

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1982

17th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

City of Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 17th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1982, 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 8:18 P.M. by the CLERK OF THE BOARD, ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE, due to the absence of the President, Jeanne-Lois Santy, according to the Rules of Order of the Board, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Given by THE REV. JOHN MURPHY, Associate Pastor, St. John's Roman Catholic Church of Stamford, 279 Atlantic Street, Stamford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by Annie M. Summerville, Temporary Acting Chairman.

ROLL CALL: Acting Clerk Audrey Maihock Called the Roll. There were 36 present and 4 absent at the time of the Roll Call. The absent members were Reps. Fauteux, Signore, Santy, and Zelinski. Rep. Zelinski came in shortly, making 37 present and 3 absent.

PAGES: Rachel Pagliarulo, 47 Bridge Street; 6th grade student at Stillmeadow School.

Jane Carlin, 36 Westwood Road; 6th grade student at Stillmeadow School.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

The late MRS. ALICE EDWARDS JOHNSON, 81 Catoona Lane; wife of the Rev. A. Ralph Johnson. She died Monday at their home; and was known for her contributions to the under-privileged, the poor, and the lonely. She was as warm as sunshine. The City of Stamford has lost a soldier of grace. Submitted by Rep. Jeremiah Livingston.

The late MR. JOHN BATTISTE, who was an ex-police commissioner; and was employed by the Urban Renewal at one time, and his resume goes on and on. Submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville.

The late MS. HARRIET DeNAPLES, 56 Stone St., who was one of the organizers of the South End Citizens Action Group. She had many qualities that the South End will miss. Submitted by Rep. Bobby Owens.

CONGRATULATIONS:

MRS. McINERNEY: Congratulations to Mr. Ted Santy and Rep. Jeanne-Lois Santy, on the birth of their first grandchild, Tara Ashley Richar, who was born Wednesday, January 27, 1982, weighing 8 lbs., 7 oz. We wish her much good luck, good health, and happiness always.

MOTION TO RECESS:

MR. DUDLEY: I would like to make a Motion for a brief recess.

TEMPORARY ACTING CHAIRPERSON SUMMERVILLE: There has been a Motion for a brief recess, and it has been Seconded. What is your pleasure? Motion CARRIED. There will be a brief recess, say 15 minutes.

RECESS: Started 8:30 P.M. - Ended 11:00 P.M.

MRS. MAIHOCK took the Roll after Recess, and the CHAIRWOMAN declared a Quorum.

ELECTION OF AN ACTING CHAIRMAN:

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I will entertain a Motion for an Acting Chairman for the Agenda tonight.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I nominate Rep. Donald Donahue. Seconded.

MRS. HAWES: I would like to nominate Rep. Barbara McInerney. Seconded.

MR. ESPOSITO: I Move that nominations be closed.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The nominations have been Moved and closed. Are you ready for the question? (Vote taken by Show of Hands) - 19 votes for Mr. Donahue; 17 votes for Mrs. McInerney; and 1 Non-Vote. The Chair declares MR. DONAHUE as the ACTING CHAIRMAN for tonight.

CHAIRMAN DONAHUE: Let's move into our Agenda as quickly as we can, and expedite matters at hand as quickly as possible.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Acting Chairman Donald Donahue did not use the voting machine.

STANDING COMMITTEES

CHMN. DONAHUE: We will move into our Agenda now, and I would ask for a Motion to Waive the Report of the Steering Committee.

STEERING COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

It was Moved and Seconded to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report. Carried unanimously.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, January 18, 1982, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M., having been called for 7:30 P.M. The Chairwoman, Jeanne-Lois Santy, declared a QUORUM present, and called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman	(R)	Annie M. Summerville	(D)
Barbara McInerney	(R)	Audrey Maihock	(R)
Robert Gabe DeLuca	(R)	John Roos	(R)
Mary Jane Signore	(R)	David I. Blum	(D)
Marie Hawe	(R)	John Zelinski	(D)
Anthony Conti	(R)	Grace Guroian	(D)
Burtis Flounders	(R)	WSTC-Kevin Roache	
Paul Dziezyc	(R)	ADVOCATE-S. Costello	
Robert Fauteux	(R)		

(1) APPOINTMENTS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the name of Bruce Spaulding for Public Works Commissioner, being the second submission.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 16 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were 27 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. On one item being Held in Committee for the Parks Dept., Terry Conners Rink, the \$5,000 for Code 620.4201 Program Services was withdrawn, leaving \$4,500.00 Code 620.2650 New Equipment, to be considered at a future meeting, having been approved by the Board of Finance.

(3) SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda relating to the Rules of Order of the 17th Board of Representatives.

(4) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 5 items of the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were 12 items: (a) Proposed Ordinance regarding free use of any municipal recreational facilities, and this item to be resubmitted by Rep. McInerney; (b) Proposed Ordinance re sale of City-owned property at the Hurricane Barrier; (c) Proposed Ordinance re increased penalties for violators of dog leashing ordinance; (d) Proposed Ordinance to increase adoption fees at dog pound; (e) Proposed Ordinance amending Sec. 6-17(3) defining "gross income, etc."); (e) Proposed Ordinance re liability for ice and snow on public sidewalks; (f) Proposed Ordinance concerning tax credit for refuse collection where not collected; (g) Proposed Ordinance amending Sec. 8-18 annual pick-up of household and yard debris; (h) Proposed Ordinance revising Chapter 20 concerning

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(4) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS (continued)

traffic and parking matters; (i) Proposed Ordinance for tax abatement for Hanrahan Center; (j) Request for an anti-obscenity ordinance on cable TV by Mrs. Harold Block; (k) Request from Dolphin Cove Assn. for one mill rate throughout the City.

(5) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, plus two new items: (a) Re-submission - ratification of Firemen's Labor Contract; (b) Matter of the Management/Compensation Plan, Merit Rules (Civil Service Regulations) as they relate to Compensation of Non-Union Administrators.

(6) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

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

(7) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

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

(8) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items, two which appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda, and one new item being the matter of a fire alarm system at the Municipal Office Building. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the matter of hazards of microwave transmitters for cable TV.

(9) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

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

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

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

(11) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution opposing an increase in water rates. Also ordered on, was a resolution supporting Poland and Solidarity. Defeated were two proposed resolutions, one regarding WYRS continuing to be a jazz station, and another regarding Halsey Moore.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

The Chairwoman of the Steering Committee, Jeanne-Lois Santy, announced that future meetings of the Steering Committee would be held on Mondays, and be called for 7:00 P.M., unless holidays or other conditions made it impossible or infeasible.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, SECONDED and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman
Steering Committee
17th Board of Representatives

HMM:MS

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE ON AGENDA:

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to make a Motion to Suspend the Rules and take up item #2 on the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE's agenda at this time. Seconded.

CHMN. DONAHUE: All in favor of Suspending the Rules to consider the Firemen's Contract, Item #2 on Personnel? Motion CARRIED. We'll now move on to the Firemen's contract. Chairman Stork, will you please proceed?

- (2) RESUBMISSION - RATIFICATION OF FIREMEN'S LABOR CONTRACT for one year from 7/1/81 to 6/30/82 per Mayor Clapes and Labor Negotiator Thomas Barrett's official first submission to this Board as of Dec. 19, 1981. Finance Board Chairman Everett Pollard on 12/21/81 advised they will not be issuing an advisory opinion in this instance. This Board on 1/11/82 DENIED the contract. Mayor Clapes re-submitted 1/18/82.

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday, January 27, 1982, in the Republican Caucus Room. In attendance were Reps. Dziezyc, Gaipa, Gershman, and myself. Highlights of the contract were reviewed by me at last month's Board meeting, but I think it is most important that I emphasize the parity this contract gives the Fire Department with the Police Department contract which was approved by the 16th Board. Again this contract calls for an 8% across-the-board salary increase, and we get longer service to the City by raising the maximum pension from 66-2/3% after 28 years to 74% after 32 years.

This contract is for duration of one year: July 1, 1981 to June 30, 1982. The Personnel Committee's position regarding one-year contracts should once again be made clear.

It is our position that the City's Labor Negotiator and the applicable unions in the City of Stamford should not negotiate any contract in the future for less than two years. We think the taxpayers are entitled to have their hard-earned tax dollars spread out over a longer period of time.

At its January 7, 1982 Committee meeting, we voted unanimously 4-0 to put the City of Stamford and its labor unions on notice that this Personnel Committee will not accept for consideration any contract in the future that contains a duration less than two years. This is not saying that either side is at fault in

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Item #2 continued - Suspension of Rules

MR. STORK (continuing): this matter, but strong advice from this committee, which will review these negotiated contracts in the future. As it did in January, the Personnel Committee voted unanimously 4-0 to approve ratification of the Firemen's labor contract, and I so Move. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank You. My only comments were some of which I stated at the meeting last month, when this unfortunately was turned down. This men put their lives on the line each time and even though there may be some parts of the contract that I may not be fully in agreement with I think we have a duty and an obligation to pass it this evening. Also I would remind my colleagues that at the November 16th meeting, we did approve the Policemen's contract which is almost identical to this one. It seems ironic that one contract would be passed whose provisions are almost identical and another one would not pass. I think we have be consistent in our judgement and in our votes in dealing with this. And I sincerely hope that this evening this contract is passed. And my only final comment is that I am very disappointed that the Board of Finance did not give their advisory opinion which, by our own City Charter Section 655 under powers of the Board of Finance, says when the collective bargaining agreements have been finalized and signed, the Board of Finance shall render an advisory opinion to this Board of Representatives, with total cost and potential long term tax burden of the agreements. I am very sorry that they did not do this and I would caution them that by Charter they are obligated to do this and in the future ^{on} other contracts, I would expect to have those opinions before us.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would like to move the question, please.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Motion has been made to move the question and seconded. Roll call vote on the main Motion. 27 Votes in Favor, 8 Votes Opposed and 2 Abstentions. The contract has been passed.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I do not know if this is the proper time. As I understand it now, I think most of the contracts in the City of Stamford come due in 1982. I think I would ask the Personnel Committee to look into the matter of the method of which the increases for the contracts are given out. I think we have come to a point now where we cannot give a percentage increase to every member who is covered by the contract. I think what is happening to the top of the ladder gets a bigger raise than the bottom of the ladder, and that continually opens up as the years go by. I would like to have the Personnel Committee look into the possibility of meeting with Mr. Barrett to find out if the blanket raise of one figure for everyone could possibly be done in the contracts coming up.

MR. STORK: Mr. Boccuzzi, it is a good suggestion. We raised it with Mr. Barrett at our January 7th meeting and he said it would be illegal to do that. He should know his business, that was his position. The chairman of Personnel takes note.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE ON AGENDA (cont'd)

MR. DUDLEY: I'd like to make a Motion to Suspend the Rules and take an item out of order, Item #4 under Planning and Zoning, the "savings clause".
Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE, ACTING CHAIRMAN: There has been a Motion to take Item #4 of Planning and Zoning, out of order. All those in favor....discussion?

MRS. SAXE: It was my opinion that this particular item on the Zoning has died because we have had two meetings prior to this one, and therefore it should not even be on the Agenda.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I heard the opinion of Corporation Counsel at the time, but I believe if you will go back, the meeting of December was not a Regular Meeting of the Board of Representatives. We had no regular meeting. That particular item was never on the Agenda, so therefore this is the second month that it is on the Agenda at a Regular Meeting. I think it is legally before us. If you decide at this time, that it is not legally before you, then you automatically, what you are doing, is sustaining the ruling of the Zoning Board. I really believe that we are....that it is legal for us to vote on this matter at this time and that the vote from this Board will be a legal vote.

MRS. GUROIAN: I concur with Ann Saxe. I think the Special Meeting in December will be regarded as taking the place of the general meeting since the Charter states that the Board of Representatives must have one regular meeting every month, and that is the only meeting during that month in which we entertained an agenda comparable to that which we normally do in our regular meetings. And I think we are running under very tricky ground because I think if it is taken to court, it can be taken to court on the basis that this Board acted illegally in entertaining the referral in the third meeting instead of the second meeting, and I would like to add my comments to what Ann Saxe says,;and I don't think it belongs before this Board at this time.

CHMN.DONAHUE: If I may digress for just one moment, I would appoint Mr. Hogan as Temporary Parliamentarian for this evening. The Motion before us at this time would be to Suspend the Rules to consider this item out of order on the Agenda. The point has been raised that it is possibly not properly before us. This Board must now act on either Suspending the Rules, or acting on that suggestion. Is there any other discussion?

MR. DeLUCA: Point of Information, please. Just out of curiosity, I was under the impression that we have an Assistant Parliamentarian, so wouldn't she take over today as Parliamentarian in the absence of our regular Parliamentarian?

CHMN.DONAHUE: We have nothing that covers that in our Rules. I did not replace the Deputy Parliamentarian, Mr. DeLuca. I filled in the position of Parliamentarian.

MR. DeLUCA: Oh, in other words, even though we have an Assistant Parliamentarian, whoever takes over as Acting Chairperson can...I was just curious as to why we would have an Assistant, if they cannot act in place of the regular Parliamentarian.

CHMN.DONAHUE: I am just following the procedure that's been used in the past, and has been set as precedent of this Board, O.K.? We don't even have a position of Deputy Parliamentarian in the Rules.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES TO TAKE UP ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE ON AGENDA (cont'd.)
(PERSONNEL AGENDA ITEM #2)

MR. DeLUCA: Perhaps you can just clarify, what precedent have we established in the past? I cannot remember this happening in the past.

CHMN.DONAHUE: The CHAIR has, in the past, appointed its Parliamentarian, in the absence of one.

MR. DeLUCA: In the absence of Mrs....I Challenge the Chair then.

CHMN.DONAHUE: There has been a Challenge to the Chair concerning the appointment of a Parliamentarian, a Temporary Parliamentarian. Is there any discussion?

MRS. GUROIAN: I concur with the Chair's Ruling. The Chair has the right to appoint its own Parliamentarian. The Parliamentarian is chosen by the President of the Board and I feel the Chair has the right to appoint its own Parliamentarian. He is Acting Chairman. He has the right. And that being the case, feeling the way I do, I would not serve as Parliamentarian, even if the Ruling of the Chair was over-turned.

CHMN.DONAHUE: Mr. DeLuca, would you remove your Challenge to the Chair?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes.

CHMN.DONAHUE: The question before the Board is Suspension of the Rules to consider the Planning and Zoning referral. Next speaker is...

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. There is no discussion under Suspension of the Rules, is there?

CHMN.DONAHUE: You are right, but a Point of Information is acceptable.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I wanted to know does the Chair consider this item properly before us. I know it's on the Agenda, but in light of some of the things that have been said....

