOSITO said he does not know; but even if they do, it is from their point of view. It is not necessarily an objective outsider's perspective.

MRS. SAXE asked Mr. Esposito if that point of view were not necessary, because they certainly are not going to give away something for nothing; and we are not going to take something for nothing.

MR. DeLUCA Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE PRESIDENT asked the members not to vote on the Main Motion yet as she had to clear the machine. She said actually she figures that this should increase the time of our meeting immeasurably.

MR. BLUM asked that when this new machine was bought, one of the biggest faults of the old machine was put to us by one of our esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that we saw what each person was voting; and wasn't this machinesupposed to cover the vote?

THE PRESIDENT said no, but it was supposed to be easy. The Motion is to approve item #2 under Fiscal for a resolution for a Coastal Energy Impact Grant. Members were requested to vote. MOTION APPROVED with 23 Yes votes, 14 No votes, and one Abstention.

MRS. GUROIAN asked if the totals appear on the bottom?

THE PRESIDENT said they do, and she has to push the button; and they swore this would be easy. You do have to get used to it. You will see that the totals are coming on there. Actually it is easy for someone who is conversant with computer technology. For someone who is not, it really does take time to get used to it.

- (3) \$15,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - to be financed by TAXATION. Adding a project in the sum of \$15,000. to be known as #450.091 INCREASE WATER MAIN SIZE - DOLPHIN COVE AREA. Mayor Clapes' letter 8/24/81. Submitted by John J. Bocuzzi. Approved by Board of Finance Oct. 1, 1981. Board of Representatives Returned to Committee Oct. 5, 1981.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #3 has been WITHDRAWN.

- (4) \$10,663.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund a LAW CLERK effective 12/1/81 at annual salary of
LESS: 172.00
\$10,491.00 \$17,825 (31 weeks @ \$343.00) Requested by Corporation Counsel Cookney and Mayor Louis Clapes 9/16/81. Board of Finance approved 10/1/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) \$ 1,675.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund a Part-Time person to do clerical work, effective 12/1/81, per Mr. Cookney's and Mayor Clapes' request 9/16/81. Board of Finance approved 10/1/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA (with Mrs. Conti Abstaining)

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Esposito to wait a few moments before proceeding to the next item as the voting machine has a delay cycle here to give it time to record.

- (6) \$10,487.00 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 104.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation to fund a new position, STATISTICAL ANALYST (S-17 - at LESS: 1,081.00 \$16,040 per annum). Requested by Jon Smith 9/10 and Mayor Clapes 9/18/81. Board of Finance approved 10/1/81.
\$ 9,406.00

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Fiscal voted 4 in favor and one opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved to waive the report of a secondary committee. Seconded. Carried.

MR. DeLUCA said he would like to use the same rationale as on Item #4. This request calls for 34 weeks; therefore, he Moves to reduce this by \$1,081.00, bringing it down to \$9,406.00, which would be a reduction of 3½ weeks' pay at \$309.00 per week. This would be a starting date of December 1, 1981, through June 30, 1982, the end of the fiscal year. Seconded by Mrs. Santy.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. Amendment approved.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked if this was an appropriation that was denied at budget time and is being re-submitted.

MR. ESPOSITO said yes, by the Board of Finance.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if the Personnel Commission or Department already have taken applicants for this position, too.

MR. ESPOSITO said it has been applied for, it has been tested, it's been certified.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he is going to vote in favor of this, but the time has come for Mr. Bernstein to remember he shouldn't be spending City funds until he gets the approval of this Board. Now this is the second one and Mr. Boccuzzi assumes there are probably going to be more. Now if this is the way Mr. Bernstein is going to operate, Mr. Boccuzzi feels the next Board, and he is going to see to it, and he will put it in, to find out what authority he has to spend money for a position that actually does not exist. He is illegally spending money, in Mr. Boccuzzi's opinion, and Mr. Bernstein should stop doing it, and the Board of Representatives should look into what he is doing and how he is doing it. He has the habit of changing job specs, and now he is spending money before he gets it!

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK Moves that the President of the Board of Representatives address a letter to the Personnel Commission, citing the feeling of the Board....

THE PRESIDENT asked that the Motion at hand be taken care of first, and then she would entertain Mrs. Maihock's Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI said as he originally brought this point up, a couple of items ago, he urges his colleagues to show that they are very concerned about this by voting against any appropriation for a new position where the position has been tested and the taxpayers' money spent to show their deep concern for this. A one month's delay will not have that much bearing on the situation regarding these new positions, and he thinks, under the circumstances, they have to act and act very strongly and show that the Board is not going to tolerate this.

MRS. PERILLO said Mr. Zelinski said what she was going to say.

MR. ESPOSITO urges the Board members not to penalize any specific department for this. The issue being discussed now concerns the Planning Board, who have acted in good faith on this issue. They have proceeded according to what it sees as its prerogatives. If there has been any ill-advised, discretionary action, it has been on the part of some other department, not on the part of the Planning Board. To penalize the particular departments that are requesting the additional positions, is taking our frustration out on the wrong body. Another issue is that of creating positions. The position of Statistical Analyst was created by the Personnel Commission and they have the power to create positions. This Board doesn't. We can fund it, or we don't fund it. But they create, they approve the position. Now what happens ^{to it} after that, Mr. Esposito is not clear on. That may be something we would want the Personnel Committee to look into. But in the letter we received as a back-up on this states, under date of 9/9/81, is addressed to Mayor Clapes from Chairman of Planning Board Patrick Grosso, and it reads "The Personnel Department has recently approved job specifications for a new position" so that the Personnel Department begins to work on the job specs and salary, etc., after the Personnel Commission has approved the position. We cannot vote on any funds until we get a position, until we get job specs, until we get the whole thing, then we vote.

Exactly what the chronological order of creating new positions and the funding is something that we might investigate, but at this point, I don't think we should penalize any particular department because of problems that might have taken place in the Personnel Department.

MR. DONAHUE said he has to agree with Mr. Esposito. While Mr. Donahue thinks that the Personnel Department was certainly putting the cart before the horse in many of these items, he does feel individual departments should be penalized who have justified a need; for this department for a Law Clerk, for example. He thinks there will be an appropriate time and place to take that issue up, of what the Personnel Department is doing. However, he would also ask the members to consider one other thing: what about the individuals, who have in good faith, applied for these jobs, taken tests, and now sit on a waiting list and are waiting to hear about it. We have a responsibility to them and we should deal with the personnel issue at the proper time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said seeing these appropriations come through, so many of which we have sat and deliberated until the wee hours at budget time, and then they are slipping in the back door, which is really what is happening. In essence, we're getting \$10,000 here and \$10,000 there. When we sat here budget night and we looked to keep the City's expenses down to the barest minimum to keep the tax rate, now everything that ^{we} did for those two nights is going for naught. I really have to look askance when I see these things come through again. That's the first thing. As far as testing for a position before we fund it, in actuality whether it be right or wrong, and I take no sides on that matter, if in fact we approve the position, we approve the funds and the position is available, and it's already been tested for, and there is a list, the next day an individual can be appointed to the position. So, in essence, it was a good move on the part of the Personnel Department. On the other hand, if we knock it down, it's a waste of taxpayers' money, so therefore this matter should be resolved with the utmost of immediacy. Because if in fact, we do knock this position down, how much money will have been spent wrongly?

MRS. GUROIAN said she cannot believe the Personnel Department goes ahead so far with testing and certification without the knowledge of the department involved and indeed without the cooperation of the department involved in some way. I cannot really believe that, so in effect when it stated that you're not to penalize one because of the actions of the other, aiding and abetting is collusion, and as far as I am concerned, I don't have any compunctions about penalizing both of them.

MR. WIDER said he would have to support Mr. Esposito on his contention that we should not penalize department heads. We have some very serious planning for this City that is going on right now, some that ^{some} people know about, and some that they don't know about, and we are short of a person to do the necessary things that need to be done. I think that we should give this department this money and let them employ this person, and deal with the Personnel Department through our Personnel Committee come the new Board.

MR. BLUM said it was just said to him "Remember you're a labor man". I was going to vote on this particular item because I do feel the Planning Board needs people for more extensive planning, and as we heard the Rev. Magistro say about a City whether it grows or it doesn't grow, after all it is the planners that make a City. But, as my colleague, Mr. Wiederlight said, we knocked this down once, and because we knocked it down at budget time, there was no move for this particular position. For some reason now this has gone through the process and they figured it's a pushover. Put it before the Board of Representatives and it'll get by. Well, it's not getting by, because where in the world have you ever seen this in private business like my colleague, Mr. DeLuca, always says "You don't see it in private business. A budget is a budget." If you don't have the money, they lay off. And believe me, how can you put up a position when the Personnel Commission or the Personnel Director is a part of the employer; he takes orders from the top. It's going down as far as I'm concerned.

MR. LIVINGSTON said one of the things Mr. Esposito should be asked to clarify and that is if this Board really turned this down. I don't believe we did. I believe that it was the Board of Finance who turned it down during budget time. The other point is that each of these items should be taken on its own merit. There is some information that we don't have available to us. We don't know if Mr. Bernstein was directed by his Commission to do this, or not. I think we should guard very carefully what we say and the implications of what we say and

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON (continuing)....how it may affect personnel that work for this City. In any case, if these things are being presented to us on the whim of any individual, I sincerely think this Board should deal with whoever is responsible for this, howsoever we may see fit. I am going to support this because I know this position is needed, and our Planning Board recently, and in fact for quite some time have been doing what I consider to be a great job for this City.

MR. FAUTEUX said he must echo Mr. Livingston very strongly on this. I think there is a bona fide need that has been proven here in the proposal for the Statistical Analyst. As I understand it, the Statistical Analyst will come on the staff to take on the duties of the Statistical Planner who has other assignments which apparently have much greater priority than the work that he is doing, which is essentially the number tumbling that an Analyst will do. We must judge this on the merits of this particular issue, the bona fide merits of the issue, not the procedures by which it has gone forward.

MR. FLOUNDERS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

MR. BLUM made a Point of Personal Privilege, stating he would like to just clarify.....

THE PRESIDENT said that was not a Point of Personal Privilege; that is speaking on the issue. The question has been moved and that is it.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote and said she would try a different procedure now. We will record first before I call the vote. Now you cannot change your vote. This is a much better procedure. The vote is 27 Yes, 8 No, with 3 Abstentions; the No votes and the Abstentions are counted together for the purposes of the vote, so even though it registers one there, it is really three. (One abstention and two N.V., no votes equal three.) For the purposes of declaring the vote. The Motion has been CARRIED.

- (7) \$ 2,300.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3641 MOVING AND STORAGE - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 9/18/81 and Thos. Canino 9/9/81 for Welfare Department eviction response. Board of Finance approved 10/1/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Rep. Stork voting NO, and Rep. Betty Conti Abstaining.

- (8) \$ 5,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE - Code 530.2210 Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 9/22/81 and Thomas Canino 9/16/81 to install electric door/closer holders with smoke detectors on seven doors, as required by Fire Marshal, to correct violation. Board of Finance approved 10/1/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Rep. Betty Conti Abstaining.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said this is item for \$10,663.00 for a Law Clerk and was turned down by this Board at the budget hearings in May, and resubmitted, and Fiscal voted 4 in favor and one opposed to approve and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved for acceptance without a secondary committee report.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to Waive the secondary committee report. Seconded. Carried unanimously by voice vote.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if this is going to be a full-time position.

MR. ESPOSITO said yes.

MR. BOCCUZZI: And we are not going to change the job specs down the road.

MR. ESPOSITO said he could not vouch for that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: They're going to change them, or they are not going to change them?

THE PRESIDENT said they would proceed to a vote on this.

MR. P. JOYCE called for a Point of Personal Privilege. He said Mr. Boccuzzi asked a question of the Chairman and did not get an answer.

THE PRESIDENT said she thought Mr. Boccuzzi is satisfied with the answer. She asked Mr. Boccuzzi if that were correct.

MR. BOCCUZZI: It is a full-time job, with no change in job specs?

MR. DeLUCA said on the grounds of nickel-and-diming the appropriation. He checked the calendar and from Dec. 1st to June 30th, it is 30½ weeks, not 31½ weeks as requested, which could result in a reduction of \$172.00, and he so Moves, bringing the total down to \$10,491.00. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote to amend and reduce by \$172.00. CARRIED. That appropriation will now read \$10,491.00.

MR. ZELINSKI said he received a letter from Corporation Counsel Cookney which he is sure that those members who voted against this appropriation during the budget process, also received; and in it, he requests affirmative action on it. What does concern Mr. Zelinski, and he doesn't know if it be under the purview of this Board, if not, then possibly the next Board, and that is in the sixth paragraph, he mentions that 16 applicants have already applied for this Civil Service position. Mr. Zelinski is just wondering about our Personnel Department, that if this appropriation were to be turned down, why should this City have had to go to the expense of testing 16 applicants or as many as might have applied for this job, in the event it weren't approved. He thinks the Personnel Department either knows something that this Board doesn't know, or has put the cart before the horse. He thinks it is something that should be investigated; of course, this Board is finished, but the new Board should look into it. To go to the point of the testing process with no funding approved would be a great waste of money and effort for nothing.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked if Mr. Zelinski knew, for a fact, that these individuals had been tested, or just applications have been put on file.

MR. ZELINSKI said according to the letter he received and which was sent only to those voting against it, and he quotes "Sixteen applicants have already applied for this Civil Service position." They have applied for it. (Someone called out "It was posted.")

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that doesn't mean the Personnel Department took the money and tested them, though.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said, through the Chair, to Mr. Wiederlight, money was spent to post it. She personally got a posting of it, so that is money within itself.

MRS. HAWE said it was not tested for.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he does not wish to beat a dead horse, however, it seems to him that something is wrong. If a job is going to be posted and people are going to fill applications for it, and we haven't even approved if that job is going to be available or not. He would hope that we would come up with some safeguards to keep this from happening in the future.

THE PRESIDENT said that suggestion is very well taken, and perhaps it should be brought up by the 17th Board to the Personnel Commission to find out what the procedure really is.