CHMN.DONAHUE: I believe that, at this time, the Chair would leave that up to the Body as a whole to decide. There has been some discussion and there is merit on both sides of the argument, and I believe it would have to be handled from various Motions from the floor; and either passed or rejected; or considered or not considered.

MR. BLUM: A Point of Personal Privilege.

CHMN.DONAHUE: Mr. Blum, I hope this is a Point of Personal Privilege.

MR. BLUM: I want to ask a question ^{in regard} as to how many times...

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Point of Order.

CHMN.DONAHUE: Mr. Blum, is this a Point of Information? If you are asking a question, it is a Point of Information, which I would entertain.

MR. BLUM: It is Point of Information. I am asking how many times has this particular item appeared before any Agenda on this Board? If it's appeared twice, then it has been before us twice.

CHMN.DONAHUE: The issue on the floor of the Board is Suspending the Rules to consider this item. It may be appropriate that we move on with that vote, suspend the Rules and then consider what we will do with this item.

SUSPENSION OF RULES, TAKING OUT OF SEQUENCE ON AGENDA, PERSONNEL ITEM #2

CHMNDONAHUE: Mr. Dudley, there is no discussion on Suspension of Rules.

MR. DUDLEY: Withdraw the Motion.

CHMNDONAHUE: Is the Second withdrawn?

Someone said "No".

CHMNDONAHUE: To Suspend the Rules?

MR. DUDLEY: I am withdrawing the Motion to Suspend the Rules.

MRS. GUROLAN: The Second is not withdrawn. (Someone else also said the Second was not withdrawn.)

CHMNDONAHUE: And the Second is not withdrawn. The Board at this time must decide how it wishes to act on this. We can either take action on the Motion to Suspend the Rules, bring it up now on the Agenda, and then consider the questions that have been raised about the appropriateness of the Motion being here before us. That would seem like the appropriate action to take.

MRS. GUROLAN: Point of Order. Would you explain to me what happens when a Motion is withdrawn but the Secunder does not withdraw his Second. Is the Motion still on the floor?

MR. HOGAN: In answer to the question, the Motion is still valid. It is still before the Body.

MRS. GUROLAN: Then I submit what you said previously is negated.

CHMNDONAHUE: The question is still before us, then, whether or not to Suspend the Rules. Can we go to a vote on Suspension of the Rules to consider an item out of order on the Agenda. A two-thirds' vote is required.

You are going to have to raise your hands on this vote, so I would need the Tellers' assistance on this, and it would require a two-thirds' vote. All those in favor of Suspending the Rules to consider this item out-of-order, please raise your hands. All those opposed to Suspension of the Rules? 13 No votes, 21 Yes votes, and 3 Abstentions. The Motion has FAILED.

MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES TO TAKE UP AGENDA ITEM OUT OF SEQUENCE (FISCAL #9):

MR. RYBNICK: I would like to make a Motion to take Item #9 on Fiscal, Congregate Housing, Welfare Department, up at this time. Seconded.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Seconded by many. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say AYE. Opposed? The item is Moved out of order on the agenda. Will the Chairperson of Fiscal Committee please take over.

(9) \$2,180,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - New Department - Code 540 - SMITH HOUSE CONGREGATE HOUSING CENTER - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - WILLARD SCHOOL CONVERSION - #535.0965 - TO BE FINANCED BY BONDS (and State Grant) - (continued)

SUSPENSION OF RULES TAKING OUT OF SEQUENCE ITEM #9 ON FISCAL (cont'd.)

- (9) continued..... per Mayor Clapes' request 12/11/81 and Thomas Canino, Acting Welfare Director, Chief Purchasing Agent, and Deputy Finance Commissioner. Planning Board's letter 1/13/82 unanimous approval. STATE OF CONNECTICUT grant for \$1,440,000; and City's share to be \$740,000. (Their approval "conditioned upon clarification of zoning for site".) Finance Board approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MS. HAWE: Item #9 on the agenda is a request \$2,180,000 for the Welfare Department as an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for the conversion of Willard School into the Smith House Congregate Housing Center. If I may, I'll announce the vote in the committee and make a Motion and then if I may, speak to the matter. The voting committee was 2 in favor of the appropriation, 2 opposed and 1 abstention. For clarity, I will make a Motion to approve this appropriation.

CHMN.DONAHUE: Motion has been made to approve this appropriation. Is there a second? There is a second. Any discussion? Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. HAWE: Of this amount requested, \$1,440,000 is a State of Connecticut grant, \$740,000 is the City's share of this project. This amount includes \$240,000 for the construction of a sanitary sewer connection and this is the engineer's estimate. This facility, if built, will have 45 units and house 49 people. If the City of Stamford gets Section 8 Funds which are being negotiated now, the residents would pay 30% of their income toward the rent, maintenance and security. The Section 8 would also pay off the City's share of the \$740,000 plus interest over a fifteen-year period. As to the need for such a facility in Stamford, according to the service needs statement which we all received in the mail I believe, this is a document which the City submitted with their application for the State Funds. It is noted that there has been a rise in the number of eligible Seniors on the waiting list for the Stamford Housing Authority. In March of 1978, there were 429 eligible Senior Citizens on the list. In March of 1981, there were 933 eligible Seniors on that list. To compound this problem, there was also a decrease of over 2600 rental apartments in the private sector owing to the conversion of these units to condominiums. According to the 1980 Census, the regional 65-and-over demographics statistics show the elderly population has increased from 29,942 (which is 9% of the total population) in 1970 to 37,107 (or 11.4%), and it expected to reach 44% by 1990. The State Department of Aging expects the Elderly to reach 18,070 which is 18% of the population in Stamford by 1990. Estimates have been based on discussions with the Social Services Department of Stamford Hospital. It was found that at least 250 Seniors who have mobility limitations there, could possibly be housed in such a facility; and also at St Joseph's Hospital, in 1976, they made over 1,000 referrals for Senior Medicare patients. Mrs. Mary Judge, who is the Head of Continuing Care at the Hospital, felt if the Congregate Housing Facility had been available, she would have been able to make approximately 119 referrals during that fiscal year to such a facility. That is the end of my report. I'm sure people have questions.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

CHMN. DONAHUE: Thank you, Ms. Hawe. The first person on the list to speak is Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This matter was discussed in Fiscal for almost three hours. We heard from both the proponents and opponents of the project. During the the discussion, several definite facts emerged. This project does not meet the statutory definition of congregate housing; and for your convenience, I have placed a copy of the State's statute of the statutory definition of congregate housing on every desk tonight. Now even though similar projects have been built in Enfield and several other communities and have been called congregate housing, that does not alter the statutory definition of congregate housing. Now if other communities want to fool around with the statutory definition, I do not want to see Stamford getting involved in skirting around issues of that nature. This is, in actuality, 45 units of Senior Citizen housing which will be operated at the expense of the local taxpayers. The Operating Budget which will start at \$250,000.00 will be financed by local property taxes. Since this is, in fact, 45 units of Senior Citizens, it should be built under the same type of financing as other Senior Citizens Projects have been and it should be under the jurisdiction of the Housing Authority, with no annual operating budget financed by local property taxes. There is no proven need for congregate housing in Stamford. For four years after it opened its doors, the Smith House Residence was half empty. It was only after the Welfare Department came to this Board last year and requested and received the money to convert the Smith House Residence rooms from Semi-private to Private rooms, that it is now full. That is full with half the people now necessary to call it full. Thus the need is unproven. The need for a Skilled Nursing Facility is well-proven, by virtue of the fact that Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility has had a two-year or longer waiting list from the day it opened its doors. Thus we definitely need another Skilled Nursing Facility, not another elderly residence facility. So we arrive at the question of whether over 2 million dollars of public money should be spent for a facility for which the need is questionable. I don't think so. If we are going to spend over 2 million dollars of public money, let us spend it for a need that is well-proven. Willard School property is a very valuable asset. And if it is to be used...IF it is to be used for a public purpose, my recommendations are that it be used for another skilled nursing facility or for a veterans convalescent home. By using it for either of those purposes, we would free public housing units for citizens who are reaching eligibility age for Senior Citizen units; a benefit which we are told this proposed facility would bring. But either of my two suggestions would reap the same benefit. Now a word about the statistics on the percentage of Senior Citizens anticipated in the next ten years. Every one quoting these statistics seems to assume that every citizen upon reaching the age of 65 is immediately going to seek public assistance. If we and our successors continue to spend public funds as we are spending them, that may happen. But it will be our fault. We will have created the problem, not the Senior Citizens. So let us realize what we are doing. If we are to spend over two million dollars of public money, let us spend it wisely, either a skilled nursing facility or veteran

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI (continuing) - convalescent home or possibly to keep Senior Citizens in their own homes with direct subsidies, or a home of their choosing. I am voting against this appropriation because I do not believe in spending public money just because it is available and we can grab it before someone else. I believe government money should be used for truly needed purposes and this proposed need has^{not} been proven. Thank you.

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you. We have in Stamford Park Manor, a tax-paying congregate housing facility with 40 empty rooms and they have been empty for years. If there is a large waiting list that is supposed to exist, why haven't these people been referred to Park Manor? I don't believe there is a waiting list. It is a lot of Bull. No list was presented to the Fiscal Committee. Four years ago the same situation existed when city officials stated there was a desperate need for congregate housing and spent \$660,000 to convert Smith House Residence for congregate housing. This facility, just like Park Manor, always had empty rooms. Why spend the taxpayers' money to build something that we don't need? Let's fill up Park Manor first. Then we will know there is a requirement for additional congregate housing. Until then, we should not spend one cent on this project as congregate housing. If there is a need for a nursing facility, let's make it a skilled nursing facility. Thank you.

MR. ROOS: The plan to convert Willard School to congregate housing is, I think, too expensive, and the results and disappointingly amount of units. If the need is great, 45 units, housing only 49 people, doesn't help much, and at what it costs. When considering costs, we must consider all cost factors Construction cost, land and building value, cash paid financing, alternative income, operating costs and the number of resulting units. To not consider the value of 8.6 acres of prime sewerable land with a sturdy, well-constructed building is not good thinking. The possibility of tax income to the City should also be considered. The City and its taxpayers have a definite fluid asset here and should not be ignored. Its sale could well go over its appraisal value and it could possibly help alleviate our housing shortage. If all the costs are considered, the cost per unit goes up to \$92,000 plus. A single 5-room house with land could be built for that. Better we sell the property, added the \$750,000 requested bought a government 10 or 20-year bond which is now up to 14.4% and use the roughly \$390,000 annual income to set up a fund to supplement needy Seniors on a fixed income and Social Security. Legal opinion says there is a statute making this possible. More than 200 Senior Citizens would be enabled to afford a facility such as Park Manor, or even room and board at home, their home. Thank you.

MR. WIDER: Thank you. I'm loaded up with figures, but unfortunately the City of Stamford is not loaded up with land. I am afraid that we have allowed too many of our areas that we could have built housing^{on} to accommodate

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER(continuing) -our Senior Citizens who are great in number and who are living in public housing and in many cases when they shouldn't be therethey should be in congregate housing. I feel that this is an opportunity that will not come down the pike again very soon. For us to put some housing out of the inner Citysee what we have done, we have swelled the inner City with our Senior Citizens to the point that it is busting at the seams. I think it is time that we begin to look out of the inner City and alleviate some of the main problems that are facing us right now. So I am in favor of developing congregate housing at Willard School, and other than that, I would like to see some of these people who are talking against it, work with us to fix it so when they get to where they have to go into congregate housing that they will have somewhere to go.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you. Before I make my comments I have a few questions and through you to the chairperson of Fiscal, Representative Hawe, I'd like to ask a few questions as I said. The first one is I have received some literature in the mail as I am sure we all did, I guess from the opponents of this particular project. And one of their contentions which seems to be the hang up, is the actual definition of congregate housing. Representative Hawe, could you possibly clear that up as to what the proper definition is and if indeed, if we pass this this evening, that we are not going to be in violation of any State statute where this particular item falls within their jurisdiction.

MRS. HAWE: I would be glad to read the definition for Mr. Zelinski. First of all I would like to say that we must remember that this is a state definition according to Public Act 775-82, State Definition of Congregate Housing. And it is the State that is giving us the money. Congregate housing means a form of residential environment consisting of independent living assisted by congregate meals, housekeeping and personal services for persons 60 years old or older who have temporary and periodic difficulty with or more essential activities of daily living such as feeding, bathing, grooming, dressing or transferring. If I might add something to maybe clarify this question, because I think this is a question that is in everyone's mind. As to whether this facility would be congregate housing or exactly what congregate housing means and I would like to read a fairly brief paragraph from the Welfare Department who is requesting this and this really concerns the basic question of congregate housing. We discussed this quite a bit the other night in the Fiscal Committee and congregate housing it appears is a relatively new concept in the care of the elderly. Subsequently, there is no set hard-and-fast definition of congregate housing. It means slightly different things to different people. I quote " If we assembled any four knowledgeable people in the field and asked what congregate housing is, we would probably receive four different answers, each one correct. Does congregate housing mean offering residents the ability to cook light meals for themselves. For us in this situation, for Willard School it would. The other two pilot programs in congregate housing funded by the State, Enfield and Hamden have also individual kitchenettes in their apartments as planned for this facility. Do we envision this facility to provide skilled nursing care like the skilled nursing facility? Certainly not. Will heavy custodial work have to be performed by the residents? Certainly not. Will living care be available to tenants? Absolutely. Care to help

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE (continuing) - in dressing and perhaps personal care. This will not be a licensed home for the aged as is our Smith House Residence. It will be a place for Stamford's elderly to live in individual apartments and have the option of communal dining or self-sufficiency. A place where community activities will be offered. It was explained to us that there are three different levels of care for the elderly. This is on the bottom rung of the ladder-congregate housing. Above this would be an old-age home, such as the Smith House Residence, where more care is provided for the residents, and then the final stage for people who can not care for themselves at all would be a skilled nursing facility. It appears around the State that there are some congregate housing facilities that do have kitchenettes that do provide one or two meals, it's no hard-and-fast rule that this is the absolute definition of congregate housing. This seems to fall within the definition as set down by the State.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Representative Hawe. On our desk tonight also to follow up on that we received a letter addressed to Mrs. Joan Fitzpatrick from Mr. Graham Foster from the office of the United States Senator Chris Dodd. I guess we all have that in front of us. It says that his description of congregate housing was people living and eating meals together who are not fully self-sufficient, who cannot cook for themselves. And that's underlined, and who are in a residential, not medical, environment. Do you believe then that we would not be in any type of violation with Federal Government in their definition of congregate housing... with the State? I know it is a technicality but again I am just trying to clear it up in my own mind.

MRS. HAWE: If you want my opinion, Mr. Zelinski, I do not. Even the plans for this are somewhat flexible. The plans are now to provide a main meal in the middle of the day. It could very well be that a supper is provided also. This is something that the residents pay for in addition. As to your question, no, I do not think it would be in violation.

MR. ZELINSKI: Two more quick questions; the second question is pertaining to the cost not now as far as the implementation of the actual conversion of Willard School, but again in the material I got, I want to be objective about it. Can you possibly tell me or was it brought out in the meetings with the people who came to the Fiscal Committee. I unfortunately could not be there. Did anything come out pertaining to the total cost in years to come as far as the various expenditures that will not be paid for by the State but will entirely be paid for by the Stamford taxpayers? Do you have any idea, either total or possibly by unit, whichever is easier for you to explain?

MRS. HAWE: According to the estimated revenues and the estimated operating budget and I think we all have that in front of us. Mrs. Conti indicated that the taxpayers will be picking up \$250,000 a year. According to these estimates, the total would be closer to \$100,000 a year. The estimated revenues from the Section 8, if those funds are gotten...they are not absolutely definite... but if they are gotten it would be \$202,000 and about \$300,000 would be the operating cost. Now these are estimated as of now and I believe they were given to us with the best guess of the Department. These are obviously not something that might not change but as

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE (continuing) of now, this is the projection. It probably would be incurring \$100,000 in operating cost.

MR. ZELINSKI: Per unit?

MRS. HAWE: No, that's total. So it would be about \$2,000 per unit based on 49 people.

MR. ZELINSKI: My final question would be to, I think again it was brought out by Representative Dziezyc pertaining to that there are at the present time available in Park Manor 40 vacancies. Do you feel anything dealing with that specifically as far as this particular project? In other words will there be a duplication and why can't that particular facility be utilized first before we utilize a second program? Can you shed any light on that?

MRS. HAWE: I will try, Mr. Zelinski, although this seems to be a very complex problem and I really don't believe the matter of Park Manor should be confused here. I know it is hard not to, because there are vacant apartments there. Unfortunately, I must say I have been to Park Manor and it's a facility that is marvelous for the people who are there. They are treated very lovingly and it is a wonderful place for them to be in their older years. Unfortunately, there are many other questions surrounding, and many other problems surrounding this whole question of Park Manor. The main part of the problem, I believe, from what we could ascertain the other night, and we did touch on this briefly in the Committee meeting, I think part of the problem lies with the State. The fact that money that had been passed for subsidies several years ago was not implemented. I think that the Welfare Department has said that when they turn people away from the Smith House Residence, because there is not enough room there. That they give each person a list of the facilities in Stamford that they could go to, whether it be Eagle Towers, Park Manor, Courtland Gardens, which is all they can be expected to do--to give the people the option of the other places that they could go. Section 8 Funds such as are being used for this Willard School would not be feasible for Park Manor because, first, there would have to be a rehabilitation, and the rehabilitation would have to be ---see with this Willard School Project, the City is putting up the money. With a private concern they would have to go to a bank to get the loan for the rehabilitation and then the guarantee to the bank would be that the Section 8 Funds would be guaranteed for the loan and there is just not enough Section 8 money to guarantee that kind of thing. I've talked to people in Community Development today, in the Housing Department, and they say that this is just not feasible for a private facility that is not a congregate housing facility, it is a hotel. As to Mr. Roos' suggestion of selling the property up there, adding the \$740,000 and putting it into a Fund using the interest to subsidize private housing, I talked to Corporation Counsel Cookney today and there are vast legal questions that he could not address right at this moment but he said that it appeared to him that there were a lot of questions to be answered as to whether public

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. HAWE (continuing) money could subsidize private housing. Plus the fact, I don't believe that we should be selling City land when we have so little as it is. It will be hard to buy more in the future. I don't know whether I've answered your question, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: You've cleared up some, thank you. Now for my comments, Certainly, I have some concerns based on the material I got from the opponents of this and I sincerely wish there were some more time. As was mentioned I think we have a time element here and certainly we have an obligation to our Seniors who have done so much for our Community to make our Community what it is today. We do have an obligation and even though I do have some reservations pertaining to some of the questions that were raised about the cost and definition of housing, I think that the overall overriding consideration has to be the big picture that definitely more housing is needed. And even though there may be some technicalities and some minor problems, I believe tonight we have no choice and I sincerely hope that we all vote in favor and this does pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will continue with the list of speakers. There are many. Mrs. Gershman?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. I, too, am going to support this but with great reluctance. There are many things about it that I don't agree with and I don't like. Not the least of which is that this is first time that it has come before this Board and we are being pressured into voting on it tonight instead of being able to talk about it and discuss it and ask questions and send it back to committee. However, I question the operating budget. People have said to me, Get the Building tonight, and the operating budget will follow. Yes, it will follow and it is going to come before us and we're going to be the ones ^{are} who going to have to vote on it. I think that there are many things missing in it. I would like to see three meals offered. I don't think the people who it will serve perhaps cannot or do not choose to cook two of their meals, and I was very happy to hear Mrs. Hawe say that there were plans for perhaps a second and even a third meal could be added. I do understand with the combined resources of the skilled nursing home, Smith House and the Smith House residents, some of these positions perhaps can be combined such as the dietitian or something like that. That's really off the top of my head. I understand that there is not going to be a manager; a manager is not projected for evenings, nights and weekends. I think that this is something that must be corrected. They say they are not going to ^{do} anything with the auditorium. That it was left without anything being done to it. At some point, something is going to be done to it and it is going to come before us to spend the money to do it. I really think that the budget, both operating and capital, that is going to come before us was not looked into very well. I would like to go on record as saying that if this does go through tonight, when the operating budget comes before us and if I am still on the Board, I will demand that some of things are put in such as evening, night and weekend managers and so forth. Otherwise, it's a farce.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, I would like to move the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been a Motion to move the question. There are many others left to speak. It has been moved and seconded. All in favor of moving the question please say Aye. Opposed? There is division. I would ask the tellers to come forward, please. All those in favor of moving the question, please raise your hand. All opposed? Any abstentions? That does require two-thirds vote. The question is not moved. We return to the list.

MR. DeLUCA: Tonight I plan to vote against it for several reasons. Hopefully we should not be controlled by our emotions. We all know we have a shortage of housing. Not only for the elderly but we also have a shortage of homes for the young married couple that is looking to stay in Stamford but cannot afford to. We keep talking about Willard School and the fact that we got 1.4 Million dollars of Federal Grant money and as previous speakers stated unless we get this money it is going to pass onto someone else. I say, so be it. We have always been concerned about grant money but eventually all the grant money is running out. We keep talking about Section 8 Funds and money to cover our operating expenses and getting reimbursements but once again we ^{are} still not sure that these funds will be available to us. We cannot base estimates hoping for the money that we are definitely not sure of. I keep hearing the word congregate housing for Willard School; I keep looking at a report that I recieved way back in May which was prepared by a respected member of the Welfare Commission, the late Frank Caputo. In his report, dated May 19, 1981, he stated that his understanding of congregate housing is that it is meant to provide separate sleeping quarters for Senior Citizens who cannot fully care for themselves, but do not need the care of a convalescent or nursing home. They should not have private kitchens where they attempt to prepare their own meals. The congregate housing that we are talking about, talks about kitchenettes in each apartment which as we have heard is a violation of State's Statute. Comments were made that Stamford is running out ^{of} land and therefore we must utilize Willard School. Once again, I refer you to the late Frank Caputo's report which in his opinion ^{for} Willard School the best possible use would be to sell it to someone. We have 33 acres of unused land up by the Smith House location. My recommendation would be for the City to sell Willard School to ^a private developer. Give him some form of tax abatement to put up homes that would be affordable once again. Not only to the elderly but also to the young married couple. We can derive a good profit with the land on Vine Road. With the funds derived there we can put up an excellent facility up in the country. We have put housing for the elderly down in Shippan, down on North Street in the flood plain area, on Greenwich avenue, why not put them up at the Smith House up in Scofield Town Road or up in that area. We keep saying, Willard School location is convenient to shopping centers. I wonder the people were several years ago when Burdick School was closed. That would have been an ideal spot to convert to congregate housing that would meet the laws of the State. Use of Burdick School would have been convenient, we could have put up more units. Especially now with J.C. Penney, Macy's coming in. The people would have been ideal for them.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing) - To walk around without worrying about taking a bus. I can go on and on this evening talking and still referring to the report of May 19, 1981 whereby this particular person was against the use of Willard School. We keep saying the cost would be a little over 2 Million dollars. Has anyone ever tried to do an alteration job on their own home? Where they expected to knock a wall down and estimate it at \$100. When you knock that wall down and you run into other problems, and the job ended up costing you \$500. Even if you were to call in a professional to do the same thing. We're just basing an estimate on going in there without an anticipation of problems you may run into. I can anticipate this project costing much more than \$2.1 Million. Therefore I urge the people here tonight to reject this proposition because there really isn't a need. Also what guarantee do we have that the waiting list that's in Stamford comprised of Stamfordites will be the only ones to go into this facility. I always understood that if you used Federal Funds that anyone in the Nation can apply to come here. Therefore we do not have a guarantee that the 2,700 people or 500 people that we hear numbers bantered around in Stamford can use the facility. These are my reasons for rejecting this proposal.

MR. FRANCHINA: I oppose the Willard conversion for several reasons. Just to cite a few...the total per unit cost of the project is too high. The current appraised value of the Willard property land and building indicate a fair market value of \$2,380,000. The conversion cost, \$2,180,000 plus the current fair market value of the property gives a total completed value of \$4.5 million which when figured out per unit comes to approximately or a little over \$100,000 per unit. The Willard concept secondly is not congregate housing. The State Statutory definition includes the requirement for meals, plural. The present planned Willard conversion includes one daily congregate meal which is optional, should the tenant exercise his option and not accept the congregate meal, then all he needed was an apartment and not congregate housing. This does not meet the State requirement for meals, plural. And there is not demonstrated need for public congregate units in Stamford. No surveys have been conducted or reports filed indicating a true need for 45 congregate units in Stamford. Reports have long waiting lists in public housing offices apply specifically to apartment needs. One recalls the great needs cited in justification for the conversion of Sunset Home to Smith House Residence. With the opening of Smith House Residence in 1978, the great need vanished and it took over three and a half years to fill the resident units. The Smith House Residence experience demands that more accurate data on need be presented prior to the commitment of millions of taxpayers' dollars to a project of unknown justification. I am sure that in the future if need is established then the right property would become also available. So I urge this Board to vote no and let's try to save the taxpayer money in these trying times. Thank you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Mr. President. There are several various issues I would like to address within this greater issue of congregate housing. The first of all is the speaker said that the construction cost when the value of the land and the value of the conversion is taken into account is approximately \$100,000 per unit. Well when you consider the inefficiency of government contracting and you consider what the going rate is for a condominium conversion or a new condominium in Stamford, these figures don't appear to be that much out of line. Now when I was around to talk to my constituents and in my area most of the cove area was built right after the Second World War, those people are retired now and one of the biggest concerns of retired people in my district in this town appeared to be that they were afraid that once they could no longer take care of their house that they would be shipped out, packed out to someplace, to Hartford or something like that to a convalescent home, away from their family, away from their friends and away from the town and city they knew, loved and supported their whole lives. I will not be a party to shipping them out. And I can urge you all that we need the housing. National statistics show that the population is getting older. If we get rid of this land now, the cost in the future of building similar type facilities is going to be astronomical. Please don't be a party to shipping old people out of Stamford. Let's give them a little bit of housing. Thank you.

MR. TARZIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the past two months that I have served on this Board I hear nothing but complaints that requests that come before us are not complete, that there is something lacking. But nevertheless, we should pass on these. That we should O.K. them. I thought they call that passing the buck, but anyhow. I'll try to limit myself to one question for the sake of expediency. I would like to ask through the Chair, Mrs. Hawe a question that was partially answered by Mr. DeLuca but I believe Mrs. Hawe could probably throw a little bit more light on the question. And this...the question is this--Is there a problem with limiting the use of Willard congregate housing to Stamford residents because or since two-thirds of the money comes from the State?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, I think I can answer that in some detail. If the State gets Section 8 money towards this housing to subsidize this housing and to pay back our initial investment, then the admissions to this facility would have to be according to Section 8 standards. Now according to Section 8 standards for admission, they allot 100 points for each person and various things go into figuring out who will be eligible. For instance certain amount of income you are allotted a certain number of points. Your need, your age, things like that. The City can reserve or hold aside thirty points for each person applying for this that they can use for residency requirement. So in other words what I am saying I guess is that the City cannot say only those from Stamford can come here but they do have a way of guaranteeing that the majority will be from Stamford.

MR. TARZIA: Thank you. My only comment on that is you are asking us to have the taxpayers in the City of Stamford pay for this at one-third

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. TARZIA (continuing) - City cost and then the future cost, yearly cost overruns, and then we can't even guarantee with only 45 units that we are talking about, we can't even guarantee a substantial number of those units will be given to the Stamford residents. Thank you.

MS. GUROIAN: I am going to vote against this proposal. I have before me a missive, a letter from Mr. Bate from the House of Representatives. And if I would accept his figures as being accurate, which I do not, I would have to accept the fact that there are 2,700 citizens of Stamford who are in need of a facility such as that proposed for Willard School. Now, at an expenditure of \$740,000 plus to the City of Stamford over \$2 Million in all, we will be accommodating less than 50 people out of the 2,700. So that in the words of a previous speaker, we will be shipping out into the realms of Hartford, 2,640 people and housing at a cost of \$750,000 plus \$2,000 a person to begin with in operating cost. Only less than 50 people. And in answer to one of the statements made previously it is because I feel an obligation to the Senior Citizens that I would like for that 750,000 dollars to reach a little bit more than 50 of the Senior Citizens, all of whom don't have to come from Stamford. They come from outside of Stamford. If in fact we were proposing that this would be a beginning and that perhaps we could accommodate more of these 2,700 people. If you project, the present cost to the City, to reach 2,750 we would have to have \$40 Million expenditure. Now it seems to me that some kind of proposal ...that they could come up with some kind of proposal whereby we won't have to spend \$40 Million to reach 2,750 people but we can spend considerably less and reach considerably more people than is being proposed right now. For these reasons, I am voting against. Not because I don't want to spend the money for the Senior Citizens; it is not because I don't feel we have an obligation to them, it is not because I want to ship them out of the City up to Hartford when they grow old. It is because I want to keep them. I want to reach more of them and I want to provide what they need to more people than this will provide at an exorbitant cost. And for those reasons, I am going to vote against this proposal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms. Guroian. Mr. Flounders. The question has been moved and seconded. All in favor of moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? I believe the Ayes have it and the question has been moved. We will go onto the vote. There will be a roll call vote. The Clerk will call the roll.