MR. ESPOSITO said they did ask the question, because there are a number of requests this evening for additional staff and as each department head came in, asking for additional staff, the committee would see that they were in various stages of having the staff. In another appropriation request, not only was the position posted, but it was tested and certified and candidates were given already. And we did ask how come that happened when it wasn't approved, and the response was the Personnel Commission or the Personnel Department has a variable policy on this. Perhaps that is something that should be investigated. The Fiscal Committee did not see it in the purview of their committee to do that, but perhaps that might be something the 17th Board would like to do.

MRS. MAIHOCK said under the circumstances, perhaps the President of this Board could address a letter to the Personnel Department, citing the feeling of the Board on this matter.

THE PRESIDENT said if there is sentiment in that regard, the Chairman certainly can, or it can be referred to the 17th Board.

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED unanimously by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Main Motion for \$10,491 for Fiscal #4. She was in doubt and called for a machine vote. The total has^{just} changed and the President asked the members to please not change their votes, once she has begun to read off the totals. The vote is 30 Yes, 7 No, and one N.V. (no vote). The Motion is APPROVED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (9) \$ 9,537.62 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and Thos. Canino. To fund a CLERK-TYPIST II at annual salary of \$11,922.00 (Step 3). Approved by Board of Finance 10/1/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said this has been necessitated by the tremendous increase in the workload of the Welfare Department, and Fiscal voted 4 in favor and one opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved to waive a secondary committee report. Seconded. Carried.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if this position also has been tested and everything else.

MR. ESPOSITO said Clerk-Typist II is a position where there is usually some kind of list, so he would assume yes, in the usual manner for this type of job.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked if this was another position that had been turned down at budget time.

MR. ESPOSITO said he did not believe it was.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote and the Chair was in doubt, so she called for a machine vote. The vote is 17 Yes, 15 No, 6 Abstentions (4 Abstentions and 2 N.V.); the MOTION has been DENIED.

- (10) PROPOSED RESOLUTION REQUESTED BY MAYOR CLAPES 10/5/81 AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND THE HEALTH DIRECTOR RALPH GOFSTEIN TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT WITH STATE TO RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS IN ORDER TO OPERATE SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM KNOWN AS W.I.C. An amended contract to be finalized later.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Esposito to hold his Motion for a few moments, so that Mrs. Maihock could make a Motion regarding the last few Personnel-related positions.

MRS. MAIHOCK MOVED that the President of this Board address a letter to Mr. Bernstein citing the feeling of the Board on these Personnel matters, that this may be clarified and resolved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion is that she send a letter to Mr. Bernstein regarding ..citing the feeling of the Board on this matter, that the matter may be clarified and resolved...that the matter of posting a position prior to the funding....

MRS. CONTI: I wonder if Mrs. Maihock would consider an amendment asking what the actual policy of the Personnel Department is, regarding testing prior to the money being appropriated.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any problem with that? We could just include that in the letter. It would be a letter regarding what the policy is and our feeling regarding posting prior to funding.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI said he has a little problem with the word "posting". He thinks it should be having any expenditures before the position is approved by appropriation Boards.

THE PRESIDENT asked if that was O.K. with Mrs. Maihock. There is no problem with that.

MR. WIDER wanted to offer an amendment because Mr. Bernstein works for the Personnel Commission, and they should be the ones to whom this letter is addressed, and have them deal with him.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mrs. Maihock if that were O.K. with her, and the President said there is no problem with that.

MR. ZELINSKI said, in the same vein, it would be very appropriate if Rep. Maihock would agree with his rationale. He also believes that whatever the proper procedure would be, possibly the letter should be sent to the Mayor asking him, as the Chief Executive Officer of the City, to get the necessary information as to what the procedure of the Personnel Department is.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she believes primarily the Board of Representatives wishes the information, and they would like to be satisfied in their own minds, and this could be forwarded on to the new Board so that it won't be a problem in the future.

THE PRESIDENT said a copy could be sent to the Mayor in this regard.

MR. LIVINGSTON Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT said the question is on the President sending a letter regarding the feeling of the Board on the matter of expenditures made prior to the funds being approved, and also getting the procedures necessary. She called for a vote. CARRIED. The President will send such a letter.

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #10 Fiscal is a proposed Resolution concerning W.I.C. and Fiscal voted 4 in favor and one opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. DZIEZYC said to spend \$149,000.00 to administer funds of \$500,000.00 is outrageous, as he said before. It should be taken from the Health Department and put into the Welfare Department.

MRS. PERILLO said she was at the meeting when Dr. Gofstein was giving his presentation. He is not sure if he is going to get money from the State, or how much he is going to get. Is not that true, Mr. Esposito, he has nothing definite on this yet?

MR. ESPOSITO said that is correct and that is why they have withdrawn item #18 from our original agenda which was the money amount. The money amount we are not committing ourselves to because we don't know what it is going to be. This is simply a resolution of agreement to enter into an agreement with the State. This does not commit us to any money at this point.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said following Mr. Esposito's words, once you enter into an agreement without a money item, you do have an obligation to fund it, do you not?

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #10 is simply the resolution authorizing us to execute this agreement with the State. We are not expending any money at this point. There is no obligation...in other words, if the State doesn't come down with the money, we are not obligated to spend the money. If the State authorizes, let us say the figure on the item #18 of \$147,000; let us say the State authorizes only \$100,000. We're not obligated to spend \$147,000. If we pass Item #18 with that dollar amount, then we would be. At this point, we are only obligated to spend what the State gives us.

MR. McINERNEY said but you must agree, in theory, that this program is necessary to be continued regardless of money amounts. Is that correct?

MR. ESPOSITO said that was right. If you vote for Item #10, you are voting for the program, yes. You are not committing yourself to any particular amount of money that would indebt the City taxpayers, but you are voting for the program.

MR. BLAIS asked if the Board votes to pass this resolution, and the State gives us a grant, do we not have to share in a certain percentage of the cost.

MR. ESPOSITO said no, this is the administrative cost which will be part of the grant.

MR. BLAIS said he wished another clarification. #18 on his agenda concerns the Board of Education agenda.

MR. ESPOSITO said he was referring to #18 on the original agenda, which was withdrawn because there was no dollar amount. And because the City and Dr. Hoffman did not want to enter into an agreement that would require the City to fund a certain amount of money that the State might not give us.

MR. DIXON said this is something we have had to deal with for a number of years and we are merely following the same procedures tonight as a first step that we followed as long as we have had to deal with this program, and he sees no reason why we should hesitate to approve the resolution, and then take whatever action is necessary at a later date, if we choose to do so, to appropriate the funds.

MR. CONTI asked of Mr. Esposito if this was not turned down once before by this Board.

MR. ESPOSITO said it depends upon when Mr. Conti is referring to. It has been held, investigated, turned down, re-approved. There has been a lot of debate about it, yes, and it has been acted upon in varying degrees by the Board in the past.

MR. CONTI said the last time we discussed the W.I.C. Program, he believes it was turned down.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said, no, currently there is a W.I.C. Program in effect right now. His recollection is that we have passed it; whether or not we had held it the prior month or defeated it and it was re-submitted, he doesn't remember. But there currently is a W.I.C. Program in effect in the City of Stamford.

MR. CONTI said it was defeated the first time.

MR. ESPOSITO said that may be so; he doesn't remember.

MR. CORBOMOVED the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Fiscal #10. APPROVED with 25 Yes votes, 10 No votes, 3 Abstentions (2 Abstentions, 1 N.V.).

- (11) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL "FOR THE CREATION OF A SPECIAL CAPITAL FUND TO FINANCE CAPITAL PROJECTS" - requested by Mayor Clapes 10/6/81 and 8/31/81 (to Board of Finance) - Deferred by Board of Finance on 10/1/81 until their November 12th meeting.

MR. ESPOSITO said that originally Fiscal voted this on CONSENT, but not being familiar with the process of dealing with proposed ordinances, they didn't vote on waiving publication. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and none opposed to this proposed ordinance, and he would so Move.

THE PRESIDENT said what they would need from Mr. Esposito would be a Motion to Waive Publication, if he wants this to be passed tonight. If he wants it to be published this evening, the Chair would accept a Motion to publish a proposed ordinance.

MR. ESPOSITO Moved to Waive Publication. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI said she is absolutely opposed to waiving publication on this, as this is a matter that can affect the Mill Rate. She thinks the public has a right to comment on this.

MR. FAUTEUX said he would echo Mrs. Conti on this. What we are doing on this is we are setting up here a special fund over which the Board of Finance has exclusive control. We all remember what they did to us the last time in changing the Mill Rate by expensing a certain portion of capital projects. To set up something like this which is solely under the discretion of the Board of Finance; it might be the right thing to do, it might be the wrong thing to do. He thinks we should get some input from the public on this.

MRS. MAIHOCK believes it would be a good idea, but she does not feel it should be waived because it should be made public and everyone should have an input before we have a final vote.

MR. ESPOSITO made a Point of Information. He'd like an answer to a question because it might affect whether or not he would withdraw the motion. Procedurally what will happen with the introduction of the new Board. If we vote to publish, how does that work? Will we publish, or will we wait for the new Board. Or what will happen?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said if it is published, the new Board will not have to re-publish it. Because what is required is the publication. It doesn't require it to be published by the same Board, as long as it is within a reasonable time frame. However, the new Steering Committee will have to begin the process of putting this on the Agenda and starting the whole thing anew. Otherwise, it would die just being published. But we can publish. The new Board would not require a new publication. Perhaps, because of the very precarious, the unusual situation that we are in, it would be wise for a motion to hold this, and start the process anew with the 17th Board from scratch.

MR. ESPOSITO withdrew his Motion to Waive Publication.

MR. FAUTEUX Moved that this item be Returned to Committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. This will be placed hopefully by the new Board on the agenda.

- (12) \$1,439,830.00 - LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN CITY AND AFSCME/MAA ADMINISTRATORS
LOCAL 2657 AFL-CIO COUNCIL 4 - VARIOUS DEPARTMENTAL CODES
for period July 1, 1979 thru June 30, 1982.
(Contingent upon approval of Board of Finance)

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Fiscal voted 3 in favor, one opposed, with one abstention, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM Moved to Waive a report of the secondary committee. Seconded. CARRIED.

MRS. HAWE said she wished to say for the record that she voted against this contract and she feels obligated to vote against the funding of it.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she did also, and she agrees, and she wishes the same as Mrs. Hawe.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on funding the labor contract between the City and AFSCME/MAA. APPROVED with 4 No votes (Hawe, Maihock, Saxe, and McInerney), and 2 Abstentions (Fauteux and Flounders), 32 YES votes. (Two members absent from the meeting were Pollard and O'Brien.) The Motion has been Carried.

- (13) \$ 1,750.00 - SEWER COMMISSION - Code 112.2910 OFFICIAL NOTICES -
Mayor's letter 10/30/81. Board of Finance approved
11/12/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (14) \$ 2,500.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Code 240.1130 PART-TIME
SALARIES. Details to be forwarded under separate
cover. Board of Finance approved 11/12/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (15) \$ 5,800.00 - BUREAU OF DATA PROCESSING - FINANCE DEPARTMENT -
245.1110 SALARIES - to fund KEYPUNCH OPERATOR.
Board of Finance approved 11/12/81. (\$11,600 annual
starting 1/1/82 = \$5,800 for six months)

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed, and he so Moves.
Seconded.

MR. BLUM moved to waive the report of a secondary committee. Seconded.
Carried.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if this is for a new position.

MR. ESPOSITO said yes and no. It was a position that did exist and when the department submitted their budget, they had cut the position with the anticipation of being able to reduce the workload due to the new optical scanners, the computers. However, they now admit that their cutting of the position was somewhat premature and that the workload is still somewhat high and that they need and are now requesting the reinstatement of this Key Punch Operator position. So yes, it is a new position, but it was a position that originally was there. They found that the workload of the keypunch function was much heavier than they had anticipated and that they need the additional position. It will be a permanent position and starts on January 1, 1982 at an annual salary of \$11,600.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if this position was tested and the whole process.

MR. ESPOSITO said there is a list, an on-going list. It is unlike the other positions we have had. There is only one statistical analyst in the City so you have to test for that specific job.

MR. RYBNICK Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED with 6 NO votes (Zelinski, Blais, Saxe, Betty Conti, Stork, Guroian.)

- (16) \$ 25,000.00 - BUREAU OF DATA PROCESSING - FINANCE DEPARTMENT - Code
245.5160 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTER SERVICE. Board of
Finance approved 11/12/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed, and he so Moves.
Seconded.

MR. FAUTEUX said EW&G concurs with the request.

MR. ESPOSITO said this money is for a Systems Designer. You may recall that in past years, there has been \$25,000 in the Data Processing Department's budget for a Systems Designer. It has always been there. The problem is that they have never been able to fill the position, for the reason that they can't get anyone to work for that salary, we've been told. It's always been

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO (continuing)....kept in the department budget so that if they needed someone to design a particular system for them, they could hire someone as an outsider, just transfer the money over. However, this past year, the Board of Representatives cut the \$25,000 from the System Designer position, so they did not have the money to transfer. They now need it for system designing and they would like the money put back in the PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT ACCOUNT so it can be used for that purpose.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he has a series of questions and it is certainly not meant to put Mr. Esposito on the spot, and he apologizes in advance, in all sincerity. It concerns him that we are going to hire consultants with the high range of unemployment that appears to be in our economy. He would like to know, first of all, what the salary range is of this position. Is \$25,000 the top, or is it going to go \$25,000 to \$30,000.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT would like to know ^{if in fact} ~~how~~ many people were interviewed for this position, as opposed to ^{hiring} ~~a~~ consultant, or hiring a full-time employee and putting a member of our community to work.

MR. ESPOSITO said the salary was listed as \$25,000. It has been listed as such for, as far as he can recall, the last three years. Whether or not someone was interviewed for this position, he has no idea. Since the position was cut by this Board in May at its budget meeting, there was obviously no interviewing done this year. How many people were interviewed for it in previous years, he does not know. They have never been able to fill the position, which is the point that has always been made.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked if Mr. Esposito is convinced that this department has tried in earnest to attempt to hire an employee, or are they just saying they can't, and they just want a consultant because it would be the easy way out.

MR. ESPOSITO said he is convinced they have tried to hire someone. It would be easier to have an extra staff person on hand. They've had the money all along if they could find the person who would be willing to work for that, it would be easy to have him. Looking at the competitive salaries of systems designers, we see that \$25,000 is not very competitive in this market, so it is a reasonable assumption that it has been difficult to find someone to work for that salary.

MR. BLAIS asked if the City has assured that they will use a line item detail in procuring this consulting contract.

MR. ESPOSITO said there is a line item for this consultant.

MR. BLAIS said he means line item detail. In other words, each task that the consultant is to perform would be broken down in detail, showing the exact amount of cost, who would be working in the firm on that particular task, and a resume of that person.

MR. ESPOSITO said he could not answer that.

MR. FAUTEUX Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Fiscal Item #16. The Motion has been DENIED with 16 Yes votes, 14 No votes, 8 Abstentions (4 Abstentions and 4 N.V.).

- (17) \$ 13,135.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM -
Board of Finance approved \$330.00 for 560.3480 Uniforms on 11/12/81. Board of Finance DEFERRED \$12,805.00 for 560.1230 College Tuition on 11/12/81.

Code 560.1230 College Tuiton	\$12,805.00
Code 560.3480 Uniforms	330.00
	<u>\$13,135.00</u>

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said this item was deferred by the Board of Finance so they will not vote on it this month. Held in Committee.

- (18) \$807,214.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION and TEACHERS' UNION. Board of Finance approved 11/12/81. Contract term 2/1/81 - 6/30/84. B. R. Reed's letter 10/28/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA; Mr. Donahue and Mrs. Betty Conti Abstained, as did Mrs. Saxe.

- (19) \$1,235,000.00 - SEWER DEPARTMENT - AMEND CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR SEWER PROJECT 17-2A. Mayor's letter 10/30/81.

Transfer from

#112.490 Ayer Interceptor \$500,000.00
(closes out this account)

Transfer to

#112.491 - 17-2A Three Lakes-Long Ridge \$500,000.00

ALSO - Request to AMEND CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY
ADDING \$735,000.00 TO A PROJECT KNOWN AS #112.491 -
17-2A Three Lakes-Long Ridge. \$735,000.00

Funding via Transfer. \$ 500,000.00

Funding via Additional Appropriation to
Capital Projects Budget. . \$ 735,000.00
\$1,235,000.00

Board of Finance approved 11/12/81.

Above also referred to SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the Sewer Committee most assuredly does concur.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said he would like to know what this is all about, this transfer. You take it from Ayer Interceptor into Three Lakes-Long Ridge, and then you take and transfer funding via transfer and via additional appropriation to capital budgets.

MR. ESPOSITO said he will answer the money part and perhaps Mr. Wiederlight can answer the other part which is the transfer, etc. Originally, this 17-2A Project was budgeted at \$1.85 Million in 1978. However, the project was never finished because there was a delay in getting easements. There has been a delay for three years in this project. The easements were not obtained in a timely manner. It's not exactly clear where the fault lies in this, but there was a delay in the attorneys' in obtaining easements and that may go back to the Corporation Counsel's office. Nevertheless, the fact is there has been a three-year delay and that has led to an increase of \$735,000.00 in the cost of the project, which now must be funded. Perhaps Mr. Wiederlight would like to add something to that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the \$735,000.00 represents the additional dollars needed to complete the project inasmuch as approximately \$1.8 million was budgeted for this project a few years ago. Due to the fact that the project is not slated to be started until this spring, the \$1.8 million because of inflation, has shrunk, if you will, and we need another \$735,000.00. Now the transfer of funds from the Ayer Interceptor to the project 17-2A will also allow the project to be completed inasmuch as they are not going to build the interceptor at this time.

MR. BLAIS would like to know if these monetary figures are inclusive of Federal funds, or exclusive of Federal funds.

MR. ESPOSITO said exclusive of Federal funds. There are no Federal funds in this.

MR. FASANELLI would like to know if the Ayer Interceptor is ever going to be built.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he does not know.

MR. FASANELLI said that if it is going to be built in the future, then won't inflation affect that the same way it has affected the rest of the project.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said it probably will, but it's not in the capital projects budget at this time since it's being taken out.

MR. BLUM asked if the contract for this particular job has been set.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the contractor has not been set. The contract cannot go out to bid until all the money is in line and we approve certain condemnations which will come later on in the agenda.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. CARRIED, with a few members off the floor.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (20) \$ 30,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC - Code 280 - AMEND CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET as follows:

Transfer From

#280.822 Bedford Garage Light
Replacement. \$30,000.00

Transfer To

#280.100 Parking Garage Elevator
Repairs. \$30,000.00

-0-

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said this item was deferred by the Board of Finance so this will be HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (21) \$273,700.00 - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS - To fund salary payments, per memo from Mayor Clapes and Budget Director Frank Harrison 10/21/81, as below:

A. \$119,620.00 - "Administrative Positions whose Civil Service and/or Bargaining Unit Status have yet to be determined," per list.

B. \$154,080.00 - "Non-Union Administrators - Equity and Merit Salary Adjustments," per list.

\$273,700.00

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Item A, \$119,620.00 is a companion item to Item #12 above where we funded the AFSCME/MAA Labor Contract. Item #12 simply funded the contract of the union people, people who are clearly within the union with no one contesting their position in the union.

Item #21 deals with two categories of individuals. Item A, as you see there, includes a number of people whose positions are being disputed. And before the State Labor Board.

Item B, is for non-union administrators, people who are clearly not a part of the union.

This is to give these people a raise which is in line with the raise that the MAA people got, and also as far as Category B is concerned, to take into account the merit increases that this Board has had in place for a number of years. Fiscal voted 4 in favor, one opposed and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said he would waive only a portion of this because he believes one portion should not be before this Board, and he will speak on that.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said it all under Item #21.

MR. BLUM said well, they shouldn't have been put together.

THE PRESIDENT said you may make a motion to separate, after this is on the floor properly. So if you make a motion to waive, we can then consider it and we can accept the motion, which will be to separate.

MR. BLUM Moved to Waive. Seconded. CARRIED.

MR. BLUM said Item A for \$119,620.00 covers persons who are the subject of a letter in our packet this evening, which is addressed to Sandra Goldstein from the Vice-President of AFSCME which says it has been certified by the Labor Relations Board of Connecticut in regard to that group of employees that they are people who belong to the union, and in fact they voted for the union, so they must have been accepted by the Connecticut State Labor Relations Board, and I don't know what it is doing on the agenda in this manner. I have nothing against that Item A.

I do have in regard to Item B, Non-Union Administrators - Equity and Merit Salary Adjustments, per list. My reasoning is that on Oct. 22, 1981 the Personnel Commission took up at their meeting a new plan which relates, because now we have union administrators, a new plan relating to the non-union. At that time, the motion to accept the plan for calculating non-union managers' raises as follows, and this is from the Minutes of October 22, 1981 Personnel Commission Meeting, and they went on to say:

Merit Ratings	0 - 4	= No Raise
	5 - 6	= Satisfactory Rating = 11%
	7, 8, 9	= Above Average Rating = +2% = 13%

If we were to look at the Merit Rules System, Item 6, and I have it with me, and after all, that's what we live by.

Rule 6 - COMPENSATION - Preparation of the Plan. The Personnel Director shall be responsible for the development of a uniform, equitable pay plan in accordance with sound personnel practices.

6.2 ADOPTION - The proposed pay plan shall be submitted by the Personnel Commission through the Mayor to the Board of Representatives for adoption. And after the adoption by the Personnel Commission after presented by the Personnel Director for their consideration.

In other words, what I am saying is that one step is missing. They mentioned it in the Personnel Commission Minutes and then adopted it themselves, and presented a fiscal appropriation request to the Mayor to fund the non-union merit raises. I have no objection to the raise. It is the Merit Rules System that we live by, and under this System, it states how this is to come before us, and I am saying this never came before the Board of Representatives for their approval and adoption of this Plan. That is why I say it is an error to have this money request before us. This Board has been by-passed on a very serious matter.

HE PRESIDENT asked if Mr. Esposito had any comment on this.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said yes, we debated this at great length on Tuesday night, and Commissioner Hoffman has indicated that we are following the same procedures that we have followed in past years in regard to the merit increases. The only thing is that the numbers are different. That the category B under Item #21 for non-union are still under the old merit system that has been established for years. What is different about that merit system this year is outlined on the third page of the back-up material for this, in a letter dated Nov. 5th to Mayor Clapes from Arthur Leary, Acting Chairman of the Personnel Commission, in which he cites the numbers which are going to be used for fiscal year 81-82. That is the only thing that has to be adjusted from year to year is the numbers, and the numbers are a merit rating of 0-4 or non-compliance with the management performance guidelines equates the Zero raise. A satisfactory merit rating receives 11% raise, and above average rating receive 11% plus an additional 2% for a total of 13%. If the resulting salary is less than the position would have received if it were in the bargaining unit, then there is one-time salary equity adjustment and a 2% merit raise if the merit rating is above the average. The issue of retroactivity will be handled the same as in the MAA bargaining unit, so that they have established what the numbers are going to be. These are the guidelines that have been established by the Personnel Commission and have been forwarded to us in the same manner that they have been forwarded to us in past years.

MR. DeLUCA said that seems to be the stand that I have a hang-up with. As regards 21-A, I have to agree with the memo that we received from Mr. Burrensci, that these should be part of the union.

And as Rep. Esposito says, the non-union is in compliance with past procedures, and in past procedures, the top increase was 9%. At that time all of the directors seem to have gotten the 9%. Today we have before us Item B, non-union \$154,080 increase, without any details as far as I'm concerned. I'm curious to know which one of these positions got the 11%, which the 13%, etc. Most private industry, even Fortune 500 companies, because of the budget crunch, have limited increases to an average of 8%. Over here, our Personnel Commission has decided if you're satisfactory, we'll give you 11%. I'll bet you dollars to doughnuts that there are a lot of people outside in the general public if they got a 7% increase. Yet, I guess the Personnel Commission feels the taxpayer has a bottomless pocket, so let's give our people 13%. I'd like to Return this.. make a Motion to Return Item B back to committee, request more details. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA said his rationale for returning back to committee is that he is interested to know what positions got the 11%, what positions got the 13%, and further breakdown where it says Law Department where they have three positions for \$24,000. I see that a full-time position has now been declared a part-time position, does it really warrant 13%, or 11%, or whatever? Likewise, the Personnel Department, which one gets what, and what are the percentages. Just to vote on this the way it is, is an insult to our intelligence. It is a sign of our being a rubber stamp.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said he Seconded it is because he thinks the Plan is not before us in the proper way, and that is why he is going along with Mr. DeLuca.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on sending Part B of Item #21 of Fiscal Back to Committee. If you are in favor of recommitting, vote yes, and if opposed to recommitting, vote no. Or you may abstain. Motion APPROVED to Return to Committee with 20 Yes votes, 7 No votes, 4 Abstentions, and 7 N.V.

MR. ESPOSITO said in light of the action taken to return Part B to Committee, he would urge the members of this Board to consider carefully voting on this now. His reason is that Category B for \$154,080.00 entitled Equity and Merit Salary Adjustments has part for merit, but also part are to put those positions in equity with their subordinates. The people who are the union people who got the raise, so that if, because the union hasn't had a raise in three years, the union person's position went up 25% or 30% so that their supervisor does not make less than them, their supervisor's position was raised accordingly; that's why a lot of those salaries are very high.

Now, what I am getting at is that if we approve Part A now, we're giving the subordinates their chunk, we are then committing ourselves next month either having the supervisors make less than their subordinates, or passing the full appropriation next month for Item B. I think we should think carefully before we do that.

MR. BLUM said he begs to differ with Mr. Esposito, because during the time of the negotiations with the MAA, we were seeing merit evaluation raises that passed through all the time that the MAA was in negotiation with their contract. You remember that for three years they did not receive a salary increase, although we also got merit evaluations for their bosses all the time during negotiation contract time, so they did receive raises all the time.

MR. DeLUCA said he would have to agree with Rep. Blum. I was just about to say where was Rep. Esposito for the past three years when the MAA was negotiating contracts. We passed on 9% increases to the non-union people. I'm sure one more month will not present any hardship to the non-union personnel. Item A, as our letter from Mr. Buresci stated, should have been part of the original contract amount, and they are just getting what was voted for in the contract, and not that they are getting anything less or anything more than what their non-union supervisors are getting, and one more month will not be any detriment to their livelihood.

MRS. SAXE said she would like to have Mr. Esposito place a Motion on the floor so that we do not pass either one of these.

THE PRESIDENT said you just vote No, you do not have to have a separate motion. By voting No, you are....

MR. ESPOSITO said responding to Mr. Blum's comments, although we did vote for merit increases, the percentages that we voted for were less than what the MAA people got in their contract; and he just wants to reiterate that if they vote on Item A, we are giving the subordinates their pay increase without talking about what the bosses are going to get. And he is suggesting that we hold off on that.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE Moved to place the A portion, \$119,620.00 (Administrative Positions whose Civil Service and/or Bargaining Unit Status have yet to be determined, per list) Back in Committee. Seconded.

MR. WIDER said he understands some of these people haven't had a raise in about three years, and we are talking about one more month. I hope you'll be aware that next month we'll have all new members, and all new members will have taken their seats. I'm not so sure that this won't be held up for another year, and I am opposed to people going for three years without a raise, and I would hope that most of you work as I do, you would think in terms of let's take care of these people who haven't had a raise for a while and get down to business on our future work. I think some of this work has been bungled, and I don't think we should have that in City government.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on referring A of #21 Fiscal Back to Committee. Motion APPROVED to Return to Committee with 17 Yes votes, 13 No votes, 8 Abstentions (4 Abstain, 4 N.V.). The item has been sent back to Committee.

- (22) \$ _____ - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES - Code 102.3509 REAPPORTIONMENT
Request for an appropriation to fund expenses relating to Reapportionment. Submitted by Co-Chairperson Grace Guroian 10/20/81.