A YES vote is in favor of this appropriation. This is an additional appropriation and requires twenty-one....requires a two-thirds vote I am instructed by the Parliamentarian. There are 37 present and two-thirds of that is 25.

ROLL CALL was taken by Clerk Annie M. Summerville

CHMN. DONAHUE: By a vote of 27 Yes, 8 No, and 2 Abstentions, the MOTION has been CARRIED. We will now return to our regular agenda.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Mary Jane SignoreMAYOR'S CABINET - PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSIONERTerm Expires

BRUCE W. SPAULDING (R)
126 Cedarwood Road
Held in Steering 12/10/81
(Denied 1/10/82)
Second Submission

Re-Appointment

Nov. 30, 1983

MR. DeLUCA: In view of the fact that the Appointments Committee convened and interviewed Mr. Spaulding for the position of Public Works Commissioner on January 7, 1982, and voted 5-0 for his approval, we did not deem it necessary to hold another meeting for another interview with Mr. Spaulding. Therefore, for this particular meeting, we have no report.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to make a Motion to place, or to hold this item in Committee until such time as we can have full participation by the entire Board in an interview session with Mr. Spaulding. I think it is too important a position and I feel that both sides of the aisle should have the option.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Motion has been made and Seconded. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, all in favor of returning this item to Committee, please say AYE. Opposed? Abstentions? Mrs. Maihock abstained, and Mr. Dudley abstained, and Mr. and Mrs. Perillo are abstentions. Mr. Spaulding's name has been Returned to Committee.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

- (1) APPROVAL OF PROPOSED PARKS DEPARTMENT FEES - Submitted by Parks Supt. Robert Cook 12/21/81 - expected to generate additional income of \$60,000. Mayor has requested 7% across-the-board reduction in departmental budgets for fiscal year 1982-1983 which exceed \$100,000. Held in Committee 1/19/82 Special Meeting.

MR. DeLUCA: It is amazing that even though I was number two on the list, I still get to talk about it at the late hour of twelve thirty. At our January 19, 1982 meeting the Board voted to return the proposed Park Department fees back to Committee for another review. On Tuesday evening, January 26, 1982 the Parks and Recreation Committee met to review and discuss the proposed fees. Attendees were Committee members Gaipa, Franchina, Boccuzzi, and Guroian, Park Superintendent Bob Cook, Members of the West Side Bocci League and myself. At this meeting we were informed by Park Superintendent Bob Cook that without the help of the Bocci League members the Bocci courts would not been constructed. The construction cost to the City was approximately \$7,500. The same courts would have cost the City approximately \$20,000 if help was not available. We also learned that prior to 1981 approximately 25-35 permits have been issued yearly for group picnics at Rosa Hartman Park. However, in 1981 for some unknown reason permits for this park dropped approximately 50 percent. Therefore, taking these two factors into consideration, help from the Bocci League, a drastic reduction in group picnics at Rosa Hartman Park plus Representative

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE(continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing) -Boccuzzi's request not to increase the fees at Rosa Hartman Park. We recommend acceptance of the fees as indicated on the January 26, 1982 revised schedule which was sent out to all members this past week. Hopefully, each and everyone has the schedule with them, they have reviewed the fees and are in agreement with them. If you any questions, I will be happy to try to answer them to the best of my ability.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Mr. President. Through you I would like you to ask Mr. DeLuca what happened to the amendments that were made on the floor of this Board?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, Mr. Livingston. We brought this up at our meeting; in fact, we tried to get two different opinions. In fact we did receive two different opinions, one from Representative Boccuzzi, one from Representative Guroian. The fact that the whole schedule was sent back to Committee, our committee interpreted this as being that the whole package had to be reviewed, and that the amendments even though they were passed upon were really not formal or considered to be a complete meeting on the whole package. Therefore, we did not consider the amendments as such. These items will be up for amendment this evening, if you so desire.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, through you Mr. President to Mr. DeLuca, and Gabe, I am saying this respectfully--I feel that the Committee was in error not to accept the amendments as granted on the floor of this Board. I don't want to make an issue out of this. I would ask you, Mr. President, how do you rule on those amendments that Motion was made...now I would think that any amendments that are made on the floor of this Board, would go right along with that item when it is sent back to Committee. I would like a ruling through you...from you on this, and of course if you rule in the negative, I would like the opportunity to make those same amendments again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would seem to me that it was the sense of the Board that those amendments would stand and should have been taken back to the Committee as a package. As the Board spoke and by majority rule amended the proposed fees last month. So I would state those amendments should be part of the package.

MR. DeLUCA: Mr. President, I have no qualms. But like I said, this was our interpretation. Now if this Board so desires that they uphold the ruling of the President, I am sure our Committee finds no fault with it. All we are looking for is to get the fees approved tonight and if this is what the Chair has ruled and the rest of the members here tonight agree with it, as I said it was our interpretation. We got two different interpretations the night of our meeting so we decided just to play it safe and vote the way we felt it should have been. We are always open for suggestions and comments and constructive criticism. So be it. If this is, once again not to be redundant, if this is your desire then we can just go back and make the changes here as such. Do I take it that the complete Board agrees

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing) with the Chair and therefore we can easily slide in these changes that were amended with the Marina fees and also for the parking sticker for City residents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair hears no opposition at this point in time. Could you take a moment and do that Mr. DeLuca?

MR. DeLUCA: If you have your schedules with you that were revised on January 26th. The fee schedule for the Marinas were so Senior Citizens should all be changed to reflect the price that existed in 1981 fees, which is for Senior Citizens only. That was the amendment. That is what we would be voting on this evening. In other words, the Senior Citizens' fees where we had put \$67.50 for the dockside 16 foot would be \$60.00. The next figure for over 16 ½ feet would be \$75. Southfield up to 18 feet would be \$30.00. Outside moorings would be \$2.75 a foot. Outside mooring minimum \$35.00. And small boat rack-\$10.00. These would be the same fees as 1981, which was amended and therefore would be part of our complete package for this evening. The other change would be.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we incorporate the changes that Mr. Livingston has addressed first, and then Mr. Zelinski your name is on the list, also Mr. Wiederlight. I think that would be appropriate. Let's clarify what we're talking about first and then we will act on the whole Motion.

MR. DeLUCA: The other amendment that was made at our January 19th meeting was the parking sticker for the resident property owner which should read \$1.00 rather than \$2.00 as printed on your schedule. Once again the reason why we went still went ahead with the \$2.00 was the fact that the security and control that Cummins, West Beach and Cove is estimated at \$50,000. We felt that the \$2.00 fee would cover most of our security expenses. But it was amended at \$1.00. The Board has ruled that the amendment should stand and that is what is should be changed to. As far as all the other fees they remain the same as we had recommended prior and we voted 3 to 0 for acceptance. 3 in Favor and 0 opposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mr. DeLuca. Mr. Livingston does that satisfy the amendments that were made?

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, Mr. President. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will go onto the next speaker, Mr. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY: Mr. Livingston said exactly what I was going to say. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Through you firstly to Mr. DeLuca. What was the thinking on the lighted field softball, increasing the cost from \$7.50 to \$10.00? However, on the two previous ones, basketball and bocci there was no increase in cost, Sir.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA: Well, like I said, the reason for the Bocci court, Mr. Wiederlight as I stated earlier is the fact that it was only because of the help of the Bocci League members that the Bocci courts became a reality. Without their help Bob Cook says the City would never have spent \$20,000 to put these courts up. Therefore, we felt that to show our appreciation to them that we would not increase the fees this year for the members that play Bocci at these courts here. We emphasize to the members of the Bocci League that were there that we would not hold these same costs next year. We definitely plan on an increase. As far as the Softball going from \$7.50 to \$10.00 per game, I have talked or Board of Recreation Superintendent Bruno Giordano called me on several occasions to advise me that the average lighting cost at Cummings Park is \$11.00 per hour where that Scalzi Park it comes out to about \$7.50 per hour. So if we try to average the two of them together it would be roughly about \$9.25 an hour for an average. The fact that this is the first increase since 1976 we felt that by going from \$7.50 to \$10.00 a game would be within reason. As far as the basketball, once again this primarily used by teenagers and we felt our rationale for not increasing these fees because it ^{was} utilized primarily by teenagers, it is a way to keep them off the streets—to keep them occupied, and their access to funds is not as great as the softball leagues would be. That was our rationale for not increasing.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. Not to belabor the point. Did Mr. Giordano give you the source of his data on computing the cost on running the lights?

MR. DeLUCA: He just told me he had studies that they took over there. I did not go into too much detail. In fact even the Board of Recreation Chairman, Tom Pia, and one of their members, Tony Marrucco, also agreed that the \$10.00 figure would not be exorbitant or place any hardship on anyone.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: A few other questions I have. On the tennis, first of all, non-resident nights, we are looking for \$8.00 a court an hour for the non-resident nights and do you think that should receive any increase in view of the fact that possibly we might want to keep non-residents out and make it more useful for our citizens.

MR. DeLUCA: We thought about increasing these fees here but our rationale was that last year these people paid the \$8.00 per hour and the lights at Scalzi Park were not in the best condition. Many blind spots, glares which I have been working with Bob Cook who has been working with the manufacturer, Cross, Hynes, to correct this. We hopefully expect these lights will be corrected by April or May at the latest. In fact I received correspondence just the other day where Bob Cook wrote to the manufacturer and we felt since these people were playing under poor conditions once again we felt that o.k. we are not concerned about non-residents as such. We feel that they should pay a higher price but by the same token morality also has to play an important factor in here when you consider the fact that for the past year or two the lighting conditions haven't been

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA (continuing) - the best, therefore we do plan with the next increase for next year when we go with these fees that the non-resident will pay a higher fee.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Well the cost you are getting now on the lighted tennis court will obviously not the cost of the electricity at \$9.25 an hour as previously stated. So therefore there is no rationale on charging them \$8.00.

MR. DeLUCA: Excuse me, Mr. Wiederlight. We are talking about \$9.25 for ball fields with higher candlelight power and a different type of lighting than your courts. Therefore, you cannot make a comparison as such because we are not talking about apples and apples when we are talking about these types of lighting.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: What was the figure on the cost of the lighting of the tennis courts?

MR. DeLUCA: To be truthful, we never did get a figure or an average rate, but this is a figure that they felt they can live with and was acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next speaker is Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Mr. President. I also had some questions through you to Representative DeLuca. First of all, when we made the changes based on Representative Livingston in the first part of that in Marinas, what is the present proposed rate for boat racks for Senior Citizens? Would that be \$10.00 or \$7.50?

MR. DeLUCA: The proposed rate would have been \$7.50 and we went back to the old rate of \$10.00. Mr. Zelinski, we were trying to keep this uniform rather than jumping around helter-skelter. We wanted to be consistent, and do away with the 25% reduction. Let's be consistent and keep the same rates as 1981.

MR. ZELINSKI: Well, I would like to make a Motion then to amend the small boat rack for Senior Citizens to be \$7.50 which was the proposed rate. I so Move.

MR. DeLUCA: I would recommend not accepting this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I ask if there is second? There is no second. So we will move on.

MR. ZELINSKI: I have some other questions. Pertaining to the Marinas, are they just for Stamford residents or can anyone from either out-of-town or state use the Marinas?

MR. DeLUCA: It will be just for Stamford residents.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: O.K. good, thank you. Next on the tennis courts. I know there had been some meetings with members of the Tennis Association here in Stamford, with Mr. Cook pertaining to the possibility of having seasonal passes for residents. In other words, they would pay a certain amount, say \$20-25 a year and thereby eliminating the per hour rate. Do you know why possibly Mr. Cook did not see fit to initiate the season pass?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, we brought this up. Mr. Cook and Park Commission members wanted to get more information on this particular subject. Check around with different areas and we have brought it up and thrown out a figure of maybe \$25 or \$20 a year and our Committee just felt there wasn't sufficient information to go by and we decided to hold up once again on this for one more year. Let's do more investigation and more research on it and then come back with a recommendation. We also figure would there be one rate for Senior Citizens, a rate for Juniors as far as a season pass goes? So rather than go into any long spiel on it, we decided to hold it up for one more year until we got more information.

MR. ZELINSKI: Then, finally, the last question was dealing with the vending trucks. Are these out-of-town or out-of-state vending trucks?

MR. DeLUCA: As far as I know they would strictly be vendors from this City.

MR. ZELINSKI: Good. O.K. thank you very much for answering my questions.

MR. GAIPA: i just wanted to clarify a couple of questions, one raised by Mr. Wiederlight--the increase in electricity that Mr. Giordano quoted did not include the 24% increase by Helco as of last November 19th. The other question about the small boat rack raised by Mr. Zelinski. That decrease in the fees that the Parks and Recreation Committee recommended was lost when this Board last month voted for Mr. Livingston's amendment to keep the fees the same. So this Board raised the small boat rack fees from \$7.50 to \$10.00 for Senior Citizens.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. If this is passed I would like to recommend to the Board of Finance and to the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives that they subtract the projected fees from the Parks Department budget.

MR. TARZIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Aside from the fact as Mr. DeLuca stated, that the Bocci League helped to build the Bocci courts, I would also like to add the fact that most of these people that participate tend to be older citizens of the community and therefore at first when I heard that they were going to double the rates from \$2 to \$4 I expressed my

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. TARZIA (continuing) - concerns with Mr. DeLuca at that time and I would like to thank him for bringing it before the Committee again and reconsidering that. I think we have to realize that these are older citizens by and large, and that they do not get very much from City. They are taxpayers in the Community.

MRS. PERILLO: Yes, through you Mr. Chairman to Mr. DeLuca. There have been complaints in the past about people renting the tennis courts and giving private tennis lessons, making quite a nice dollar. Is this practice still going on, Mr. DeLuca that you know of?

MR. DeLUCA: I haven't checked into the practice but I think that this is something that you find people going up to the golf course, paying fees and also going out and giving private lessons. We find these going on at the Terry Conners Rink. We have instructors, professionals giving lessons, Mrs. Perillo. If you go to the tennis courts most places, after an hour or so the people will get off and let someone else use the courts. Down at Scalzi Park you have a person there who oversees what is going on and collects your money as you go on to use the courts, maintains a list. This question was not raised but this will be something that goes on no matter what your recreation is in the City of Stamford.

CHMN.DONAHUE: Mr. Flounders? Motion to move the question has been moved and seconded.
The Motion has been made to Move the question concerning the new Park fees. All those in favor of moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? The question is Moved. We will go on to the main Motion which is the approval of the fees presented by the Parks and Recreation Committee tonight and as amended in the past. All those in favor of the new Park fees for the next year, please say Aye. Opposed? Two No. Any abstentions? The Motion is carried.

MR. DeLUCA: That concludes our report.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to make a Motion to adjourn now, please.