Above also referred to CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said Item #22 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to accept the CONSENT AGENDA items: #5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18; with Mrs. Saxe abstaining on all Board of Education items; Mr. Stork voting NO on Item #7; Mr. Donahue abstaining on #18; and Mrs. Conti abstaining on all Consent Agenda items. Seconded. CARRIED.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a five-minute RECESS just to stretch the legs.

RECESS from 11:15 p.m. to 11:27 p.m.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP ITEM NOT ON AGENDA

MR. DeLUCA Moved to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda which he feels is an important item that should be acted upon tonight. It has to do with the increase in the Mayor's salary and that of the Executive Aide. Unless we act on it this evening, it could not go into effect until the next election. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote, but the Chair was in doubt, and called for a machine vote. Motion DEFEATED with 20 Yes votes, 12 No votes, 6 Abstentions (3 Abstain, 3 N.V.). The Rules have not been Suspended.

MR. DeLUCA asked if he could make a comment as a Point of Personal Privilege.

MR. ESPOSITO asked what vote was needed for passage of this motion.

THE PRESIDENT said two-thirds, or 26 affirmative votes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

Note: Mr. DeLuca's Motion was voted upon later in the evening and passed. See Pages 44-45 of these Minutes.

Note: Pages I, II, III, IV, Fiscal items referred to in President Goldstein's letter of 11/12/81 that might be considered under Suspension of Rules were not brought up this evening.

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

MR. ZELINSKI said the Legislative and Rules Committee met on Thursday, November 12, 1981. Present of the Committee were Reps. Saxe, A. Conti, and J. Zelinski. Also there were members of the public as there was a public hearing. Present were Bruno Giordano, Supt. of Recreation, Walter Maguire, Manager of Sterling Farms Golf Authority, and Fred King, the Treasurer of the Stamford Taxpayers' Assn., and Mr. Frank Chuddy, the Vice-President of the Stamford Ambulance Corps., and Atty. Edw. Zam. Unfortunately, with only 3 members present of the nine-member committee, consequently there was no quorum. However, individually Mr. Zelinski would like to move a couple of the items.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE NATURE CONSERVANCY, 294 Washington St., Rm. 850, Boston, Mass. 02108, for 1.8 acres located on Heming Way, Stamford. Held 8/24/81. Approved for publication 10/5/81.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to take Item #1 out of committee. Seconded. Carried.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved for Final Adoption of Item #1. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Final Adoption, by voice vote. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REGARDING FREE USE OF ANY MUNICIPAL RECREATIONAL FACILITIES BY ANY MEMBERS OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, ELECTED OFFICIALS OR CITY EMPLOYEES. Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney 8/19/81. Approved 10/5/81 for publication as amended. Re-committed to Committee 10/5/81 for public hearing.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to take Item #2 out of committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on this Motion, but it was in doubt, and she called for a machine vote. CARRIED with 26 Yes votes, 11 No votes, Zero Abstentions and 1 N.V. (Mrs. Saxe was changed from abstention to yes.)

MR. ZELINSKI said they had a public meeting at 7:30 on Nov. 12th and even though there was no quorum, they did conduct the public hearing, and as mentioned in his report, they had 3 people who spoke on this item. Mr. Giordano brought up some very interesting points regarding this item and he conveyed some of the sentiments of the members of the Recreation Commission, who stated there are some functions that are run by the Board of Recreation; specifically one that comes to mind is that the Sterling Barn Theatre has a performance to which they do invite members of various boards and commissions, and also members of this board to a particular play once a year to show the members of this board and other boards and commissions the operation of the theatre and so forth, and if this were to pass, it would prohibit the inviting of the members of boards and commissions from attending.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI (continuing): Walter Maguire, the manager of the Sterling Farms Golf Course, had mentioned that he raised some questions pertaining to the commission members and the employees who work for the golf course. Mr. Fred King, the Treasurer of the Stamford Taxpayers' Assn., mentioned that he did support this. For a positive motion so it can go to discussion, Mr. Zelinski Moved for final adoption. Seconded.

MRS. McINERNEY said for clarification, she believes that a definition of "employee" must be covered under this ordinance, and she would like to offer that definition at this time. The definition of "employee" for this ordinance shall not include those employees employed at the municipal recreational facility itself". Moved. Seconded.

If the Board members will recollect, this problem became apparent when we were interviewing people for boards and commissions that dealt with the golf authority primarily. We found that contrary to our past belief that we had cleared up the problem of free use of facilities by board and commission members, that in fact it had continued not quite as greatly abused as previously; however, it does continue. There is no way that this type of action can be controlled since they are both policy-making bodies for their own board and commission, and the only way in which to discourage members from serving on commissions and voting to use public facilities paid for with taxpayers' dollars is, in fact, to have an ordinance against this action. It is my belief that if we take no action now, there will be no control in the future. If you are aware of the vacancies that are coming forward, you will know that we will have the same problem in the 17th Board. I can understand and appreciate the position taken by some people that if a City employee is engaged and works on the greens and possibly works at the recreational facility, such as the Ethel Kwekin Theatre, that they should be entitled. Those people, I must say, have never been abusers. It has, in fact, been those people who came before this Board and been interviewed by the Appointments Committee that sat there and agreed that they did not believe in free play or free use; and we must control that. If we follow their premise through, it means that somebody who sits on the Zoning Board might be able to have a permit waived because he is entitled to it, being that he gives so much of his time. Somebody who sits on the Planning Board might be entitled to a privilege; and somebody on the Board of Reps should probably be entitled to all those privileges. It appears that the people who volunteer their time to this City, as you and I do, do it out of their service to the betterment of this community; and I think that these other Boards should be no different.

MRS. PERILLO is against having an ordinance when you say if you work for the facility, you can have it free. Does Barbara feels that because she didn't hear of any complaints on employees getting freebies, that it was just people serving on the commissions. That's not true. There were complaints on others, but I don't think you can have an ordinance and say it's O.K. for you, but not for me. You can't have an ordinance and say you can do it and I can't. It's either freebies for everybody, or no freebies.

MR. BLUM said he, too, has sat and talked about these so-called freebies and free use of the golf authority and we sometimes wonder why they always can fill the golf authority or the golf commission vacancies. But let us take another matter, as Mrs. Perillo says, it's either yes or no, none at all, or just a little. But we, who sit on this Board of Reps, occasionally get a freebie and we might go to the Sterling Farms and see an opening night there,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM (continuing)....or we might get something else. Once in a great while, isn't it something that they do hand us volunteers, us VACS, something for spending now close to twelve o'clock at nothing per hour, nothing per hour, and no time-and-a-half on top of that. And we get a free sandwich, that's a freebie. Either cut it all out, it's either yes or no, not halfway in-between.

MR. DIXON is sure the intent of this ordinance is good and that we anticipate such an ordinance to serve a good purpose, but he is now beginning to see no real effect coming from it. Mrs. McInerney has just watered it down by 50% by amending it not to include the employees, and he believes this is what it was intended for, to have that kind of control and some flexibility over employees, as well as commissioners. He said they were told in the hearing that the golf authority is an autonomous body and the City has no control over it. Certainly it doesn't have any control over its employees, and if the City doesn't have any control over the employees, he sees little control, if any, that the City might have over the commissioners of the golf authority. We may be adopting an ordinance that will only add to the confusion and cause a lot of problems. Mr. Dixon saw the need from what he heard at the hearing. He saw a need for the Law Department to fill up some of the doubts, and have some of the discrepancies that arose cleared up. It ought to be decided once and for all what authority, if any at all, the City has over the Stamford Golf Authority. And he does not believe it would be fair for the commissioners and the employees of the golf authority to continue to have the privilege of free play when the Hubbard Heights commissioners and employees there don't share that equal right, and the same thing would apply to recreation activities and other departments around town, as well as this Board of Representatives. If we are going to pass an ordinance, it should cover the whole City and everyone, as stated before. If we are not going to have that, we shouldn't have an ordinance at all.

MR. RYBNICK said this needs a lot more clarification than we've got here tonight, and we are hastily doing something, and trying to rush it through. He would like to make a Motion to Return to Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said there is an amendment on the floor and we are voting on that.

MR. DeLUCA said if the members will recall, a few years back, the public pressure was enough to cut out the use of freebies. Some of the commissioners at Sterling Farms said that they were just following policy on freebies, and if such an ordinance were created, they would abide by it. We are just trying to prevent the honest guy from being tempted. If someone wants to break into your house, he can do it, if he really wants to. All we're doing here is preventing the honest person from being tempted. This is likewise with the people in the Sterling Farms facility, E. Gaynor Brennan, or any other facility. I have to disagree with the comments of Mrs. Perillo. Freebies should be non-existent for everyone. But once again if you were to play a private golf course, be an employee there, during the off-peak hours, the employees are allowed to play. I can remember as a caddy at the old Hubbard Heights course years ago, the caddies were allowed to play during off-peak hours. And this is part of the fringe benefits for the employees at the recreational facilities. We realize the good work they are doing and the Fringe benefit entitles you to play. I would prefer to see this ordinance passed as preventive to temptation.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT reminded the members that the amendment to the ordinance is the subject of this discussion.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT Moved the Question. Seconded. Carried.

THE PRESIDENT said the question is on amending the ordinance to include the definition of employee shall not include the employees employed at the municipal recreational facility itself. She called for a vote. The vote is 18 in favor, 18 opposed, and 2 abstentions (zero abstentions and 2 N.V.) The Motion is DEFEATED.

THE PRESIDENT said the question before the Board now is the final adoption of the ordinance.

MRS. McINERNEY said Mr. DeLuca indicated ^{earlier} that public pressure two or three years ago cut out some of the abuses. However, as she indicated, she sat through that Appointments Committee for two years now and it has not stopped. As a matter of fact, the minutes of 8/21/79 reflect the following: "Leo Belsito made a motion to have free golf play for golf authority members. This would not include guests, carts, bump starting times; it was seconded by Anthony Ferri. Pete Stekla, Ken Sunblad opposed the motion. Anthony Ferri, Mr. Koester, Frank Noto, Leo Belsito voted yes. The motion was CARRIED. Chairman Dastoli said, for the record, he would not use the privilege because he felt the entire board did not agree on free golf. June 17, 1980, Mr. Edw. Martin made a motion stating that the authority members do not play free. It was seconded by Ken Sunblad. And a roll call vote was taken: Palley, No; Crosby, No; Stekla, abstained; Sunblad, Yes; Belsito, No; Martin, Yes; Ferri, No; the Motion was defeated, and the free play continued and continues.

Gabe DeLuca indicated that morally this type of ordinance shouldn't be needed within the City of Stamford. It should be an obligation of every person who comes before a board or commission to serve this City, and gladly serve this City. However, it has become necessary to take steps, and Mrs. McInerney certainly hopes that the taxpayers of this City realize that both of these golf facilities happen to be operating in the red, and that it amounts not just to golf, but it also applies to reciprocal golf privileges. If you are a member of Sterling Farms, you have the same privilege at Hubbard Heights. If you play paddle tennis, you can use that. If you play tennis, you can use that. There must be a place to set up an example. It is obvious that the people involved will not govern themselves, and if that is the case, if they are mis-using public facilities, I think it is our obligation to help the taxpayers.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said it casts a very poor light on these people who are running these organizations, these golf courses, etc., to hear something like that, when in fact, really, they are very hard-working people. They spend quite a bit of time doing their jobs, and doing them well. And now it's up to us to come along and "clean up the act" to make sure they pay their fair share when they get out there and play a round of golf and there is nobody around, and they don't bump anybody, I really think that is going a bit far at this point. If the golf course is not being used and they're not saying to anybody, "Hey, you can't play while I play," what is the harm in letting them have a round of golf. It doesn't cost us anything.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT (continuing): In fact, it probably wouldn't be used anyway.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he has been trying to think; that Mrs. McInerney called off certain names at certain meetings, if these people were still on the golf commission. I don't believe Mr. Ferri is.

MRS. MCINERNEY said Mr. Belsito's term is expiring shortly.

MR. BOCCUZZI said when his term expires, we can take care of that problem.

MRS. MCINERNEY said that is what we thought about the other people, that's the problem, that we had interviewed, and they indicated that as long as there were a policy, they would use the privilege.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that seeing as how Mrs. McInerney tried to push through an amendment which allowed the help to play, now she is saying that the commission can't play; so therefore I think you can't have it both ways. Her amendment was defeated, so therefore I think we should defeat the whole ordinance or have her make a motion to take it back to committee.

MR. BLAIS Moved the Question. Seconded. DEFEATED.

MRS. PERILLO said, as a member of the Appointments Committee for five years, she takes her job very seriously and she checks into these people, their performance and their attendance on the boards and commissions that she gives her vote on. She thinks this Board has an obligation, but she thinks the Mayor also has an obligation because he submits the names to this Board. If they are re-appointments, she thinks it is the Mayor's job to check with the rest of the committee of these boards and commissions to see the type of job these people are doing, just as she does. When she is going to interview someone, she checks with the boards and commissions they have served on, to see what type of a job they have done. If their attendance and their performance are bad, she does not vote for them. She does not think the whole fault should be put upon this Board. She thinks the Mayor and the Democratic City Committee and the Republican Town Committee have an important role to play in this also.

THE PRESIDENT said Mrs. McInerney will now be speaking for the second time. There are people waiting to speak for the first time. Even if you are standing, anybody who has not spoken has precedence. Mr. Zelinski is next.

MRS. MCINERNEY called on a Point of Personal Privilege, stating that our Rules provide that every member should stand and address the Board.

MR. ZELINSKI said based on the comments that were made, he would like to make an amendment to this ordinance which would read "Proposed ordinance supplemental regarding free use of Sterling Farms and Hubbard Heights golf courses by any members of boards, commissions, elected officials, city employees...", it seems to me that the only problem is the golf courses. It doesn't involve any other facilities. No one has mentioned any other abuses, so he does not see why we must be so encompassing and have such a broad ordinance. The problem is the golf courses. Let's address the problem of the golf courses, and that's my motion to change the proposed ordinance which had read "any recreational municipal facility" to "Sterling Farms and Hubbard Heights golf courses" and I so Move. Seconded.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said they would discuss just the amendment which is to change the name of the ordinance from "municipal recreational facilities" to "Sterling Farms and Hubbard Heights golf courses". We have a different list of speakers for the amendment. Anyone who wishes to speak on this amendment may raise their hands so that they will be recognized. After this is approved or rejected, we will proceed to the next list. Mrs. Conti is the first speaker on this amendment.

MRS. CONTI asked since Hubbard Heights is a golf commission, and Sterling Farms is a golf authority; and an authority is authoritarian, can we enforce this against the authority, or can we only enforce it against the commission. And if we can't equally enforce it against both, that's a big mistake.

MR. ZELINSKI said that any ordinance that is passed by this Board of Representatives becomes a law for the City of Stamford, and so it would affect both golf courses.

MR. LIVINGSTON asked if we adopt this ordinance with the amendment, what happens if it is ignored. He is not saying that to be facetious, but what assures any of us that this is going to be binding? If it is violated, what happens at that point.

THE PRESIDENT said she did not know if anyone could answer that question for Mr. Livingston.

MR. LIVINGSTON said that was just the point. Just maybe we are going about this in the wrong way. Maybe we have not done our homework properly. For us to adopt a bad ordinance, or a non-enforceable ordinance, he does not see where we are doing this City any great service. Frankly, he would like to see this passed on to the next Board unless we can come up with answers to some of the questions he has posed.

MR. ESPOSITO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amendment. DEFEATED with 5 Yes votes, 25 No votes, 8 Abstentions (Zero Abstentions and 8 N.V.)

THE PRESIDENT said they are now back to the Main Motion which is the final adoption of the proposed ordinance and there is a list that was being worked from.

MR. LIVINGSTON Moved that this be put Back in Committee. Seconded.

MR. CONTI asked for a clarification. Even if this does go back to committee, there is a difference between the Gaynor Brennan golf course and the Sterling Farms authority. In the public hearing the other night, it did come up that Sterling Farms is autonomous. Now, will we actually have control over Sterling Farms? There is no question that our vote will take care of E. Gaynor Brennan, but will our vote actually control Sterling Farms because ^{it's} an autonomous body.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that is one reason why he wanted it to go back to committee. We should get a ruling if we make an ordinance, who has to abide by it, and who doesn't. He is in no mood to pass an ordinance that only solves half a problem.

THE PRESIDENT said that Mr. Zelinski had answered the question somewhat differently, and that is if we pass a law, that law pertains to everyone.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. CONTI said the reason he asked for a clarification was because he doesn't think so.

THE PRESIDENT said she tends to agree with Mr. Zelinski. However, that would require not just a mere opinion from the Chair or from the Chairman of the Committee. It would have to wait for Corporation Counsel. The question before the Body now is to re-commit.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said it is evidenced by the confusion here tonight that the different ramifications between commissions and authorities, it is necessary to move this back to the committee to do the proper research and come out with the ordinance in its proper form to do the job that it's intended.

MR. RYBNICK said with the authority, we do not regulate their fees, and he doesn't know if we control any of their regulations. That is his reason for voting to send back to committee, and get an opinion from Corporation Counsel.

MR. DIXON said in sending this back to committee, he would like to be certain that we would get a ruling from the Corporation Counsel that would get this matter cleared up once and for all. He cannot agree that simply because we pass a law, it is enforceable. I don't think we can stop the authority from playing golf for free if that is their policy. We must get clarification from the Law Department just what jurisdiction, if any, the City has over the Sterling Farms Golf Authority.

THE PRESIDENT said that certainly can be established, if it is sent back to committee.

MR. JOYCE said, speaking as a member who is attending his last meeting this evening, and he sat many evenings with this Body, and now it is 20 minutes after twelve, one of the hardest-working groups in Stamford is the Board of Representatives, and he thinks on the recommitment of this particular item, there is a serious question of the ability of the sovereign, such as the City of Stamford, making an ordinance applicable to an authority which it created by ordinance as a separate entity. But what he is trying to say in this context, since this governing body that controls this authority, has granted privileges to certain members to play free golf, they might consider extending this to the Board of Representatives. It would be in the concept that the health of the members of the Board would be improved by stretching their legs and getting out on the golf course a little bit.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to Return to Committee. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, 3 No votes, Zero Abstentions, and 3 N.V.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON EAST SIDE OF THE HURRICANE BARRIER, SOUTH OF SEAVIEW AVENUE TO OCEAN VIEW CONSTRUCTION, INC. Per Mayor Clapes' request 6/29/81. Approved by Planning Board, Public Works Dept. and Traffic Dept. Held in Committee awaiting Board of Finance action 7/20, 8/24 and 9/21/81.

HELD IN COMMITTEE due to lack of quorum at meeting.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (4) REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE OF \$1,200 FROM THE STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS. See letter 8/13/81 from Pres. M. King, SAC. Held 8/24 and 9/21/81.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to take Item #4 Out of Committee. Seconded. CARRIED.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to approve the request for reimbursement^{of} the building permit fee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on that Motion. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to take up an item that is not on the agenda, relating to an ordinance passed at the October meeting, which did have a couple of corrections needing to be made on the tax abatement. Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote as the voice vote was not definitive. APPROVED with 29 Yes votes, 4 No votes, 1 Abstention, 4 N.V. (Change Rep. Saxe from N.V. to Yes)

MR. ZELINSKI said last month we passed for final adoption the ordinance granting tax abatement for the Church of God and also the reimbursement of \$725.00. The beginning of this week, he received a telephone call from Mr. John Mello, the Tax Collector, informing him that there some corrections that needed to be addressed, and that was (1) there was a discrepancy in the amount of money that had to be reimbursed, and after the attorney and Mr. Mello sat down, a new ordinance was drafted by Atty. Edw. Zam, who did come to the L&R meeting 11/12. The new ordinance does not grant any reimbursement, and also mentions that there are two lots. One is the actual property where the church is located, and the other one is an adjoining lot which is a parking lot, also owned by the church. That is what we will be voting on this evening.

There is one other correction Mr. Zelinski would like to make to the corrected ordinance that the attorney drafted. It is still not correct, unfortunately, and we have to delete the section 12-81(b) both in the heading and in the context of the ordinance, so everyone that has the corrected ordinance on his desk, we are simply going to delete, I would make an amendment to delete 12-81(b) which calls for reimbursement, and since there will be no reimbursement, that section number does not have to be part of the ordinance. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on this motion to delete. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to Waive Publication. Seconded.

- (5) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO GRANT TAX ABATEMENT TO THE CHURCH OF GOD - REPEALS ORDINANCE NO. 463 approved on Oct. 5, 1981 meeting.

MR. ZELINSKI made a point of clarification. He said if we do not finally adopt this ordinance this month, we will have to go through an unnecessary expense for the taxpayers of publishing again.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote, which was not definitive. It requires two-thirds affirmative votes for passage. This will repeal Ord. 463 and replace it with this corrected version; and we are voting to waive publication. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, 2 No votes, Zero Abstentions, and 4 N.V.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI Moved for Final Adoption of the proposed ordinance. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the FINAL ADOPTION. CARRIED with two NO votes (Betty Conti and Audrey Maihock). Approved as amended.

MR. ZELINSKI said he would like to add that there were some other people who came to the meeting, just for the record: Jim Hyland, the Tax Assessor; Mr. Bob Thomas, the Data Processing Supervisor; and Mr. Hal Maddox, the United Appraisal Company. They gave the Committee a breakdown of the reassessment. Hewould at this time, being the last meeting of this Board, like to thank the members of the Legislative and Rules Committee, who came to the meetings and did contribute and help the Co-Chairmen with their duties and business of the past two years.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA AND TO RECONSIDER THAT ITEM, IT HAVING BEEN DEFEATED EARLIER IN THE EVENING, BEING SALARY INCREASES FOR THE MAYOR AND HIS EXECUTIVE AIDE. (Page 34 of these Minutes)

- (23) \$ 6,749.00 - MAYOR'S OFFICE - Code 201.1110 SALARIES -Additional Appropriation to fund salary increases for Mayor and Executive Aide, effective December 1, 1981. Approved by Board of Finance 11/12/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

THE PRESIDENT said the vote needed to Reconsider requires a simple majority. To Suspend the Rules, it takes two-thirds. This was to answer Mrs. Guroian's question.

MR. ESPOSITO said on a vote to Suspend the Rules, it doesn't have to be Reconsidered. He recalls many times this Board in which they have gone through various parts of the Agenda requesting repeatedly to Suspend the Rules for a particular item over and over again, which was defeated, and eventually it got passed. His knowledge is that it doesn't require someone to be on the Prevailing Side, nor is it necessary for the Board to vote to Reconsider it. It is just another Motion to Suspend the Rules again.

THE PRESIDENT said she would welcome an opinion from the Parliamentarian in this regard.

MR. HOGAN said he would have to disagree with Mr. Esposito. It is a Motion, and it becomes a principal Motion, and the principal motion is on Suspension of the Rules. Therefore, in order to Move for Reconsideration, it is necessary to follow the Rules, and which is the procedure being followed at the present time. This takes a simple majority.

THE PRESIDENT agrees with the Parliamentarian, stating they now need a simple majority to RECONSIDER. The President asked the members to vote by machine. APPROVED by a vote of 24 Yes, 9 No, 5 Abstentions (1 Abstention, 4 N.V.)

MR. DeLuca Moved to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the agenda. Seconded.

SUSPENSION OF RULES TO TAKE UP A FISCAL ITEM (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO said Mr. Loomis left some time ago.

THE PRESIDENT said he did not inform the Chair he was leaving; but that now leaves 37 members present, and two-thirds of that would be 25 Yes votes for passage.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion which is to Suspend the Rules to consider item not on agenda regarding the Mayor's salary and that of the Executive Aide. APPROVED with 26 Yes votes, 8 No votes, 4 Abstentions (2 Abstention, 2 N.V.).

THE PRESIDENT asked Co-Chairwoman Marie Hawe to make the Motion to approve the funding of this item, \$6,749.00.

MRS. HAWE Moved to approve \$6,749.00 for 201.1110 Salaries, Mayor's department. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on this Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI asked what the Mayor's present salary is, and what the increase will bring his salary to; and what the Executive Aide's present salary is, and what that will bring it to; and approximately what type of percentage is that of an increase.

MRS. HAWE said the current salary of the Mayor is \$37,450.00. The proposed annual salary is \$45,000.00. The Executive Aide's current salary is \$18,725.00, and the proposed annual salary is \$22,500.00.

MR. ZELINSKI said his last question was what percentage increase is that? Does Mrs. Hawe know?

MRS. HAWE said she is not sure, but she thinks it comes out to about 3% a year.

MR. FAUTEUX said even though it is indicated that it is a 20% increase over the base salary, you have to take into consideration that this increase that we will be approving tonight for the next two years spread over the total 4 years is a 3.3% increase over the base salary for four years. According to the schedule that we have here, the salary increase is going to take effect on the base salary of \$37,450. Now that was the salary that was put into effect back December 1, 1979. Now, with the increase going to \$45,000 effective through December 1, 1983, the Mayor will not get the total difference on the four years, he will get only the difference between the \$37,450 and the \$45,000 for essentially 2 years and 7 months. Now spread that over the total amount of money that he would make at the base salary, and it is a simple division back into the increased amount, and that comes out to be about 3.3% over the four-year period, even though he is at \$45,000.

MR. DeLUCA said he would have to agree with Mr. Fauteux. You look at it and it says 20%, but once again that is just on the base salary. When you consider a person as the Mayor of a City of 101,000 people, a 3% increase is zilch compared to what we have been passing on to all our union people and non-union people; and when you consider the position that he has, regardless who the man or woman may be as our Mayor, if they are not entitled to a 3% increase, then our City is in sad shape.

SUSPENSION OF RULES TO TAKE UP A FISCAL ITEM (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he, too, shares some consternation with these numbers as Mr. Zelinski does. The Mayor's salary now is \$37,450, and that base is going to go up to \$45,000. In pure economic terms, that is an increase of \$7,550, or an increase of 20%. I don't care how you spread it out, but the annual base goes from \$37,450 to \$45,000, which is a 20% increase.

And for the Mayor's Aide, the base is \$18,725, and it goes to \$22,500, which is an increase of \$3,725, or 20%. Now I don't know how you can justify 3%. It is 20% per year.

MRS. SANTY said you can sit here and talk about 3% and 20%, and dollars and cents. What she is talking about is upgrading the position of the Mayor and his Executive Aide. It doesn't matter who the Mayor is, two years from now or four years from now. But a city the size of Stamford, growing as we are, a corporate city, certainly the Mayor of this town, no matter who the person is, no matter who is elected, should be making that salary. I ask you to reconsider, and also the Executive Aide. We approve salaries here every day, all types of contracts, and the Mayor of the City of Stamford should certainly be in the \$45,000 category.

MR. FLOUNDERS said he wished to respond to Mr. Wiederlight's questions. The \$7,550 is spread over a four-year period through December of 1983. The last increase was in December of 1979. So while it is about 18% for the total, you divide that by four years, and you don't have anything like that. You've got a 3.3% increase per year. So even if it is 4%.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the \$6,749.00 for the Mayor's Office. APPROVED with 28 Yes, 5 No, 5 Abstentions (1 Abstention, 4 N.V.)

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) RATIFICATION OF LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND THE STAMFORD POLICE ASSOCIATION, INC., for one year from 7/1/81 to 6/30/82. Submitted by Mayor Clapes 10/19/81.

MR. BLUM said the Personnel Committee met on this item, but inasmuch as they did not have a quorum, they did meet to hear those present. Present were Reps. Hogan, Rep. Dziezyc, and David Blum. Also present was Rep. Anne Saxe. Labor Negotiator Barrett presented the City's side of the negotiations. Sgt. Frank Cronin, the Vice-President of the Stamford Patrolmen's Association. The contract was initialed by the Mayor of this City, and it is now being presented to this Board. Mr. Blum places this before you because there was no quorum of the Committee. He Moved to take this out of committee. Seconded. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote. Mr. Blum then Moved to ratify. Seconded.