CHMN.DONAHUE: There is a Motion on the floor to adjourn; it has been moved and seconded. All in favor of adjourning the meeting, please say Aye. Opposed? It would seem that the meeting is not adjourned and we will go on with the Agenda. There is a Division. Could I ask the tellers to come forward, please. All those in favor of adjournment, please raise your hand. All those opposed to adjournment, please raise your hands. The meeting is not adjourned. The Motion has failed. We will go on with the meeting. The vote is 15 in favor of adjournment, and 21 opposed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Marie Hawe

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday evening, January 27th. There were five members present, constituting a quorum. I would like to Move the following items on the Consent Agenda: Items #1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and item # 16.

Item #1 is a request for \$13,135.00 for the Health Department Public School Health Program. In accordance with the contract between the City of Stamford and the registered nurses, the City must now reimburse the full cost of tuition and books for job or promotion related education. And also must pay for an increase in their uniform allowance. Fiscal voted 5 in Favor and 0 opposed. I so Move. Seconded.

(1) \$ 13,135.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM -
Code 560.1230 College Tuition \$12,805.00
Code 560.3480 Uniforms 330.00
\$13,135.00

On 11/12/81 Board of Finance APPROVED the \$330.00 for Uniforms; and APPROVED the \$12,805.00 for College Tuition on 12/17/81. Held in Comm. 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I would like to Move that item back into Committee.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and seconded to move this item back to Committee. Is there any discussion? There being none....

MRS. HAWE: All I can say is these people have been waiting to be reimbursed for this and I think it is only fair that we let them have the money.

MRS. CONTI: This is a contractual obligation, under the nurses' contract which I believe the majority voted for and passed and this is part of the financing for the contract.

MR. TARZIA: Time and time again we approve contracts and yet when they come back for the appropriation we have doubts about the items, we send them back to Committee for whatever reason. It is not fair to the people out there that we enter into a binding contract with these people and they expect to get their money at a reasonable amount of time.

MR. BLUM: Inasmuch as this is contractual, then I think we have to pay this money. It is something that we cannot hold. It is State Law that we must pay the money if it is a part of a contract.

MRS. GUROIAN: Through the Chair, I would like to ask Mr. Boccuzzi why he wants to return it to Committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Two Democrats sit on that Fiscal Committee legally and we intend to send it back.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN: Is it his intention to send everything back to Committee?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I didn't say anything about any item except #1, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. SAXE: As a Point of Information, I have taken the time, and I personally am going to call for the resignations of some certain parties of this Board because we are derelict of our duty, and we are not doing what we have been elected to do.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Mrs. Saxe, you are out-of-order. The discussion that is on the floor is about sending this item back to the Fiscal Committee. Is there any other speaker? There being no one else to speak, we will vote on the Motion. Will the Tellers please come forward? All those in favor of sending back to Committee, please raise your hands. The Tellers have asked that you raise your hand high. Those opposed? Any Abstentions? None. The Motion has been DEFEATED.

The Main Motion is \$13,135.00. If there is no further discussion, we will vote. The vote is: 18 in favor and 19 opposed.

MOTION TO RECESS:

CHMN. DONAHUE: We have a Motion for a Recess. Seconded, for a five-minute recess. All those in favor? Opposed? There is a Division. Will the Tellers please come forward. The Motion has CARRIED by a vote of 27 in favor, 6 opposed, and 2 abstentions. We will recess for five minutes.

RECESS: From 1:00 A.M. until 1:27 A.M.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to Move the following items on the CONSENT AGENDA: #1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.

(1) - See detail on page 28. APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(2) \$214,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3601 CASH RELIEF - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor 11/2/81 - 90% of this is reimbursable by State of Connecticut. Board of Finance approved \$214,000 on 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81.
~~\$394,000.00~~

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

(3) \$123,185.00 - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS - To fund salary payments, per memo from Mayor Clapes and Budget Director Frank Harrison 10/21/81. Approved by Board of Finance 12/17/81. Held in Committee 11/16. For UNION ADMINISTRATORS, per CONTRACT and per list. Held in Steering 12/10/81 and 12/28/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.
APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (4) \$ 21,800.00 - COMMITTEE ON TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT (CTE) Stamford Youth Planning and Coordinating Agency - Additional Appropriation to be reimbursed by State Grant (to be allocated to various Youth Service Bureau accounts) Mayor's request 11/2/81. Board of Finance approved 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: This request for \$21,800 will be reimbursed by the State for the Committee on Training and Employment, Stamford Youth Planning and Coordinating Agency. In this year's annual budget, the City appropriated \$20,000 for the core services unit of the Stamford Youth Planning and Coordinating Agency. This amount has been matched by a grant of \$21,800 from the State Department of Child and Youth Services and this is that grant money. Fiscal voted 4 in Favor and 1 Opposed and I so Move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved and seconded. Any discussion? There is no discussion. We will go to a vote. All in favor of this appropriation please say Aye. Opposed? The Chair is in doubt. Will the tellers please come up? Education, Welfare and Government was the secondary committee on that item. Do they concur with this report.

EW&G are presently absent, and we don't have a report from that Committee. It has been Moved to Waive that report. And Seconded. All in favor of waiving the secondary committee report? Opposed? Abstentions? It is CARRIED. We will now vote on the Main Motion, to approve the \$21,800. All in favor, please raise your hands. Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED with 28 in favor, 7 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

- (5) \$ 28,068.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM - Code 761 - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/3/81 to fund ONE-QUARTER of the Federal Fiscal Year 1982 Budget for Day Care Title II Program. State grant contingent on August Reconciliation Act funds being appropriated, per Jeanne Ellis Hudgens 11/3/81. Bd. of Finance approved 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81 and 12/28/81.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (6) \$ 75,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 - PROFESSIONAL SERVICES. Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 11/30/81, and Corp. Counsel Leonard Cookney 11/25. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: On item #6, bills are now presently outstanding for more than this amount. Last year \$190,000 was spent in this account. The Law Department requested \$100,000 this year and the Board of Finance cut them to \$50,000 with the idea that they would come back for the additional funds as needed. Fiscal voted 5-0 in favor and I so Move. Seconded.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

CHMN. DONAHUE: I have a Motion to waive the secondary committee report. All in Favor? Opposed? 2 Opposed-Mr. Zelinski & Mrs. Gershman. Abstentions? 35 in Favor and 2 Opposed. We will go onto the main Motion. Any discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Through you to the chairperson of Fiscal. Representative Hawe, could you tell me what the \$37,000 bills are for, please? You said that they are outstanding \$37,000?

MRS. HAWE: No there is \$109,000 outstanding, and I can read the list if you like. This appropriation is only for \$75,000, but in addition to that, there is \$35,000 also billed to be paid.

MR. ZELINSKI: I am sorry, I didn't get that. In other words, I have the form, the sheet from the Law Department requesting this and it says reason for request that they are presently holding bills for professional services rendered for \$37,000.

MRS. HAWE: O.K. That is because this request was sent in in November and our latest information, when we talked to Mr. Cookney last Wednesday, was that now there are additional bills totaling \$109,000.

MR. ZELINSKI: Would you have the breakdown of what those expenses are for?

(At this point, the cassette tape became stuck and did not record momentarily.)

CHMN. DONAHUE: We will now vote on the Motion to appropriate \$75,000 to the Law Department for professional Services. All those in favor please say Aye. Opposed? 2-Mr. Blais & Mr. Zelinski. Abstentions? 1 M. Perillo. The vote is 34 in Favor, 2 Opposed and 1 abstention. The Motion is carried.

- (7) \$ 56,050.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - Various 573 accts. - Additional Appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30 to fund a coordinator, nutritionists, lab technicians, and account clerks, to distribute food supplement vouchers for milk, cheese, cereals, fruit juice, infant formula and eggs. This is only portion of yearly appropriation due to uncertainty of Federal funding for Connecticut. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe. Mrs. Hawe, did you invite Dr. Gofstein of the Health Commission to the meeting to discuss this?

MRS. HAWE: No, I did not.

MRS. PERILLO: What is the reason that you did not?

MRS. HAWE: I invited the Grants Officer. I felt that perhaps we could get information from the Grants Officer in order to satisfy the questions that the Committee had.

MRS. PERILLO: You felt she would give better information than the Health Commission, or Dr. Gofstein on this?

MRS. HAWE: I felt that this time I was going to invite her rather than Dr. Gofstein and see if we could get the information from her.

MRS. PERILLO: Now another question. Are these new positions?

MRS. HAWE: No. These are positions that have always been in the W.I.C. Program.

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you. As I stated in the Fiscal Committee that we are spending \$150,000 to administer a program of \$500,000. Seven regular employees and some part-time employees. Then we have this bookkeeper bilking the Program out of \$108,000. How much money is really going to the people that need it, the women, children and infants. I can't see this. It should be in the Welfare Department. Take it out of the Health Department where they could watch it and monitor it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Point of Information. Mr. Chairman through Mr. Dziezyc, You said something about a bookeeper, Sir. I am not familiar with that.

MR. DZIEZYC: Ex-bookeeper convicted in fraud. The former bookeeper of a Federally-funded nutritional Program in Stamford yesterday was sentenced to one to two years in jail for her part in bilking the Program of \$108,000. Bridgeport Superior Court Judge Aaron Ment sentenced Lucy Rucker.

MR. BOCCUZZI: In all due respect, Mr. Dziezyc. The article was in the Advocate but I really don't think it has any bearing on whether we fund this Committee or not. We don't have someone illegally doing something now. The person was put in jail, I think. It does not have anything to do with the Committee right now. The reading of that particular article is about someone who is not on the Board and cannot defend himself. I don't agree with what they did but I..

CHMN. DONAHUE: I think the question has been answered already, Mr. Dziezyc.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Well, I do think it was pertinent information and I do recall that Mrs. Hawe had an investigation the first time this was presented also, for certain irregularities. It is unfortunate that these irregularities occur, but I think at this particular time when there is such a dire need for these food supplements, I really think we should approve them and just hope that our feelings are conveyed to the Health Department and to Dr. Gofstein to be especially careful that we don't have any more irregularities.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I am going to be as brief as possible. I am sure that we are not going to be sold blind to eliminate these needed supplements because they were people who were hired and apparently have done something wrong. I don't see how we could dare imagine to make the people who are benefiting from this program suffer because of some of the activities of the people who are directing it.

CHMN. DONAHUE: There being no other discussion, we will go onto a vote on the main Motion. \$56,050.00 for the Health Department, W.I.C. Program. All in Favor, please say Aye. Opposed? Can we get your hands on the No's, please. Mr. Dziezyc, Mrs. Guroian, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Conti, Mr. DeLuca Mr. Tarzia, Mr. Stork, Mrs. McInerney. Make a note of this Mr. Gaipa has left the room. There will be 36 now present. Are there any abstentions? 23 in Favor, 9 Against and 2 abstentions. The Motion is carried. It is a simple majority on this one because it is a grant.

MRS. HAWE: Item #8 is a request from the Health Dept. for \$16,881.....

MRS. CONTI: Point of Information, Mr. Chairman. This was item #8, was it not? It says additional appropriation request. This is not a grant. I think two-thirds would be needed. Would you please re-confirm that, Mr. Chairman, please?

MRS. HAWE: The agenda reads additional appropriation, but as a matter of fact, there is a problem about it as they have to fund it little by little. Congress has not yet appropriated the money, and this is being appropriated directly from Stamford. It is an additional appropriation.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Mrs. Conti, we are waiting for a clarification.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I would like to say that we have a commitment with the Federal Government which was ratified by this Board last October. This amount funds the commitment through March 31st; and I believe possibly April. You will know by March 31st what the Federal funding will be for the balance of the year. They are coming in on a quarterly basis to insure that the Federal funding is absolutely guaranteed. So long as the dollars don't exceed last year, it is guaranteed.

MRS. HAWE: It is my understanding that it is a reimbursable grant. It needs 21 majority.

MR. HOGAN: I concur with Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. CONTI: But the agenda reads additional appropriation.

CHMN. DONAHUE: I believe it is an error according to the information we have gotten from the Fiscal Chairman and the Parliamentarian.

MRS. CONTI: Then we cannot act on it if it is not correctly on the agenda. I would say that we cannot act on it.

MR. FLOUNDERS: All of the forms that come to the Fiscal Committee have typewritten on the top of the page, and these are monolithed, operating budget requests for additional appropriations regardless of the exact nature of the request, whether they are grants, reimbursed not reimbursed. The form remains the same. We only have this one piece of stationery that comes through and they all say request for additional appropriation. This happens to be 100% reimbursable. This one is coming to us quarterly to insure that we do not exceed the amount reimbursed.

MR. BLAIS: I was, and perhaps Mrs. Hawe could answer my question when I am through. I was under the impression that a grant is contingent on the agreement between local, State and Federal governments, depending on the entities involved. That any appropriation, the grant itself...the making of the grant is the agreement between the entities and not the manner in which the money is actually appropriated for the specific purpose. So therefore under the definition of a grant where an agreement is made between the Federal and Local Municipality to conduct a program that is reimbursable, that definition would hold, and although we call this an appropriation of money, it is really a front ending of the grant money. Am I correct, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: As I understand it, Mr. Blais, ^{on} things like this, the City has to pass a resolution to apply for the money, which we did in October. We passed the resolution for this W.I.C. Program. However, then the Board of Representatives also has to vote on the actual appropriation of the money since it is a reimbursable grant. We have to put the money up front and then we are reimbursed for the money.

MR. BLAIS: But my question was, is it not already in the form of a State grant since that resolution has been passed, the Federal agreement has given us paper agreeing to the grant?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, they have given us papers agreeing to the grant, but according to our Charter, we have to vote on the actual sum also, as well as the resolution, to apply for the money....as well as executing the agreement, we have to vote on the funds.

MR. DIXON: Point of Order. We have already voted on this item. It seems to me now that all that is needed is that the Chair make a ruling on the Motion that we have already voted on.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Chair has ruled already.

MR. DIXON: Well, then, all the discussion is out-of-order.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Based on the information from Mrs. Hawe, the Fiscal Chairman, and from the Parliamentarian, Mr. Hogan, I would rule that this appropriation needs 21 votes.

(8) \$ 16,881.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - CODE 575 HYPERTENSION EDUCATION AND CONTROL PROGRAM; per Mayor Clapes' additional appropriation request of 12/14/81. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: Item #8 is a request from the Health Department for \$16,881.00 to fund the second year of the Hypertension Education and Control Program in the three middle schools. The program is run in conjunction with the American Heart Association. Through this program the children are taught about hypertension with the idea that they will take the information home to their parents. The program is run by an administrator who has worked to integrate this program into the regular continuing health program of the middle schools and after this year the regular health staff of the schools will carry on the program. The program will not be continued after this year. It will end at the end of this year. Of Fiscal, the Committee felt that this is a program that has doubtful benefits and the Committee voted 4 in Opposition and 1 in Favor. So I will make for the purpose of clarity, I will make a Motion to approve this considering that the Committee ^{voted} four to one against.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and seconded. Health and Protection? Motion to waive the secondary Committee is moved and seconded. All in Favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2 Opposed, 1 Abstention. The Motion to waive has been carried by a 33 in Favor, 2 Opposed and 1 Abstention.

MR. ESPOSITO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe. You said that Fiscal voted against this, questioning the value of the grant. This has been in effect for the past year; did Fiscal receive any information about how effective it has worked in function the past year.

MRS. HAWE: We didn't at time of the meeting. We requested the Board research^{er} it to look into that. The information that I got from her or that she was able to get as to how well this program worked, was that nationally there has been a drop in hypertension. As to how the goals have been met in Stamford, I really don't know.

MR. ESPOSITO: We don't have complete information on that. Might it be a friendly Motion to return this to Committee to get that information?

MRS. HAWE: I would not object to that.

CHMN. DONAHUE: There is a Motion to Return to Committee. Seconded. Any discussion on returning this item to committee?

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It is my hope that we will vote to put this back into Committee because I am sure that after it goes back to Committee and the Fiscal Committee gets the proper documentation from the Middle Schools, as I know it exists by virtue of first hand information from my child. You will definitely see the benefits that this program has to offer. I would hate to see this killed without the proper documentation to show that it really offers no benefit, when in fact it can be a terrific benefit. I realize they cannot speak on the Motion as it stands of approving this; however, I feel let's give it a fighting chance and let all the facts be brought out properly in Committee and then brought forth from the floor next month.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I move the question.

CHMN. DONAHUE: All those in Favor of moving the question? Opposed? Abstentions? The Motion is carried. Unanimous vote. I will move to the main question which is to ... not the main question. We will move to the question at hand to return this item to Committee for further study. All in Favor of returning this item to Committee, please say Aye. Opposed? Would you raise your hands, those that are opposed. Mr. Dziezyc, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Tarzia, Mrs. Maihock. Abstentions? One Abstention. By a vote of 31 to 4 with 1 abstention, we return this item to Committee.

(9) \$2,180,000.00 -- See Page 9 of these minutes. This item handled earlier in evening, under Suspension of Rules.

(10) \$ 739,980.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS - GROUP 41 - 1/11/82

Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request to fund Labor Contract between Stamford Police Assn. and City of Stamford for one year 7/1/81 - 6/30/82: Finance Board approved 1/19/82.

41-1110	Salaries	\$418,000.00
41-1124	10% Differential	9,400.00
41-1125	15% Differential	12,500.00
41-1201	Overtime	29,600.00
41-1202	Holidays	14,600.00
41-1204	Minimum Manpower	11,500.00
41-1211	Court Time	1,200.00
41-1210	Day-Off Slips	9,100.00
41-1413	Police Pension	234,080.00
		<u>\$739,980.00</u>

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with McInerney voting NO; and Maihock Abstaining; rest voting yes.

(11) \$ 650.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3632 CLOTHING AND SHOES -
Additional Appropriation requested per Mayor Clapes
12/4/81. State reimburses 90%. Finance Board approved
1/19/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (12) \$ 4,500.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3641 - MOVING & STORAGE -
Additional Appropriation requested per Mayor Clapes
12/4/81. For evictions done by sheriffs. Finance Board
approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (13) \$ 6,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3612 - BURIALS - State
reimburses 90%. Additional Appropriation requested per
Mayor Clapes 1/8/82. Finance Board approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (14) \$ 24,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.3623 - PRESCRIPTION DRUGS
AND MEDICINE. State reimburses 90%. Additional Appropria-
tion requested per Mayor Clapes 1/11/82. Finance Board
approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (15) \$ 64,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PARKS - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS
BUDGET - by adding to a project known as #610.818 GENERAL
 (Taxation &) PARK LIGHT IMPROVEMENTS, to be financed as below, per
 (Transfer) Mayor Louis A. Clapes' request of 1/8/82:
Additional Appropriation to be financed by taxation \$42,439.00
TRANSFER from project #610.461 "Resurface Scalzi
Tennis Courts" (which closes out this project) . 21,561.00
\$64,000.00

Finance Board approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: Item #15 is a request for \$64,000 for the Department of Parks for general park lighting improvement to Scalzi Parks. Of this \$42,439 will be an additional appropriation, and \$21,561 is a transfer from Code 610.461 resurfacing Scalzi tennis courts. There is presently \$48,000 in unencumbered funds available in this account. This added to the appropriation request before us tonight gives a total of \$112,000 for the project. The lights to be constructed will be metal haloid lights which will result in a savings of kilowatt hours. Fiscal voted 4 in Favor and 1 Opposed and I so move.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Mr. DeLuca? Parks and Recreation secondary Committee? I will accept that as a second. Discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you, I did have one question of the Chairperson of the Fiscal Committee. In the information sheet that we had received there seems to be a discrepancy in the figure of the amount of money that is still in the account, #610.461, resurface Scalzi tennis courts. In Mr. Cook's original letter which was dated September 16, 1981, it states in the third paragraph that there is an additional \$19,628 in unexpended capital funds in the Scalzi tennis court resurfacing account, the account, which I just mentioned, and yet in the Mayor's letter to us it has an amount of \$21,561. I am wondering how \$1,933 can be found, additional funds from September to January? Could that be answered, please?

MRS. HAWES: Mr. Zelinski, I really... the only thing I can say is that the correct figure is the \$21,561.

MR. ZELINSKI: O.K., thank you. I think this is a very worthwhile project; however, I am very much surprised that Mr. Cook, the Superintendent, because for a fact the tennis courts at Scalzi Park are not correct. There is still a great deal of problems as far as the drainage on the courts. I happen to know this first hand that even if we were to have a light rain shower in the morning the courts are unplayable and also near the fence there is still some open spaces where balls can go through. I would just as soon not have funds that might be needed to correct this problem in the tennis courts taken away and possibly have to be appropriated another time. I would rather see the funds taken from an additional appropriation rather than transferred because after all this project is still not complete. Being as that is the case, I would like to make a Motion to return this to Committee, please. Seconded.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would like to speak against that Motion. We have to allow a Department Head to determine what is best and what is most needed. If anyone has been out to the Park at night, we can certainly use an improvement on lights. If the Park Department is wise enough to set some priorities, I think we should let them get on with handling that Department the way they would probably know best. For us to sit back and Monday morning quarterback and second guess them on this, the only thing we are going to be doing is prolonging the project and perhaps because of the inflation factor probably just raising the cost. Mr. Cook, he has shown and demonstrated time and time again to be a capable administrator and I think we should support him on this.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd also not recommend sending this to Committee for several reasons. I agree that the tennis courts at Scalzi are not in the best condition, but I think all Bob Cook is trying to do is to alleviate a problem that has been in existence for many years at Scalzi Park. And that is the poor lighting on the baseball fields. We keep jacking up the fees for the baseball players which are more or less self-sustaining with their programs. All the Parks Department ^{do} is modify and resurface the tennis courts. Granted they may not be in the best of shape but I feel they owe an obligation to the people who utilize the baseball field because the lights are poor, especially down the left line, as softball player Paul Stork will attest to it, that we are lucky at the time so far that no one has been seriously injured. And as Rep. Livingston said the cost has escalated because two years ago we had \$75,000 in this account and Bob Cook just got the bid back last Thursday and the lowest bid was \$109,000 even though it is \$3,000 less. He did not recommend reducing the \$112,000 to \$109,000 for any contingency factors; but to keep on delaying this, the costs will keep escalating and then they would have to come in for a further appropriation. I urge that we do not return this to committee, but to approve it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I was listening to Gabe. I think it is time that we start to let our administrators, as Jerry Livingston said, run their Departments, and not sit back and look over their shoulders and see how they operate. We have to have confidence in their ability. In addition pretty soon, it is going to be time to use these facilities and the lights should be in place before the warm weather sets in. I know we are talking in February but the warm weather is around the corner and it will take time to go out to bid, I am sure, and get these structures in order. I think we should not delay and we should not send this back to Committee.

MRS. HAWE: I would really urge the Board members not to send this back to Committee. The time frame involved installing these lights and getting everything set is really... it takes quite a while to do that. As it is, when I spoke to Bob Cook he said that probably even if they got the appropriation tonight that the lights would not be installed probably at the beginning of the season. If it is held up another month, it will be closer to the end of the season before these lights can be in. So I really urge the Representatives to vote on this tonight and not to hold it another month.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Responding to the poor lighting charge...if it does go back to Committee, Mrs. Hawe, would you inquire please why sodium vapor lighting is not used?

MR. STORK: I would also like to speak against sending this back to Committee. First hand knowledge of the condition of that field at night is extremely dangerous. Being a third baseman, as I am there, if you just blink you're eye at the wrong time, you are going to get hurt. It may be but it is definitely a safety factor for everybody who plays there. I know our outfielders have trouble picking up the ball. Somebody's going to get beamed, somebody's going to get hurt and it may not happen this year, it could happen next year. I would like to see this moved.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I also oppose sending this back to Committee. There are many economies associated with these metal haloid lights. They have a seven-year life as compared to three years for the incandescent lamps and also they are stronger lights but much more energy-efficient than the incandescent lamps. Mr. Cook pointed out that the fees will be increased, as we heard tonight, in the Park which for the Park's use will go towards operating cost but putting in these metal haloid lights would cut the operating cost, that is the cost of power, by 50%. I think that we should move and not send this back to Committee. But Move on this immediately, and give Mr. Cook his approval.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I move that...I am supporting sending it Back to Committee and holding it there, because I think that perhaps Mr. Cook should have included this in his prior budget; and I think we should hold and he should include it in his 1982 budget. If they have gotten along with the lighting as it is so far, I think they can do so for a few more months. Let's not have a special appropriation.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

CHMN. DONAHUE: The question has been moved and seconded. All those in Favor of moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? One opposed. Abstentions? The Motion is carried. We will go on to the Motion to return this item to Committee. All in Favor of returning this item to Committee, please say Aye. Please raise your hands. Mr. Zelinski, Mrs. Guroian, Mrs. Conti, and Mrs. Gershman. All those opposed, please say No. Abstentions? The Motion to return to Committee has lost. 4 in Favor, 32 opposed. We will go onto the main Motion. All those in Favor of this item for the Department of Parks amounting to \$64,000 please say Aye. Opposed? Please raise your hands. Mr. Zelinski, Mrs. Conti, Mrs. Gershman. 33 in Favor and 3 Opposed. The Motion is carried.

- (16) \$ 8,867.65 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3150 ELECTION EXPENSES -
Additional Appropriation per Mayor Clapes' request 1/11/82
to fund increases in telephone, salaries, food, machine
supplies, and general supplies. Finance Board approved 1/19/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. HAWE: That ends the report. The items I move for approval on the CONSENT AGENDA are: #1, \$13,135; #2, \$214,000; #3, \$123,185; #5, \$28,068; #10, \$739,980; #11, \$650; #12, \$4,500; #13, \$6,000; #14, \$24,000; #16, \$8,867.65. Seconded.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Consent Agenda is Moved and Seconded. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? Abstentions? The record should note that Mrs. Maihock abstains on #10, and that Mrs. McInerney votes NO on #10.

MRS. MAIHOCK: May I ask a question? I couldn't get my question in. On Item #2, why is there a line through the second....

CHMN. DONAHUE: I believe that would be out of order at this time.

MRS. GUROIAN: Before the Chairman of Fiscal completes her report, and we move on to the next item, may I, through the Chair, ask her a question as regards...the question is, does she know how much money we have spent in extra appropriations since the budget was passed?

MRS. HAWE: I don't have that information with me, but I can get it for you and let you know tomorrow. I am sorry I don't have it with me.

CHMN. DONAHUE: We will go on to the next item on the agenda: Special Orders of the Board. I believe this was referred for advice and review of the Legislative and Rules Committee.

SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD:

- (1) ADOPTION OF RULES OF ORDER OF THE 17th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES AT-
TACHED HERETO - submitted by Republican Caucus of the Board. Held
1/11/82 for February meeting as a SPECIAL ORDER, not requiring taking
out of committee and is a matter^{on} which L&R Committee may make recom-
mendations; and adoption of the Rules to be by majority vote.

SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD (continued)

MR. CONTI: We discussed changing the adoption of the Rules of the Order of the Seventeenth Board of Representatives which were submitted by Betty Conti. We had quite a few changes here which we have sent to everyone. There are two pages of them. I believe what has happened this evening would supersede these and I think leadership knows more about what's going on as to whether they are going to accept the Sixteenth Board Rules or not.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Chair would entertain a motion to that effect.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to make a Motion to accept the Rules of the Sixteenth Board as our permanent rules, and after the Motion is seconded, I would also to amend the Rules on Page 4 of the Sixteenth Rules of the Board. I think that that may be the better way to proceed. I would like to make an amendment to Page 4 of those rules, please. Item #1-Committees —should read, "there shall be the following Standing Committees: Steering, membership 18; Appointments, membership 9; Fiscal, membership 9; Legislative and Rules, membership 9; Personnel, membership 7; Planning and Zoning, membership 5; Public Works and Sewer, membership 7.

MRS. GURIOAN: Point of Order, Mr. Chairman. I think the proper way to present this is that she moves the adoption of the Sixteenth Board Rules with the following changes.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, Mrs. Gurioan is correct. Then I would have my Motion read that I would move to accept the Sixteenth Board rules with the following changes: and if I may proceed with the changes. We were at Public Works and Sewer, membership 7; Health and Protection, membership 5; Parks and Recreation, membership 5. #10 would be changed to read "Charter Revision Ordinance and Reapportionment, 8; Education, Welfare and Government, membership 3; Urban Renewal, membership 5; Public Housing and Community Development, membership 5; Environmental Protection, membership 3; and Transportation, membership 3.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Is there a second? Discussion?

MR. BLUM: I would like to make one change, if it is at all possible. Inasmuch as the Public HOusing and Community Development, housing is a item that is very important now and it is all types of housing. I would like to make a motion to delete the word "public" to make it Housing and Community Development Committee.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and seconded to amend the amended version of the Rules by deleting the word "public" from item #12. Mr. Livingston, we are discussing this amendment.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, and I will speak to that amendment. I am not sure of Mr. Blum's intentions. If we change the name from Public Housing and Community Development and we just say Housing, it implies that pertains to all housing. The understanding that I have had since I have been on this Board, that our Public Housing Committee was really there to

SPECIAL ORDERS(S) OF THE BOARD (continued)

participate in the affairs of Public Housing. If we make that kind of a change and I don't know whether I am for or against it, I do think that we should give an awful lot of thought because once we do that we would be leaving the door wide open for a Committee to take on responsibilities that it did not have in the past. I am hoping that some of our members will express themselves on how they feel about that.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I, too, feel like Rep. Livingston. The scope of the Committee, the intent of the scope of the Committee is to basically encompass the Public Housing area. And in taking out the word public, it might in some point of time, might lead to lack of attention being paid in this area. I think that the intent of the Committee is to engaged in the Public Housing area; that was the original intent and I personally do not see any reason to take out "Public." In essence that would therefore include the private housing sector area of which this Board really has no purview at this time.