MR. FAUTEUX wished to call the Board's attention to the letter received this evening from the Board of Finance enumerating the numerous provisions in this contract which resulted in an unanimous decision on their part to reject the contract; in particular, the very high retirement benefits, and the unlimited medical coverage upon retirement. Accordingly, he asks the Board to consider these tremendous liabilities that will face the City in the future if the Board goes ahead and ratifies this contract.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said that she agrees with Mr. Fauteux that we are encumbering such a liability for the City of Stamford, one which she does not believe the taxpayers of this community can afford to fund. She certainly thinks the Board should take stock of what it is doing and think clearly when voting on it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said he thinks the opposite of Rep. McInerney. He thinks it is a liability the taxpayers cannot afford ^{not} to incur. We must incur this liability and turn it into an asset because this asset is our police protection. Our salaries in this community for our police officers must remain competitive with the salaries in the surrounding communities; or like what happened with the teachers a short while ago, we will lose our good people. The police officer on the street is our first line of defense against crime. Many of our districts have had neighborhood meetings on how to combat crime, and we're asking for help; and now are we, the Representatives, to tell the people in our community that we're going to turn our backs and say, hey, we can't afford this contract. We should be paying top dollar to get the best, because we do have the best, and we should keep it.

MR. DZIEZYC said in order to get the best-qualified men and women to serve our City as police officers, you have to provide them with benefits that are comparable to other communities. These police officers, every day, must lay their lives on the line to protect the citizens of Stamford. What stands between anarchy and our present system of good government is our excellent police department. If we start lowering our standards by not getting the best to serve our City, for certain we will move toward lawlessness and anarchy. Therefore, Mr. DziezyC urges the members of the Board to vote for this contract.

MR. ESPOSITO said he would like to add something to the comments made about the liabilities of the pension plan. We might consider, certainly, that there are liabilities here, and it is going to cost the City more and a greater percentage. But there are also assets, and let us just consider the assets of this. We have to remember the fact that the City has gone and entered into this contract. That means the negotiator for the City has agreed to these terms and there must have been something in it for us as well for us to agree to it. It has been the prerogative of this Board to argue for 25-year retirement, to try to do away with the 20-year retirement. This is something that we have encouraged the labor negotiator to try to achieve. He has not been ^{if} able to achieve that. What he intended to do in this particular contract is, you can't get 25-year retirement, at least try to provide the incentive to keep the people on the job longer. And that is the purpose of this retirement pension plan, so that you have extension from the 20 years of service at 50%, all the way to 32 years of service. They are trying to get 12 more years out of a police officer. That 12 years is going to take its toll on that police officer. As a compensation for that, they are giving him 25% in pension plan. I think if you cost it out, you might find out he doesn't live as long and he won't be collecting as much. When he dies, his widow gets the 50%; she doesn't get the 25% extra, so that it reverts back. The other issue here is that the City benefits by having trained, experienced police officers on the streets for anywhere from one to twelve years until they reach the maximum of 32 years of service. Consider what it costs to hire new police officers, test for them, train them, etc., there is no way you can add in, in dollars and cents figures, the benefits of experienced police officers. That is one asset. The other asset that is not clear in this contract has to do with the productivity savings that are on-going, that we approved the last time around, and that we are seeing the measurable effects right now. That is the work schedule. The work schedule remains the same in this contract as it was before, but that work schedule has been very successful

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ESPOSITO (continuing)...in reducing the over-all police budget. For example, he can remember when Mrs. Goldstein was Chairman of Fiscal, and almost every month they had \$50,000 requests for Minimum Manpower; \$50,000 to \$100,000 for Over-Time; \$50,000 for Sick Pay, or \$100,000. As Chairman of Fiscal, he has not seen any of those in the last two years. The contract in front of the Board tonight, which reinforces and continues that new schedule has done away with a good deal of the Minimum Manpower, a good deal of the Sick Pay, a good deal of the Over-Time, and there have been enormous savings in that, and we should take account of those assets and reward the police officers accordingly.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said she doesn't think anyone can remember back that far.

MR. BLUM said that this contract, negotiated as soon as it was, realizes even through its pension benefits, a savings to the City eventually. Eventually, if we are going to see our long-time officers spending more time on the force, having experienced patrolmen on the force, we will realize a savings over the long run. The pension today of 1980, as per a periodical he received from the School of Industrial Relations at Cornell University is going to be a great thing coming in the 80's. All the pension systems will be over-turned to the betterment by increasing productivity of municipal employees, federal employees, and even in the private sector. There is going to be a complete overhaul of the pension plans in the federal system. The aim will be to extend time on a particular job, not having people going out at an early age, trying to give an incentive to stay on the job. This is the purpose. How do we make an incentive. Does the incentive come lightly by saying well, you've got to stay another 12 or 15 years on the job, but how can you do that? You've got to give an inducement. The inducement has to be in what you will receive at the end when you do go out on pension. Do we know what is down the road in the 80's and 90's and even in the year 2000? Inflation is going up. It is not going down yet.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

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

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked how many votes are needed for passage.

THE PRESIDENT said a majority.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE Called the Roll.

THE PRESIDENT said the contract has been RATIFIED, with a vote of 26 Yes, 10 No, and 1 Abstention. (Three members were absent from the meeting at this point.)

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR RAPE CRISIS COORDINATOR OF RAPE CRISIS CENTER - submitted by Rep. Paul Esposito 10/20/81.
The Center will reimburse City for these benefits.

MR. BLUM said no one appeared for this item at the committee meeting. A letter was sent to the sponsor, Mr. Esposito, who did not appear. A letter was also sent to the Coordinator, or someone at the Rape Crisis Center, and the letter was returned to us. That is the only thing Mr. Blum has to report. This item will have to be Returned to Committee.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said that finished his committee report. He wished to thank those who were on the Committee for the past two years, and whatever they did, they did together.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee met on November 12th. Present were Reps. Stork, O'Brien, and Donahue. He Moved to the Consent Agenda Items #1, #4, #5, and #6.

- (1) ACCEPTANCE OF MILL VALLEY LANE as a City Street. City Engineer Sabia's certification dated October 8, 1981.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF COACHLAMP LANE as a City Street --- Application 10/19/81 from Petitioner L. Sansone & Sons, Inc., and Atty. John D. Fusaro of Strada, Fusaro, Scherban & Ventre.

MR. DONAHUE said while Coachlamp Lane has been inspected by himself and the road has been found to be in good condition, a number of questions have come up as late as this afternoon which the Committee has not received answers on, and they feel that it is in the best interests of the City that this item be HELD FOR A MONTH, so it is Returned to Committee.

- (3) ACCEPTANCE OF HUCKLEBERRY HOLLOW as a City Street - Application 10/19/81 from Petitioner Roger Arnow, Trustee, and Atty. Thomas R. Ventre of Strada, Fusaro, Scherban, & Ventre.

MR. DONAHUE said that Huckleberry Hollow is not, at this time, ready for certification. It is Held in Committee.

- (4) ACCEPTANCE OF OUTLOOK STREET as a City Street - That portion from a line 20' south of Winsted St. northerly approximately 187' total length. Applicant: Wm. Sabia, City Engineer, City of Stamford, dated 10/22/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) ACCEPTANCE OF WEST AVENUE as a City Street - Southerly from the already accepted portion 166'± to Outlook Street. Applicant: Wm. Sabia, City Engineer, City of Stamford dated 10/22/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (6) ACCEPTANCE OF WINSTED STREET as a City Street - Westerly from West Avenue 246'± to Outlook Street. Applicant: Wm. Sabia, City Engineer, City of Stamford, dated 10/22/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (7) ACCEPTANCE OF LIGHTHOUSE WAY as a City Street - Running from the westerly side of Ocean Drive West 400 ft. ⁺ to the end of a permanent cul-de-sac. Submitted by John B. Menegon, 6 Richmond Drive, Old Greenwich, Conn. 637-3814 - 10/26/81.

MR. DONAHUE said this would be the same with Lighthouse Way, it is not ready for certification at this time. Held in Committee.

- (8) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL - amending previous ordinances enacted concerning the Establishment of Fire Districts, for the City of Stamford to conform with the revised Connecticut Basic Building Code effective Sept. 1, 1981, per 9/8/81 letter from James J. Sotire, Bldg. Official and Zoning Enforcement Officer of Stamford. Approved for Publication 10/5/81.

MR. DONAHUE said there is one change to this matter, we are removing the "RD" Classification from that ordinance because RD is the Residential Design District and it is more closely-related to single-family and low-density multi-family dwellings, which are also not included, and he Moved this be amended by eliminating the Residential Design District from the ordinance. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said he received some material on this, and his understanding is that this is in compliance with the State Building Code.

MR. DONAHUE said that is correct.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on amending the proposed ordinance by deleting the RD classification. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for Final Adoption of the ordinance as amended. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approving the ordinance as amended. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (9) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING DISCONTINUANCE OF ALLYN PLACE Approved for publication 10/5/81. Public hearing to be held, per Rep. Donald Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE said that some months ago, this Board passed a resolution which showed an intention to discontinue Allyn Place as a City street. Subsequent to that, a report was given to the Committee by Mr. Cookney and Mr. Sabia which advised this Board to act to discontinue Allyn Place, and an ordinance was submitted and published. Only 360 ft. more or less of Allyn Place had been accepted by the City, and all adjacent property is owned by Trizec Stamford Goldfeld, who seeks to develop a hotel and office complex that is bounded by the Thruway, ConRail, Fairfield Avenue, Greenwich Avenue. Allyn Place is included within these boundaries. If Allyn Place is discontinued, the border of the Trizec property, about 160 ft. deep, will be landscaped, with benches and they will be installed along Fairfield Avenue. The developer has also agreed to do approximately \$400,000 to \$600,000 of sewer reconstruction and drainage work to replace substandard pipe, and to connect the site to the City interceptor to the Rippowam River at no cost to the City, and in accordance with City specifications. Having inspected Allyn Place on a number of occasions, the latest being this morning, I can attest that it is now being used as a dumpin

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE (continuing).....ground and poses a serious health hazard to the neighborhood. This will also remove the possibility of a future accessway for Trizec development onto Fairfield Avenue, which is a major concern of area residents. At a public hearing which was held on November 12th, opposition was voiced by the Citizens Action Group, represented by Ralph Antonucci, who felt Trizec should do more for housing in Stamford, and that we should use this issue as leverage to bring this about. While the Committee is in agreement with the motives behind this opposition, we were being asked to force Trizec to comply with the Master Plan designation that is not in place at this time, or may never be in place. The developer has committed a substantial amount of money to area improvements and is developing the tract in compliance with the current Master Plan as it zoned. The failure of the Board to discontinue Allyn Place would not stop the development of the Trizec property and will leave us with a street which is of no use to anyone and will have to be maintained with City funds and will serve as an attractive nuisance to the area. While some of us feel the property should be developed in other ways, ^{denying} this request will not bring that about. As far as housing is concerned, that would not be approved by the Department of Housing and Development (HUD) because of the proximity to the Thruway and the railroad. This Committee has voted to recommend the discontinuance of Allyn Place by a vote of 3 in favor, none opposed, and Mr. Donahue so Moves. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI asked what happens if we do not approve this discontinuance of Allyn Place, to begin with. What are the consequences?

MR. DONAHUE said, as he stated in his report a moment ago, it will have no effect on the development of this property. We will be left with a City street that we will have to maintain, that will serve as an attractive nuisance to the neighbors on Fairfield Avenue, and again it will not stop the development of this tract.

MR. BLUM said he does not know whether it will stop the development or not. Allyn Place is a City street at this time, and true, by giving Allyn Place there has been a promise by Trizec Development Corporation that they would do certain amenities on Fairfield Avenue, and so on. There also has been other talk of housing, a possibility of moderate-income housing. Well, we all know in this City of Stamford, that's lacking. Housing is very badly needed, and Mr. Blum is going to go and vote with StamCAG. Allyn Place is very important to Trizec. They would like to have this as the second inlet from Fairfield Ave. and he will vote against this as long as they will not consider housing to be one of their needs to give the people in the community. He is going to ask the Board to follow his lead to vote against this final adoption for the discontinuance of Allyn Place.

MR. DONAHUE would like to clear one thing up. The Committee was shown the plans for the development along Fairfield Avenue, and Allyn Place will not exist anymore. It will be filled in and it will be landscaped 160 ft. back from Fairfield Ave. with trees, shrubbery and benches. This is a commitment that was made by Trizec Goldfeld. As far as housing is concerned, and it has nothing to do with the issue of Allyn Place, Trizec Stamford Goldfeld has on their ^{own} donated, or will donate \$200,000 towards neighborhood reinvestment in the City.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said you mean something is going to happen on Allyn Place, a City street, they're going to fill it in? How is that possible.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Blum will have permission to speak again when his turn comes up.

MR. DZIEZYC said the City is going to gain immensely in abandoning this street. We shouldn't be forcing private enterprise to create housing, especially if they're not able to do it. Right now they are giving us a proposition of giving us \$400,000 for the sewers, \$200,000 for other items. This is \$600,000 we're getting for nothing, so we shouldn't be fighting this.

MR. WIDER said he would be the first one to say that it is time that we take a look at some of the corporations that are coming out to Stamford and displacing people, and see if they can come up with some housing grants, but unfortunately this wasn't caught in time. It should have come up when they were purchasing the property, that should have been the condition that was tied on to it. As for the discontinuance of Allyn Place, it would mean absolutely nothing to them one way or another, with the exception of their being able to close that off. They will build there with or without Allyn Place. I am hoping that we can encourage, by our action, with Trizec, the need for cooperation and involvement in the creation of housing. I think by having them allocate \$200,000 is a good beginning in the land bank we can have for housing, if we can find it. I can't see where stopping the discontinuance of Allyn Place is going to help us too much at this time.

MR. STORK said to carry the comments concerning the \$600,000 worth of City improvement that we tend to get from this project, I maintain the position I took at last month's meeting, that it is \$600,000 plus dollars that the City won't have to fork over.

MRS. PERILLO said she thinks there is some misunderstanding about Trizec. No one was displaced. They didn't put a gun to these people's heads and say you have to sell us your homes. These people were paid a very high price for their homes and they chose to sell to Trizec, and they own beautiful homes now, much better than the ones they owned on Allyn Place. She heard no one that sold their house complain about Trizec coming along and buying it. I think that Trizec is adding a lot by picking up the tab for the sewer, so that the taxpayers of the City don't have to pick it up.