MR. BLAIS: If this proposed amendment is passed, does that give the Committee domain over private housing? In other words, I could go home and find David in my house investigating?

CHMN. DONAHUE: Could we go on? Mr. Zelinski is the next one to speak on the amendment proposed by Mr. Blum.

MR. ZELINSKI: That is a tough act to follow. In all seriousness, I really think we are making a proverbial mountain out of a mole hill about this. I think that housing as it means should not be limited impossible when this Committee was first initiated many, many years ago probably before most of our times. The thought possibly was not given to give it larger scope and I don't think we should engage in a large debate for one word which is the word "public." I don't think that any Representative on this Board that was duly elected is going to abuse the power of his/her responsibility and if they do we can certainly correct that situation. At the present time, the innuendos as far as what this could lead to, I really think does not hold any water.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I must agree with Mr. Livingston and Mr. Wiederlight. I think that there is a great difference between housing and public housing. I can see where housing could infringe on Planning and Zoning and I must support public housing as opposed to housing.

MRS. CONTI: As I understand the motion, there is no intention to eliminate public housing but it is to broaden the scope of the Committee. The interesting thing is that Public Housing under the Housing Authority is autonomous and this Board has very little control over it anyway. So that if the scope were broadened, and despite what Mr. Blais says, it would be up to the Steering Committee as to whether Mr. Blum could go over to Mr. Blais' house and look through it. That would entirely be up to Steering. I don't see anything that wrong with the resolution...with the amendment.

SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD (continued)

CHMN. DONAHUE: Motion has been made to move the question and seconded. I would remind the Board that we are voting on the amendment, Mr. Blum's amendment to delete the word "public". We are voting on moving the question. All in favor of moving the question? Opposed? Mr. Roos-No. Abstention? No abstentions. Motion is carried. We will go to the main Motion to delete the word "public". All in Favor, please say Aye. Would you raise your hands, please? Mr. Blum, Mr. Zelinski, Mrs. Conti. All Opposed? Abstentions? 3 in Favor and 33 Opposed. We will go back to the main Motion.

MRS. McINERNEY: I will move down to Rule #6 under Committees--the word Republican leader and Democratic leader should be in place of majority leader and minority leader, and that line should read "the President of the Board, the Republican leader and the Democratic leader may participate in any meeting of any committee of which they are not regular members but without the right to vote. Members of the Board of Representatives shall have the right to attend any of the Board of Representatives Committee meetings."

MR. DIXON: Point of Information. Are we voting on these amendments as they are made, or are we going to wait for a group of amendments and then vote?

CHMN. DONAHUE: It has been proposed as a running motion. There is one more, Mr. Dixon. I believe there is one more change.

MRS. McINERNEY: Item #7--again the words majority leader and minority leader should be deleted and in their place Republican leader and Democratic leader. That should read "the Steering Committee shall include the President, the Clerk, the Republican leader and the Democratic leader; at least one member from each of the other Standing Committees shall also serve on the Steering Committee. Co-chairmen not on Steering shall be ex-officio members of the Committee and shall have the right to vote in the event of the absence of the Co-chairman who is a designated member of Steering and I so move those changes.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The item is moved, and seconded by Mr. Boccuzzi, with the changes incorporated. Is there any discussion?

MR. FLOUNDERS: To Mrs. McInerney through you, did you mention Transportation Committee?

MRS. HAWES: Yes, that was Committee #15, Transportation, with 3 members.

MR. BLAIS: I Move the question.

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Motion has been made to move the question and seconded. All those in favor of moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? The Motion is carried. We will go onto the main Motion. All in favor of the Motion as amended, please say Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? We made the Motion and called for the vote. There was a Motion to move discussion. We have already called for the vote. No other item can be discussed.

SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD (continued)

MRS. HAWES: May I have a Point of Clarification. The problem has arisen and it became a problem at last month's Steering Committee for those members that were present where an item that was presented to Steering in less than 5 days had to be waived by a vote of two-thirds of Steering, and if you take it to a point of being exact, it was two-thirds of 18 not two-thirds of those present and voting. I believe Mr. DeLuca would like to clarify that particular type of...or take the restriction out of us and have it read unless by way of by those by a two-thirds vote of Steering and those present and voting. That would be on Page 6.

CHMN. DONAHUE: It would seem that Mr. DeLuca we could vote on these changes now and a motion would still be in order at a later point.

MR. DeLUCA: (beginning of tape, some dialogue lost)...it could be ambiguous. I realize this is how we always operated in the past.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think what it is, is if you have a quorum of Steering you need two-thirds of those present and voting. It's like two thirds of an appropriation of the Board of Representatives. We don't need two-thirds of forty, you need two-thirds of those present and voting. It is the same thing. I don't see any problem with it. You want to clear it up with words, but I don't think there is any problem.

CHMN. DONAHUE: I think that would be a proper way of moving on it. Let's take the vote on the corrections already been made and on the main Motion, that was to accept the Sixteenth Board Rules as you have just amended them as the Rules of the Seventeenth Board. Is there any discussion on that? All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? One abstention, Mrs. Conti. The Motion is carried.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to change Item #12, Page 6. My reason for making this change is to clarify any doubts in anyone's mind as Barbara McInerney mentioned at one of our last meetings. There was some confusion as to whether it would be two-thirds of those voting and present at Steering, or two-thirds of the total Steering Committee. It is just a simple change to read "not less than 5 days before such meeting, unless waived by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting at a Steering Committee meeting."

CHMN. DONAHUE: Motion has been moved and seconded. Any discussion? There being no discussion, we'll move to a vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Is it two-thirds of those present and voting, is that how you worded it?

CHMN. DONAHUE: The Motion has been made and seconded. There is no further discussion. All those in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? There being none, the Motion was unanimous.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:

MR. BLAIS: I would Move to Adjourn. I withdraw that.

SPECIAL ORDER(S) OF THE BOARD (continued)

- (2) PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE RULES OF ORDER OF THE 17th BOARD - submitted by Reps. Gerald Rybnick and Annie M. Summerville 11/30/81:

"There shall be the following Standing Committees:

I.	Steering.	18 members
II.	Appointments	8 members
III.	Fiscal	10 members
IV.	Legislative and Rules.	8 members
V.	Personnel	6 members
VI.	Planning and Zoning	6 members
VII.	Public Works and Sewer	8 members
VIII.	Health and Protection.	6 members
IX.	Parks and Recreation	6 members
X.	Education, Welfare and Government.	4 members
XI.	Public Housing & Community Development	4 members
XII.	Urban Renewal	6 members
XIII.	Environmental Protection.	4 members

"In all cases where Majority and Minority Leaders are specified, they will be called Democratic Leader and Republican Leader."

No action taken 1/11/82; presumably held for February meeting, same #1 above.

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

MR. CONTI: The L&R meeting was called for Monday, Jan. 25th at 7:30 p.m., and called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present were Tony Conti, John Zelinski, Robert Fauteux, Ann King Saxe, Audrey Maihock, and Barbara McInerney. Also present were Sandra Gilbane and Jeannette Semon. We had a letter from Jim Ford who was unable to attend. The items as taken from the agenda: #1, Proposed Resolution to apply for State Grant for Chlorine Facilities Modification, Water Pollution Abatement Facilities per Mayor Clapes' request of 11/19/81. The State will reimburse the City for 30% or \$41,760 of the cost. Jeannette Semon attended and answered questions asked by the Committee members. The vote was 6-0 in favor and I so Move. Seconded.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO APPLY FOR STATE GRANT FOR CHLORINE FACILITIES - MODIFICATION, WATER POLLUTION ABATEMENT FACILITIES - per Mayor Clapes' request 11/19/81; State will reimburse City for 30% (\$41,760) of cost. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to ask Mr. Conti exactly what this chlorine facility entails.

MR. CONTI: First, it is part of the sewage treatment plant on Magee Avenue and they are going to store the chlorine in cylinders instead on tank cars. They will be one ton apiece. They must keep the chlorine at 40 degrees up to fifty degrees, otherwise they have a problem with that. It is a safety factor right now where it is easier to handle the cylinders than it would be the cars. They are going to put up a building which is forty by forty and twenty feet high and it would hold 16 cylinders. The facade would be made of brick to look like the rest of the sewage treatment plants.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Conti is right. The building is 40 x 40 and 20' high. What it will allow the City to do is to control the dosage of the chlorine into the facility more accurately than is presently done. We are mandated to add chlorine to the water year round due to the proximity to the shoreline. I believe we are presently using 3/4 of ton per day and that is 365 days a year.

MR. BLAIS: I would support this measure. I made a few visits to the sewage treatment plant in October. At that time I found them storing chlorine cylinders next to...not next to, but in approximate vicinity of hydrogen peroxide which is a highly corrosive material. I think that there is a potential. I don't know how definite it is of a serious accident occurring and I think that this measure would help alleviate that problem.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Indeed that is precisely what Mrs. Semon said. She said if a cylinder would rupture, it would be very hazardous. They need a permanent facility and this facility that they have suggested is going to be very helpful to reducing any problems as far as danger to the citizens of Stamford.

MR. CONTI: I would like to add a little bit more to that. She also told us that using the cylinders rather than the 90-ton tank would save anywhere from \$5,000-10,000 and it has been passed by the Planning Board and the Board of Finance.

CHMN. DONAHUE: If there is no further discussion, we will move now to a vote. All those in favor of the proposed resolution to apply for State grant for chlorine facilities Modification, Water Pollution Abatement Facilities, please say Aye. Opposed? Abstentions? One abstention, Mrs. Conti. The Motion is passed. 35 in Favor, one abstention.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO APPLY FOR GRANT TO ACQUIRE LaGUARDIA PROPERTY UNDER LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND PROJECT, STATE DEP (adjacent to Carwin Park; also see Resolution #1324, 9/3/81) - Federal share \$37,500; State share \$18,750; Local share \$18,750. Requested by Mayor Clapes 11/20/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

MR. CONTI: Number 2 is the proposed resolution to apply for grants to acquire the LaGuardia Property under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Project, State Department. Adjacent to Carwin Park. I would like to change that from adjacent to "behind Carwin Park" which explains it more clearly. This was requested by Mayor Clapes November 20, 1981. The Federal share is \$37,500, the State share is \$18,750, and the local share is \$18,750. Sandra Gilbane attended and answered questions by the Committee members. The vote was 6 to 0 and I so move.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and seconded. Is there any discussion? There being none, we will move to the vote on the proposed resolution to apply for grants to acquire the LaGuardia Property. All those in Favor, please say Aye. Opposed? One No, Mrs. Conti. Abstentions? The Motion is passed. 33 in Favor and 1 opposed.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) PROPOSED DRAFT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF PERSONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH STATE DEPT. OF HEALTH SERVICES FOR PURPOSE OF HEALTH SCREENING OF REFUGEES (INDO-CHINA, HAITI, CUBA AND OTHER COUNTRIES) SETTLING IN STAMFORD - AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,500, per Mayor Clapes' letter 11/10/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

MR. CONTI: The Committee voted to Hold in Committee. Sandra Gilbane attended. The vote to Hold was 6-0. I would like, therefore, to HOLD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FOR RENOVATION OF YERWOOD CENTER BASEMENT TO HOUSE A HEAD-START CENTER, per Mayor Clapes' request 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

MR. CONTI: Item #4 is for waiver of building permit fee. At last month's L&R meeting, when no quorum was in attendance, Jean Ellis spoke on this matter. At the last Committee meeting, Sandra Gilbane discussed the project with the Committee. The amount involved is \$480. The Committee voted in favor 6-0 and I so Move. Seconded.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Any discussion? There being none, we will go to....Mrs. Maihock?

MRS. MAIHOCK: It was pointed out by Mrs. Ellis if they don't get the funding they are expecting, the City would not be obligated to pay any more than the waiver of the building permit fee.

CHMN. DONAHUE: If there is no further discussion, we will go on to the vote. All those in favor, say AYE. Opposed? Abstentions? It is UNANIMOUS.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING REGULATION OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING, per 12/8/81 letter from James W. Ford, Director of Traffic and Parking. Held in Committee 1/11/82. Proposal is to increase penalties for parking violations; definite procedure for appeals of parking citations; and appropriate provisions to enforce the terms of the ordinance.

MR. CONTI: Item #5 for the proposed ordinance on regulation of traffic and parking was voted to HOLD IN COMMITTEE 6-0. Mr. Ford attended the previous meeting where no quorum was present, but sent apologies for not being able to attend the last meeting. We will notify Mr. Ford that a separate meeting for this item only should be arranged. That concludes my report. The date of the meeting will be Feb. 8th. Mr. Ford has already consented and agreed to attend that night and it will be at 8:00 P.M. in the Republican Caucus Room. This item is, therefore, being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR RAPE CRISIS COORDINATOR OF RAPE CRISIS CENTER - submitted by Rep. Paul Esposito. Held in Committee 11/16/81, and in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81.

THIS ITEM WITHDRAWN.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. STORK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will continue with my report that I began earlier tonight. Item #1 is a proposed resolution regarding medical benefits for Rape Crisis Coordinator of Rape Crisis Center which was submitted by Rep. Esposito. Appearing for this item with Mr. Esposito was Lois Anderson representing the Rape Crisis Center. They told us based upon a reevaluation of the cost and other factors concerning these medical benefits, that they had changed their minds. Therefore, Mr. Esposito informed the Personnel Committee that he withdrew his resolution. So this Board would take no action on this item. We have already reported on Item #2.

- (2) RESUBMISSION - RATIFICATION OF FIREMEN'S LABOR CONTRACT for one year from 7/1/81 to 6/30/82, per Mayor Clapes and Labor Negotiator Thomas Barrett's official ^{first} submission to this Board as of Dec. 19, 1981. Finance Board Chairman Everett Pollard on 12/21/81 advised they will not be issuing an advisory opinion in this instance. This Board on 1/11/82 DENIED the contract. Mayor Clapes re-submitted 1/18/82.

See Page #5 of these Minutes, when Item #2 above was handled.