MRS. GUROLAN said, as a member of the Committee, she would like to reiterate her support of this motion. She feels that the City is getting something, for a change, for the little that it is giving up, and she would hope that each member would vote for this.

MR. JOYCE has one question. Is it in writing from Hy Goldfeld, who is Trizec, that you are going to get the \$200,000.

MR. DONAHUE said, as he stated before, the \$200,000 is not a part of this agreement, and it is something they are negotiating with the City agencies. We have it in writing about their commitment to do the sewage and drainage work in the area. That every member of the Board received and it is on file in the Law Department and it is signed by Hy Goldfeld, the General Partner for Stamford, Trizec, Goldfeld.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. JOYCE said the answer to his question is that they do not have a firm, binding, legal agreement to get the \$200,000. Is that correct?

MR. DONAHUE said that was correct. He would like to repeat that was not part of the consideration here. That it was something that was discussed with other City agencies.

MR. JOYCE said that in that case, this should be made very clear to these Board members who are going to vote on this particular item.

MR. ROOS said his thoughts here are, are we in a democracy or aren't we? We're talking about forcing private individuals to build public housing. Here we have public housing which the federal government has told us we can't use this land for public housing, and just what are we discussing here. We've got some people that are offering us money to help us with the sewers. It sounds like a good deal to him.

MR. DeLUCA Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Adoption of this ordinance. She said there is something definitely wrong with the count on the machine. (The tally sheet showing 27 Yes, 1 No, 2 Abstentions, 8 N.V.).

THE PRESIDENT said she would take the vote by a show of hands. In opposition is: Mr. Blum; Abstaining are: Mrs. Hawe, Ms. Summerville, Mr. Owens. The rest of the members will be recorded as voting Yes. The ordinance has been APPROVED.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for approval of the CONSENT AGENDA. Seconded. CARRIED.

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

MR. PERILLO said there is no committee report.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL, AS AMENDED, ADOPTING REGULATIONS RESTRICTING USE OF WATER DURING WATER SHORTAGE.
Submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes. Held in Committee since Jan., 1981. Published 3/11/81. Held in Committee 7/6, 8/3 and 9/9/81.
Approved for re-publication 10/5/81.

MRS. SANTY said her Committee held a public hearing on October 28th, with Paul Dziezyc and herself attending. They were the only two members in attendance at that meeting. Also attending were several representatives from major corporations: John Mitovich from SACIA, Stamford Water Company officials, Dr. Gofstein, and concerned taxpayers. This past year, during 11 meetings and 2 public hearings, they discussed this ordinance, wrote it, re-wrote it many, many times. At this last public hearing, they heard more pertinent information and suggestions than they had ever heard before, and they feel this should be considered as a part of the ordinance. Since there is a conservation ordinance in effect now, they recommend that this ordinance be forwarded to the 17th Board for action.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT: And that requires no motion.

MRS. SANTY said as a matter of public information, there is 41% capacity in the reservoirs today, with 144 days left. One year at this time, the were 38% of the reservoir capacity and 134 days, so people are conserving.

- (2) STATUS REPORT - FIRE TASK FORCE - Held 6/22, 8/3 and 8/24/81. Reports made 9/9 and 10/5/81.

MRS. SANTY said this is the status report from the Fire Task Force. The Fire Task Force was appointed by the Mayor in February, 1981, for the purpose of improving and strengthening Stamford's Fire Code. There were 15 members, who represented the Stamford Fire Department, Police Department, the Big 5 Volunteer Fire Departments, Fire Marshals, Fire Inspectors, an architect, a construction engineer, corporate manager, Stamford Building Inspector, and a member from this Board.

After 14 meetings and many workshops, 100 suggestions were studied and scrutinized. The Task Force compiled all these suggestions into two ordinances: one concerning the installation of automatic sprinkler systems in buildings two and three stories because the State mandate ^{that} sprinklers in buildings of four stories or more is still in effect. And an ordinance concerning common elevator service keys, which would provide one common key to operate all fire service control in elevators. These proposed ordinances were sent to Corporation Counsel's Office and everyone has received a copy of his decisions regarding these proposals. The State statutes preempt us from adopting other legislation, but since the Task Force feels more stringent sprinkler regulations are necessary for Stamford, he suggests that we approve the attached resolution. There is one correction to the resolution. On the top of the page, "ordinance No. ____ Supplemental" should be removed. This is not an ordinance. This is a resolution. That was a typographical error.

Concerning the proposal for a common elevator key, the State again preempts the City, and in 1977, designated an ordinance regarding a designated key. Chief Vitti will pursue this, as it may be the common elevator key that we can put into effect.

The Health and Protection Committee met on November 10th with members Paul Dziezyc, David Blum, and Lois Santy attending, and unanimously approved the resolution as submitted and Mrs. Santy so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mrs. Santy to again mention the resolution's title and the correction.

MRS. SANTY said it is the last two pages of the letter received from Barry Boodman October 8, 1981. The second page from the top says "Ordinance No. ____ Supplemental", just strike that out, so that it should read "Proposed Resolution Requesting that the Legislature of the State of Connecticut to approve legislation... and she so Moves.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion is to approve the resolution as articulated by Mrs. Santy...

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI said he believes Rep. Santy and her committee worked very conscientiously and diligently on this. However, he is extremely disappointed, as Rep. Santy had mentioned, the Mayor's Fire Task Force, as so-called, was appointed in February of 1981. Here we are nine months later, and when he originally had written a letter back in January, asking in this building where we are presently sitting, that we should have smoke alarms, a sprinkler system, and fire alarm boxes, as we sit here today, they are not here. The reason he first brought this up was because of the tragic fires in Las Vegas, and at another location, and he did not want anything to happen here for the employees of the City of Stamford. Now, really, what do we have to do to get something done. Do we have to have a tragedy occur, and then all of a sudden, we'll have to get everything done. You know, task forces are fine, but the bottom line is, what has been accomplished? We've accomplished nothing. We are here nine months later, finishing up the business of this 16th Board of Representatives, and asking the State Legislature in the form of a couple of resolutions to do something. I am very disappointed. I think it is outrageous really, that right now there is still isn't anything insofar as those sprinklers, or smoke alarms are concerned, in this building, and this is an old building and there could be a tragic fire here someday and I don't know what else we can do. I would like to see possibly, if it is the will of this Board, to send a letter to the Mayor expressing these concerns, and I would like to make that Motion.

THE PRESIDENT said they already had a Motion on the floor right now, and first that Motion will be taken care of, and that is to approve the proposed resolution requesting that the legislature amend Section 29-44CGS to allow for more stringent local requirements for sprinkler systems.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote by voice. The Motion CARRIED with one abstention, Mrs. Mildred Perillo.

MR. ZELINSKI said originally he had requested that something be done along the lines of a sprinkler system, and first of all he was surprised that we didn't have....

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Zelinski to make his motion.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved that the President of this Board, ^{you, Madam Chairman,} send a letter to the Mayor expressing our concern that there are still not smoke alarms, a sprinkler system and fire alarm boxes in this building itself; and before a tragedy occurs, we would like to have that accomplished.

THE PRESIDENT asked if there were a Second to Mr. Zelinski's Motion. There was no Seconding Motion.

MRS. SANTY said she would refer to Mr. Wiederlight who has comments on this one item.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that Mrs. Santy and her Fire Task Force did an admirable job. He is involved with emergency services, as far as the ambulance corps in this community is concerned, as most of you know. It is quite a job to get all of these people together, and to come up with these ideas, and I congratulate you, Mrs. Santy, and your Committee for the job you did. It took nine months but it's nine months of hard work.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. SANTY thanked Mr. Wiederlight and all the people that served on a volunteer basis. That concludes her report.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA said he is looking at the clock up there on the wall, and when he gets home tonight, he is going to be asked how can he stay up so late, as during a regular week night, he is in bed by ten! That's dedication!

The Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday evening, November 9th. The attendees were members Perillo, Pollard, Park Supt. Bob Cook, Park Commission member Ravallesse, Rink Manager Mark Magliola, and interested members of the staff of Fish and Game Assn. of Fairfield County.

By a vote of 3 in favor and one opposed, the Committee put the following items on the CONSENT AGENDA: #3, 4, 5.

- (1) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FEES AT TERRY CONNERS RINK for 1981-1982 -
submitted by Parks Supt. Robert E. Cook 10/13/81.

MR. DeLUCA said by a vote of 3 in favor, none opposed, the Committee voted to approve the proposed fees with three changes

On Item 1, first page of the Fees, The present Non-Resident Child fee is \$1.75, and this is increased to \$2.00, and the Park Dept. went along with this. He so Moved. Seconded.

MR. OWENS said in reference to the Terry Connors Rink, why is this under Parks, instead of the Recreation Department.

MR. DeLUCA said several months ago, he got an opinion from the Corporation Counsel, as this has been a sore spot with Mr. DeLuca for years, and if you interpret the reason given by the Corporation Counsel, the reason it is under the Parks Dept. rather than the Board of Recreation is because that is where the Mayor has put it in the budget; and as long as the budget remains under the Parks Department, that is where the jurisdiction of the Rink will be. One of these days, it may be switched over to the Dept. of Recreation, but as it is now, that is the primary reason.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on this Motion. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

MR. DeLUCA said on Item 1, first page of the Fees, (d), Non-Resident Adult proposed fee \$2.50, they have increased this to \$3.00, and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA said on the second page, item #11 (a new item to be added) for Skate Sharpening Fees, for each pair of skates \$2.00 per pair charge. And he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he agrees there should be a skate sharpening fee, but isn't there special equipment for this, and do we already have it at the Rink?

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA said they are planning on using existing equipment, and they estimated \$4,000 in revenue against \$1,700 expense, with a profit of \$2,300.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote and the Motion was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA Moved for acceptance of the entire fee schedule, all other fees and items as indicated on the schedule of Rink Fees to be as listed, Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PARK REGULATIONS - Submitted by Parks Supt. Robert E. Cook 10/13/81 - "WEAPONS PROHIBITED IN PUBLIC PARKS."

MR. DeLUCA said one change was made, once again with the consent of the Parks Commission, in the second paragraph, it should read "The Park Commission may issue permits at their discretion." The words "for sporting events, displays, archery, contests, etc." should be deleted. He so Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Motion, as amended. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on approving the entire Park Regulations regarding Weapons, as amended. Moved. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

- (3) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PARK REGULATIONS - Submitted by Parks Supt. Robert E. Cook 10/13/81 - "GOLFING" REGULATIONS.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PARK REGULATIONS - Submitted by Parks Supt. Robert E. Cook 10/13/81. REGULATIONS CONCERNING "GLASS BOTTLES".

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ACROSS HOPE STREET FROM NOV. 21st to DEC. 5, 1981 to announce Holly Festival (or Christmas Fair) - submitted by EMMANUEL EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 977 Hope St., Springdale, Susan Turner, Chairman, her letter 9/29/81.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED for approval of the CONSENT AGENDA Items #3, 4, 5. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO CONSIDER AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

MR. DeLUCA Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the agenda, being the placing of the Salvation Army kettles on Stamford streets starting Nov. 23, 1981. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Suspending the Rules. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) REQUEST FROM BRIGADIER JOSEPH KITTLE dated 10/26/81 TO PLACE THEIR CHRISTMAS KETTLES ON THE STREETS STARTING NOVEMBER 23, 1981.

MR. DeLUCA Moved for approval of this request. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA said he would like to conclude his report by saying that the Parks and Recreation Committee was a fantastic committee for the past two years, and every meeting they held, they've quorums; on special committees, sometimes they haven't had quorums, and he owes his fellow members a debt of gratitude for their hard work and dedication.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he would like to thank Mr. DeLuca for his work this year. He has been one of the most dedicated chairmen, and got the job done all year around, and it has always been a pleasure to listen to his reports and to work with him.

THE PRESIDENT said she seconded that.

MRS. McINERNEY said she would agree with Mr. Boccuzzi. However, we might ask for an interpretation as to whether his work is concluded because she has a problem she would like to give him. It has to be addressed immediately and it has to deal with the Ice Skating Rink. She can bring it up now, or she can talk to Gabe, but she feels every Representative needs to be apprised of the situation that is happening. She will talk to Mr. DeLuca after, and ask him to intercede.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux

MR. FAUTEUX said even though he does not have a formal report, he would like to end his two years with EW&G with a positive note from the Education section by assignment, and that is that we do have some tangible results of the so-called quality education in this City; and he is referring to the resolution he has at the end of the Agenda. He would like to point out that in our public school system, there were 41 students that ended up in the upper 2% of all the pupils tested in this country. Unfortunately, only eight of them made the commended, rather the semi-finalist group. An interesting statistic is that of the eight, five came into the school system in kindergarten. One came in Grade 2, one in Grade 3, one in Grade 5 and one in Grade 10. This is a reflection that there are some good things coming out of the public school system.

SEWER COMMITTEE - Chairman Michael Wiederlight

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said Gabe is a tough act to follow.

- (1) FOLLOW-UP ON EASEMENTS FOR 17-2A SEWER DISTRICT - Submitted by Reps. Wiederlight and Goldstein, 16th District Reps., 7/17/81. Held in Committee 8/3, 9/9 and 10/5/81.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said the Sewer Committee held many meets in the last 45 days with the residents of the 17-2A Sewer District, and various City Departments. Pressure was put on by the citizens to secure the easements and/or get the condemnations in order for this project. As a result, this puts us on to #2 on our Agenda.

SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) RESOLUTION FOR THE CONDEMNATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES FOR SEWER PROJECT 17-2A. Held 10/5/81. Requested by Mayor Clapes 9/4/81.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said we were sent a letter from the Mayor on Item #2. He put a summary on everybody's desk tonight dated 11/16/81 of the various names of owners of property in this area which must be condemned. He Moved for approval of this Resolution. Seconded.