MR. STORK: Item #3 is the Management Compensation and Merit Evaluation Plan for Administrators. Appearing before our Committee on this item were Mr. Sim Burnstein, Personnel Director, and Mr. Frank Harrison, Budget Director. Due to the fact that our Committee received copies of the Plan that evening, we voted unanimously 4 to 0 to hold this item in Committee, and we will vote on it at our Committee meeting later this month. That concludes my report.

- (3) THE MATTER OF THE MANAGEMENT/COMPENSATION PLAN, MERIT RULES (CIVIL SERVICE REGULATIONS) - as they relate to Compensation of Non-Union Administrators - submitted by Rep. David I. Blum 1/18/82, and as relating to Fiscal item.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

CHMN. DONAHUE: Thank you, Mr. Stork. We will move on to Planning and Zoning. Mrs. Guroian or Mr. Stork, who is giving this report?

MR. STORK: The Planning and Zoning Committee met on Tuesday, January 26th, in the Republican Caucus Room. Members of the Committee in attendance were Reps. Guroian, Signore, and myself. Items 1, 2, and 3 have been HELD IN COMMITTEE by UNANIMOUS vote of 3-0.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) ACCEPTANCE OF COACHLAMP LANE as a City Street - Application 10/19/81 from Petitioner L. Sansone & Sons, Inc. and Atty. John C. Fusaro of Strada, Fusaro, Scherban & Ventre. Held in Committee 11/16/81. Certified 11/16/81 by City Engineer Wm. D. Sabia. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) 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. Held in Committee 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) ACCEPTANCE OF LIGHTHOUSE WAY as a City Street - Running from the westerly side of Ocean Drive West 440 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. Held in Committee 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) REFERRAL CONCERNING ZONING BOARD'S DECISION ON APPLICATION #81-017 TO AMEND SEC. 17 OF ZONING REGULATIONS ENTITLED "APPLICATIONS AND PERMITS, SUBSECTION C - changing the "savings clause", briefly, to the effect that it would require that a foundation permit or building permit be granted and substantial work completed for projects which might subsequently be affected by changes of zoning. Applicant is Zoning Board, who, on 10/26/81 approved its application, as amended. Appeal is brought by petitioners signing and submitting 36 pages of signatures of property owners, pursuant to Charter Section 553.2 of City Charter. Transcript of Zoning Board's proceedings received 12/8/81, 194 pages. Held in Steering 12/10/81. On 1/11/82 this item "Tabled" (Laid on the Table) for February consideration. This Board has until second regular Board Meeting after receipt of submission to act on referral.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. STORK: Item #4 is the referral concerning Zoning Board decision on application #81-017 to amend Section 17 of the Zoning Board Regulations entitled "Applications and Permits, Subsection C". This item was tabled at our Board meeting of January 11th, and before we can proceed with the disposition of this item, it must be brought off the table. Therefore, I MOVE to Take Item #4 Off The Table for action by this Board. Seconded.

ACTING CHAIRMAN DONALD DONAHUE: Any discussion? Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'd like to repeat what I said previously. I think it was put on the Agenda not in conformity, and I don't think it belongs on the Agenda; nor, if we Take It Off The Table, I do not believe that we are empowered to act on it in view of what I said previous to this.

MR. DONAHUE: Is there any other discussion? Mrs. McInerney.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Yes, I would agree with Mrs. Guroian's opinion, and certainly I would hope that all the other members will vote in the same way.

MR. DONAHUE: If there is no further discuss, we will move to....this is Item #4 under Planning and Zoning, and the Motion is to Take that item Off The Table for discussion this evening. All those in favor, please say AYE; opposed? The CHAIR is in doubt. Would the Tellers come forward? Mr. Blais and Mr. Wiederlight.

All those in favor of lifting this item from the table, please raise your hands.

An unidentified male voice: Mr. Chairman, can you repeat that, please?

MR. DONAHUE: All those in favor of lifting Item #4 of the Planning and Zoning Committee off the table, please raise your hands. All those opposed? Abstentions? By a vote of 10 in favor, and 15 opposed, the item is NOT REMOVED FROM THE TABLE. Can we go on?

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. Point of Information. I would like the record to show that by not taking it off the table, that has indicated no action by this Board, and the record should so indicate and the Administrative Assistant should forward the appropriate materials to the Zoning Board indicating that we took no action.

MR. DONAHUE: I'll accept that. Any other discussion?

MRS. GUROIAN: I intended saying the same thing, except that I would add to it that by virtue of the fact that no action was taken by the Board, the decision of the Zoning Board has prevailed.

MR. DONAHUE: That is so noted.

MR. STORK: I would just like to concur with those comments from Mr. Esposito and Mrs. Guroian that that was the advice that I was given by Corporation Counsel should the action that this Board take tonight occur. That concludes our report.

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Chairman Burtis Flounders

- (1) THE MATTER OF DISCONTINUANCE OF CITY GARBAGE COLLECTION SERVICE TO COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN STAMFORD. Requested by Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi 7/8/81. Held in Committee 8/3, 9/9, 10/5 and 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held 1/19/82 at Special Meeting.

MR. FLOUNDERS: The Public Works Committee met on Thursday, January 28th. A quorum was present to conduct the Committee's business. It consisted of Robert Fauteux, Ann King Saxe, John Roos and myself, Burt Flounders. George Connors, Administrative Officer of the Sewer Commission, and Commissioner Spaulding at the Committee's request also attended this meeting. Item #1 regarding the matter of discontinuance of City garbage collection service to commercial properties in Stamford was discussed at length using as the basis of discussion Rep. Rinaldi's letter of July 8, 1981 to the President of the Board. The Committee by a vote of 4 to 0 decided to lay this matter on the table pending the receipt of updated information from Rep. Rinaldi who was not present at this meeting.

- (2) LETTER RE PURCHASE OF TRUCKS WITH FRONT-END LOADERS TO PICK UP DUMPSTERS AT CONDOMINIUMS - submitted by Rep. David Blum 10/22/81. Held in Committee at Steering 10/26/81, also 12/10/81. Held at 1/19/82 Special Meeting.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Item #2 regarding trucks with front-end loaders came to us from the written recommendation dated October 22, 1981 from Rep. Blum that the City purchase trucks with front-end loaders to pick up dumpsters at condominiums. Specifically, Rep. Blum's suggestion was that the City purchase two front-end loading trucks using funds from the surplus declared by the City for fiscal year 1981-82. The Committee determined that such funding is legally prohibited; That such trucks would have to be financed by the capital programs procedure. Moreover, the Committee looked into the matter also suggested by Rep. Blum's letter, that there were approximately 50 letters from condominium owners who are part of the Rock Spring Terrace Association expressing displeasure at the discontinuance of garbage collection from their properties. Our Committee has been in touch with the Plaza Realty Company, who manages the Condominiums referred to by Mr. Blum, and they report that they are quite satisfied with their private collection and indeed preferred their pick up. Hence, because this issue of condominium owners and sewer tax district is more relevantly an issue of collection vs. possible compensation from the City for garbage collection, then it is a question of dumpsters vs. no dumpsters. The Committee voted 4 to 0 in favor of rejecting Mr. Blum's request and instead asking the President of the Board to include on our next Steering Agenda the Public Works Committee's broader examination of the whole issue of commercial garbage collection, the proposed ordinance from Commissioner Spaulding submitted to the Board September 9, 1981 which concerns a tax credit for refuse collection. Within the context of this broader question, the Public Works Committee would then consider the question of the economics of collection vs. the economics of tax credits, along the line recently suggested by Rep. Blais in his letter of January 28, 1982

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION OF SANITARY SEWER EASEMENTS THROUGH AND UNDER THE PROPERTY OF ROBERT J. WEST AND ANN WEST, FRANK R. AND FLORIDA M. VALENTI, AND BARRY E. AND JO ANN CALLAHAN NECESSARY FOR THE COMPLETION OF WINDELL PLACE SANITARY SEWER PROJECT, per request of Mayor Louis A. Clapes 12/4/81 and George Connors, Jr. 11/23/81. Held in Steering 12/28/81.

MR. FLOUNDERS: We have one more item on the Public Works Agenda, Item #3 also considered on this agenda is the proposed resolution authorizing condemnation of sanitary sewer easements through and under the property of Robert J. West and Ann West, Frank R. and Florida M. Valenti, and Barry E. and Jo-ann Callahan necessary for the completion of Windell Place Sanitary Sewer Project. The problem with Windell Place which runs east and west and is situated just off Glenbrook Road between Glenbrook Road and the Railroad tracks, is that the railroad tracks form an unnatural barrier for water which causes the septic tanks in the 8 two-family homes in Windell Place to be flooded out. The City can correct this problem by connecting Windell Place through City Sanitary and Storm Sewers which already exist on Culloden Road which lies to the South of Windell Place but which is separated from Windell Place by the 4 private properties named in the condemnation resolution. Since this resolution was originally drawn and in a letter dated January 9, 1982, Robert J. West and Ann West have officially volunteered an easement through their land so there is no longer a need to include the West property in the easement proceedings. The Public Works Committee urges approval of its revised resolution which has been placed on everyone's desk tonight. Approval by this Board will give Corporation Counsel the authority to petition the Court to sanction the two remaining condemnation easements.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and Seconded. Any discussion?

MRS. SAXE: Mr. Flounders, on the information that you gave us, you show sanitary sewers and the street sewers, the storm sewers. On the proposal given on the agenda, it does not say the storm sewers.

MR. FLOUNDERS: As to the storm sewers, I am told...Mr. Connors automatically put in with the sanitary service.

CHMN. DONAHUE: There being no further discussion, I'll call for a vote. Those in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? Abstentions? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. FLOUNDERS: That concludes the Public Works Committee's report.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairman Paul Dziezyc

- (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 January, 1981. Published 3/11/81. Held in Committee 7/6, 8/3 and 9/14/81. Approved for re-publication 10/5/81. Held for 17th Board 11/14/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81, Returned to Committee at Special Meeting of 1/19/82.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DZIEZYC: The Committee met on Tuesday, Jan. 26, 1982, with Barbara deGaetani, Joe Tarzia, and myself attending. Rep. Mary Jane Signore was also there. We voted for public hearing and publication of the water ordinance. There are a few minor typographical errors that we corrected in the ones that you received. On Page 2, the 100 they supply should read 120. On Page 3, #11 should be request it, not its. #12, unless required to insure that the deleterious ingredients are not incorporated. In Section 5, Restrictions - we removed a quantity of water that can be used. That is it, and I so Move.

CHMN. DONAHUE: So you would be moving for publication, as amended?

MRS. CONTI: Point of Order. The agenda says final adoption.

CHMN. DONAHUE: It does, but as has been past practice in this Board, an item published prior to the time that this Board sits requires re-publication. It happened like that two years ago and I believe the ordinance was the abandonment of Crosby Street, as a matter of fact.

MR. DIXON: I Move the Question.

CHMN. DONAHUE: Moved and Seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The question has been moved.

We will now go to the Main Motion which is to recommend publication for final adoption...or publication of the proposed ordinance supplemental as amended, adopting the regulations restricting use of water during a water shortage. All in favor? Opposed? Could we have the Tellers up here in front, please? The Chair is in doubt. Please raise your hands, if you are in favor. All opposed to publication? Abstentions? The Motion is LOST by a vote of 14 in favor and 12 opposed.

MRS. CONTI: ^{Point of Order?} There is a resolution attached to this ordinance. What about that? What disposition has to be made of that? This is a separate resolution; it has nothing to do with the ordinance. It is a completely separate resolution.

CHMN. DONAHUE: It is not on the agenda.

MR. DZIEZYC: It was part of the ordinance.

MRS. GUROIAN: May I ask a question of the Chairman about the water situation? I would like to know if he knows how full the reservoirs are?

MR. DZIEZYC: As of 3:00 p.m. this afternoon, it was 75% of capacity and 265 days....

MR. DIXON: Point of Order. The Motion has been denied to publish the ordinance, so we have no further discussion on this.

CHMN. DONAHUE: I accepted Mrs. Guroian's question as a Point of Information. I believe Mr. Dziezyc is going to be short and to the point.

MR. DZIEZYC: Yes, very fast. 265 days' supply based on an average consumption of 14 million gallons per day.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) PROPOSED CREATION OF A DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES FOR THE PURPOSES OF INSTITUTING ADVANCED LIFE SUPPORT IN STAMFORD - submitted by Rep. Michael Wiederlight 12/3/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee at Special Meeting 1/19/82.

MR. DZIEZYC: Item #2 was HELD IN COMMITTEE because Mr. Wiederlight did not attend and he didn't give us any information.

- (3) THE MATTER OF THE MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING, 429 Atlantic Street, concerning fire alarm system - from Fire Marshal Carmine Sperenza 12/31/81 letter; also Supt. of Bldgs. & Grounds John Strat's response.

MR. DZIEZYC: On Item #3, Carmine Sperenza attended. He is the Fire Marshal of the City and he presented some interesting information about the City's Municipal Office Building. There is no fire alarm system in here. There are many violations that occurred. He would like to....one thing he wants the is the Fire Alarm System. We'll have to keep it in Committee to get all the information. And second, he wants the education of the employees and others who use this building in regard to where the fire doors are, to keep the doors closed. And don't get caught in the elevators if there is a fire, or smoke.

All combustible material should be removed from the Central Supply. There are chemicals, inks, and other chemicals and volatiles there. What we are doing is HOLDING IT IN COMMITTEE for further information.

Bruce Spaulding said that they have a design for overhauling the complete switchgear wiring for City Hall, the Municipal Office Building, that is. A fire alarm system design is in process and should be completed shortly. When this is done, he will submit a transfer of funds of approximately \$100,000 from an existing Capital fund. and it should be completed in about two months. That concludes our report.

EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert Fauteux.

NO REPORT.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Chairman David I. Blum

- (1) THE MATTER OF PERSONNEL POLICIES OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. Held in Committee 9/9 and 10/5/81. Held in Committee 10/26/81 at Mayor's request to hold for an additional month. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held at Special Meeting of 1/19/82.

CHMN. DONAHUE: There is no report from Education, Welfare and Government Committee. Mr. Blum has left the meeting so there is no report from Public Housing and Community Development.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Chairman John Roos

NO REPORT.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

NO REPORT.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

NO REPORT.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE

NO REPORT.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

NONE.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION OPPOSING STAMFORD WATER COMPANY'S PROPOSED 47.31% RATE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF WATER - submitted by Rep. John R. Zelinski, Jr., 1/8/82.

CHMN. DONAHUE: I have a Motion to accept that resolution. Moved and Seconded. All those in favor, say AYE. Opposed? Abstentions? The Motion is CARRIED.

There is a Motion that we Adjourn. All those in favor? Opposed? This meeting is adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the Board, the Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 A.M. Moved and Seconded.

By

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

APPROVED:

HMM:MS

Jeanne - Lois Santy
Jeanne Lois Santy, President
17th Board of Representatives