MR. BLUM asked if there was a public hearing held prior to condemnation of this land.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said there was.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approval of the Resolution. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Lathon
Wider and John Roos

MR. WIDER said although they didn't have any work to do to have a meeting, he would like to take this opportunity to express his thanks to his committee, who worked very hard, and also to the Housing Coalition who helped to get some emergency housing and St. Luke's. There has been some improvement in public housing and he would be the first one to say that they are strictly in need of security and some additional improvements in public housing. He thanks everyone who worked so hard toward these improvements.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman Richard Fasanelli

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING APPROVAL OF A MUTUAL EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS IN THE SOUTHEAST QUADRANT (EXTENDED) URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT, WITH FAIRFIELD PROPERTIES, INC. - on lower Summer St. and affecting Re-Use Parcel #16. Submitted by Mayor Clapes 10/16.

MR. FASANELLI said the Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed, and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on this item. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she had planned to do this later on in the evening, but she thinks it is fitting now for the district people to go along with this Board that Mr. Fasanelli will be around in the district, and she appreciates and thinks highly of him for all of those who have misinterpreted why he did not run for re-election. Mr. Fasanelli chose not to run on his own, but she does, as a district representative, plan to ask him to be her private consultant. So to the constituents out there, Mr. Fasanelli will be around and she is sure that when he wants his voice heard, he will do it through her. And, Richard, she would personally like to say that he was her favorite chairman, and he has done a great job as there were some issues that came up that were very controversial. She is going to miss him, and that he should stay in touch.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

MRS. MAIHOCK said she does not have a report this evening, but she does wish to say that it was a great pleasure serving as the chairman of this committee. Although it was not their authority to enact flood regulations as a committee, the Environmental Protection Committee did work diligently on these regulations and did, she felt, contribute toward them.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - Grace Guroian and John Hogan,
and REAPPORTIONMENT. Co-chairpersons

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL REGARDING RE-APPORTIONMENT. Held in Committee 10/5/81. Progress Report made. This is an on-going project.

MR. HOGAN said on Item 1, there will be a public hearing held on...well, this evening now! That is 7:00 P.M. tonight, November 17th, here in the meeting room with the Re-Appportionment Committee of the Board. Mrs. McInerney has submitted a number of questions to the Corporation Counsel's Office. They were submitted this morning and we expect an answer by tomorrow evening. And a number of questions have come up in the Committee itself. We also scheduled a public hearing for November 30th. This in itself is now in doubt inasmuch as we have asked the Corporation Counsel for an opinion as to whether this falls within the parameters outlined in the Stamford Charter for conducting the business of the Committee. And also tonight you received a packet which we received only this afternoon, I think at 20 minutes of 5:00. The Administrative Assistant said they completed putting this together. We had received last week the original of what you have copies of in your packet this evening; we received this last week the day before the holiday, and Central Services went to work and reproduced these for us in a very rapid manner. I might state that one-third of that report was, on the original ones, completely illegible, and could not possibly be read. We had to contact Mr. Leyland in Washington and he forwarded the originals to this Board which received them on Saturday morning, and they were run off today and the entire packet was put together as soon as it was humanly possible to do. We are not sure whether your receiving them tonight will interfere with our public hearing tomorrow night. This is another question we have asked of the Corporation Counsel and expect to have an answer before tomorrow evening.

- (2) REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION ON REASONS FOR THREE APPORTIONMENT MAPS BEING IN CIRCULATION; WHO AUTHORIZED CHANGES FROM ORIGINAL MAP; TO WHOM WERE THEY DISTRIBUTED, ETC. Submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville 10/15/81.

MR. HOGAN said regarding Item #2, he can only speak to that of which he has personal knowledge, and that is that ^{at} the regular monthly meeting in October of this Board, maps that were received from the Engineering Department at approximately 4:30 that afternoon were distributed to the members present that evening. Subsequent to this, approximately a week later, the first public hearing was held by this Committee, and there appeared at that public hearing, two additional versions of the maps which had different district lines, that is different from those on the original map. I had no idea how these maps came into being; and I had no idea who possessed these maps; where they came from; where they went; I don't know. The only maps that were in my possession were the maps that were made by the Engineering Department and distributed to the members at the regular Meeting. I had, and still have, no knowledge of the

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. HOGAN (continuing).....existence of the other maps, or where they came from, or who possessed them. If my Co-Chairlady, Mrs. Guroian, has anything to add, I would gladly turn the microphone over to her at this time.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she has some questions. This report that is on the desks tonight, has that been approved by the Committee before it was published, because she has a page that she cannot even read? Did the Committee approve to have this given out to the members to talk about tomorrow night, not so much for the Board, but this is for public information? This is the way the public hearing is going to be conducted tomorrow night? With the report that we cannot even read! At random, I picked a page and I cannot even read it.

MR. HOGAN said that report that Ms. Summerville is referring to, that page, and there are a number of pages that are similar to that in the report, he can only say that the original of that report was completely, almost blank, and you couldn't make it out at all. That's what we originally received. And it was only through the efforts of my Co-Chairlady, Mrs. Guroian, and our Administrative Assistant, that we prevailed upon Mr. Leyland to send the original copies. Now, he sent copies that I saw here this morning when I was in the office, and those copies were 100% better than what we had received last week. The copies you can see were very, very poor. It is through no fault of this Committee, or no fault of anyone in the office, that the quality of these copies are as bad as they are. Of necessity, they had to be printed up because of the public hearing tomorrow night, and as far as rectifying it, the only way that it can possibly be rectified is by asking Mr. Leyland for a copy of the computer print-out that we can have reprinted and made up and submitted subsequently to the members of the Board.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she was not finished with her questions, and she would like to comment on Mr. Hogan's not answering the first question. If somebody on the part of the Committee...how can you expect me, you're the Committee, you're charged to give us a report that we can legibly read. How can I intelligently discuss it with my constituents when I can't even read it? I'm saying I'm not going to take that very lightly, and I'd like to know are we going to get a legible report?

MRS. GUROIAN said to Ms. Summerville that she has gone through this with Mr. Leyland on the phone; she has made it very clear to him how dissatisfied we are with the material that he sent; he has now sent his originals which are also illegible, and for all this illegibility, we have now expended over \$22,000, and he even has an \$1,000 bill in with the packet of illegible material that was sent this time! There is nothing we can do except to have the whole thing re-run again, and there is no time to do it, and Mrs. Guroian does not know whether she, personally, would ask him to do anything again, if this is what he takes \$22,000 for. That is all she can do. And she has tried her best. She said Mr. Leyland knows perfectly well how we feel about it. She has written him a letter and told him that when he comes, he should be prepared to answer any questions regarding his work that is asked of him by the Committee, or anybody on the Board, who would wish to ask it of him. Besides that, Mrs. Guroian would welcome any suggestion that Ms. Summerville has as to what could be done about it.

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE said her next question is on the maps that are on this report, has the Committee gone over them to make sure that they are accurate before this evening when they have the public hearing, because she would hate to be sitting in the audience when there are two or three maps produced that are different, that we will have to do all over again. She is asking the responsible committee, have they checked all this out before this afternoon?

MR. HOGAN said the maps that are contained in the report have not been checked out simply because this information was not received until late yesterday afternoon, or late this afternoon, and it was not available over the weekend because Mr. Leyland didn't get it in the mail until Friday. The original copy we can attest to that it was worse than the one you have in front of you right now.

THE PRESIDENT said that in terms of compensation, perhaps there is something that can be done in this regard, because this has read from start to finish like a horror story.

MRS. GUROIAN said Mr. Cunningham was asked to check his map when it came back from Mr. Leyland and she believes he did so and found it to be accurate. He signed it and said it was accurate. As to the other map, she does not know whether to check it again, as she still does not know which of the three maps was the right map. But Mr. Leyland said he sent a map with his signature down, and that is supposed to be the official map.

THE PRESIDENT asked if Mr. Leyland were scheduled to be at the public hearing tomorrow night.

MRS. GUROIAN said yes, he is expected.

MR. HOGAN said yes, Mrs. Guroian spoke to him, and he is going to be at the public hearing.

THE PRESIDENT said then perhaps they can clarify some items at that time. She also would hope the Co-Chairmen would discuss the illegibility of the voting tracts with them.

MR. BLAIS said it is not only a matter of a few pages being illegibility. From his preliminary review, it appears that there is so much illegibility in this report that it makes a comparison of statistics impossible, and time is running out. If the Committee does not come up with a recommendation, it may very well be the primary cause.

MR. ROOS asked if they were going to get a larger map, something that they can study and that is intelligible. Is that being made now in the Engineering Department?

MR. HOGAN said he did not speak to Mr. Leyland but he is under the impression that there are maps here tonight, that arrived.

MRS. GUROIAN said she spoke to Mr. Leyland and also put it in writing that she wanted to make certain that when he came for the hearing that legible and large maps would be on the wall which would be correct or proper maps, and he promised to do that. She believes there will be a large map at the library for the public to see. But each individual member of the Board will not receive a large map, as far as she knows, unless you ask for it.

REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said there has been a lot of talking here, and there are a lot of pages that have to be gone through before the public hearing. He would like the Co-Chairpersons to tell him what is the plan after the public hearing is held. Where do they intend to go with this redistricting plan.

MR. HOGAN said the public hearing tomorrow night will be followed by a Committee meeting, and if necessary or if possible, depending upon what they get from Corporation Counsel, there will be a Special Meeting of this entire Board to act upon whatever the Committee comes up with, with a recommendation, or they go without a recommendation, whatever the Committee chooses.

MR. BLUM asked what is, if they are waiting for an opinion from the Corporation Counsel, and this might tend to hold up the whole thing, are we looking to hold this whole thing up so that we allow this to go null and void and become a part of the 17th Board of Representatives, or are we going to do something on this 16th Board.

MR. HOGAN said that is entirely up to the 16th Board as to what action they take on this.

THE PRESIDENT said this matter will obviously be determined at a Special Meeting that will be held at the end of this month. And tomorrow evening, she would hope that the Committee comes up with a date that will be determined to be in the best interests of the Board.

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 PROPOSED BY REP. FAUTEUX 9/29/81
COMMENDING STUDENTS OF CLASS OF 1982 IN STAMFORD HIGH SCHOOLS
FOR OUTSTANDING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT.

RESOLUTIONS (continued)

MR. FAUTEUX said a copy of the resolution has been provided to all the Board members. Once again, it is an outstanding result of our school system, both public and private, and if you have not read it, please do so. Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MRS. CONTI MOVED to SUSPEND THE RULES to consider an item not on the agenda. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Suspension of Rules. Voice vote CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION COMMENDING KARLA SOARES, SEMI-FINALIST IN THE NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM FOR OUTSTANDING NEGRO STUDENTS AND COMMENDED STUDENT - submitted by Reps. Betty Conti and Grace Guroian, 7th District Representatives.

MRS. CONTI said everyone was given a copy of the Resolution, and she Moved for its acceptance. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Motion, which CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PETITIONS - None.

MRS. McINERNEY said before this Board adjourns, and after listening to all the nice things said about the other competent members of this Board, I would like to thank the President for all of the diligence and work she has put into this Board. We all appreciate your efforts, and I know that it has not always been easy to conduct these meetings.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said I must say that Barbara stole my thunder, but I would like to say that it has been a pleasure sitting here with Sandy as President and I hope that you will return in a few days. I do think that we couldn't have found a better president. There are capable people on this Board, but I think this Board should rise and give Sandy a standing ovation.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN: I would like to say that there are many competent people capable of doing this job. Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESWEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1981 REGULAR MEETING

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved for Acceptance of the Sept. 9, 1981 Regular Meeting Minutes. Seconded. APPROVED with Mr. Zelinski voting No.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved for Acceptance of the Oct. 5, 1981 Regular Meeting Minutes. Seconded. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

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 duly MOVED, SECONDED, and CARRIED, the meeting ADJOURNED at 2:00 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.

Police Contract - P.E. CONNEL H1 - 11/16/81 - Roll Call Note

Seat No.	YES	NO	Ab-stain	Ab-sent	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.	Seat No.	YES	NO	Ab-stain	Ab-sent	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.
1	✓				CONTI, Betty	R-7	21	✓				LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	D-5
2	✓				GUROIAN, Grace	R-7	22	✓				BOCCUZZI, John	D-2
3		✓			FLOUNDERS, Burtis	R-13	23	✓				<i>Jwens, Bobby</i>	D-3
4	✓				WIDER, Lathon	D-3	24	✓				CORBO, Fiorenzo	R-14
5		✓			SAXE, Ann King	R-13	25	✓				DZIEZYC, Paul	R-15
6		✓			McINERNEY, Barbara	R-20	26		✓			FAUTEUX, Robert	R-20
7			<i>absent</i>	✓	POLLARD, Everett	R-17	27	✓				DIXON, Handy	D-2
8		✓			JOYCE, Patrick	D-10	28	✓				FASANELLI, Richard	D-6
9	✓				ESPOSITO, Paul	D-4	29	✓				PERILLO, Mildred	D-9
10	✓				BOWLBY, Doris	R-17	30	✓				BLUM, David	D-12
11		✓			ROOS, John	R-10	31	✓				ZELINSKI, John	D-11
12		✓			SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	R-18	32			<i>Abstain</i>		SIGNORE, Mary Jane	R-18
13	✓				STORK, Philip	R-15	33	✓				PERILLO, Alfred	D-9
14	✓				CONTI, Anthony	R-11	34	✓				BLAIS, Peter R.	D-8
15		✓			DeLUCA, Robert "Gabe"	R-14	35	✓				RINALDI, Mary Lou	D-5
16	✓				HOGAN, John J. Jr.	D-12	36	✓				RYENICK, Gerald	D-4
17		✓			MAIHOCK, Audrey	R-19	37	✓				DONAHUE, Donald	D-8
18			<i>absent</i>	✓	LOOMIS, Ralph	R-19	38	✓				WIEDERLIGHT, Michael	D-16
19			<i>absent</i>	✓	O'BRIEN, John	D-1	39		✓			HAWES, Marie	R-1
20	✓				SUMMERVILLE, Annie	D-6	40	✓				GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	D-16

TALLY:
APPROVED

Yes 26
No 10
Abstain 1

ABSENT: 3
PRESENT: 37

Date: _____