

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, APRIL 5, 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, APRIL 5, 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 8:40 p.m. by the President, Jeanne-Lois Santy, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION: Given by Charles F. Magistro, Pastor of the Unitarian Universalist Society of Stamford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President Jeanne-Lois Santy

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville Called the Roll.
Present were 36 members with 4 absent. Absent were
Reps. Flounders, Stork, Goldstein and Signore.

The President declared a QUORUM was present.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: Good working order.

PAGES: None

MOMENTS OF SILENCE: For the late John Bosilevas of Oaklawn Ave. by Rep. J. Zelinski.
For the late John Hogan of W. Trail Rd., by Rep. McInerney.
Mr. Hogan was 49 years old and the father of 7 children.
A wonderful devoted father, husband and good friend.
For the late Randy Burns by Rep. Summerville. His mother
was the ex-President of the Democratic Women's Club and
lives in the 1st District.

STANDING COMMITTEES

THE PRESIDENT asked for a Motion to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report. Seconded. Carried.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the STEERING COMMITTEE was held on Monday, March 22, 1982, in the Democratic Caucus Room, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:15 p.m., when a Quorum was present. President Santy called the meeting to order.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman
Barbara McInerney
John Boccuzzi
Handy Dixon
Audrey Maihock
Gerald Rybnick
James Dudley
Annie Summerville
Joseph Tarzia
Anthony Conti
John Roos

Donald Donahue
Mary Jane Signore
Robert DeLuca
Paul Dziezyc
Robert Fauteux
Paul Esposito
Sandra Goldstein
Jeremiah Livingston
David Blum
Mary Lou Rinaldi
Brian Ward, Station WSTC

Lathen Under

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(1) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN COMMITTEE were the remaining names: 1) Loren Jaffe, reappointment to the Zoning Board of Appeals; 2) Peter F. Canzano, reappointment to the Patriotic & Special Events Commission; 3) Ronald Bane, reappointment to the Transit District.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA BUT PLACED ON THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE'S AGENDA was one item from the Tentative Steering Agenda: RE: Why Group Westinghouse did not undergo CAM review before Zoning Board. (From Addenda)

(3) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

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

(4) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

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

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA BUT HELD IN COMMITTEE were six items submitted by R. Gofstein, Dir. Health Dept.

(5) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 16 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA BUT PLACED ON THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE'S AGENDA: RE: Ordinance & Resolution authorizing the Zoning Board to employ Zoning Analyst.

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were two items: 1) Tax abatement for Hanrahan Center and 2) Dolphin Cove Committee re mill rate.

(6) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA but Held in Committee were three items: 1) Resolution from Classified Employees' Retirement Fund Board of Trustees; 2) Matter of Change of Insurance Carrier; 3) J. Livingston's request to change status of Human Rights Director to civil service status. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the Matter of Management/Compensation Plan, Merit Rules, etc.

(7) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were six items (four from the Tentative Steering Agenda and two from the Addenda (1 from EP and 1 from L&R)).

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA but Held in Committee until information from the Engineer is received is one item re; Huckleberry Hollow as city street.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(8) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four items on the Tentative Steering Agenda.
ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was one item re Acceptance of Bid #S-3986. This item has been taken care-of.

(9) PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

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

(10) CHARTER REVISION, ORDINANCE COMMITTEE MATTERS

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

(11) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item on the Tentative Steering Agenda.
ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA BUT PLACED and Held for discussion was the Resolution for Relocation of the Municipal Offices.

(12) TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MATTERS

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

(13) FISCAL COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 21 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(14) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three Resolutions on the Tentative Steering Agenda.
ORDER OFF THE AGENDA BUT PLACED and Held for discussion in the Education, Welfare and Government Committee was the Resolution for Relocation of the Municipal Offices.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion duly made, Seconded and Carried, the Meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

JLS:ak

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman
Steering Committee

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairperson Mary Jane Signore and Handy Dixon

MR. DIXON said his Committee met on Thursday, April 1, 1982. Present were Reps. DeGaetani, M. Perillo, Tarzia, Boccuzzi, DeLuca and Dixon. Co-Chairperson Signore was absent due to illness.

MR. DIXON placed on the Consent Agenda items #1 and #2. The proper motions were made and carried so the items might properly be before the Board.

BOARD OF ETHICSTERM EXPIRES

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| (1) <u>WILLIAM MENAPACE</u> (D) | Additional member per Ord. #445 | June 30, 1983 |
| 1500 Hope Street | | |

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDAPARK COMMISSION

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| (2) <u>KIERAN HICKEY</u> (D) | Replacing Charles Stobbie | Dec. 1, 1984 |
| 46 Wedgemere Road | whose term expired. | |

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDAMAYOR'S CABINET - CORPORATION COUNSEL

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| (3) <u>P. BENEDICT FRASER</u> (R) | Nov. 30, 1983 |
| 27 Balwood Road | |
| Old Greenwich, CT 06870 | |

MR. DIXON stated that Mr. Fraser is not a resident-elect of Stamford as required by Sec. 706 of the Charter, it would be necessary to waive or suspend the requirements in order to act on the Appointment. MR. DIXON referred to an opinion issued by a former Corporation Counsel, Joel Freedman in 1974. This opinion has been referred to and sustained by other heads of the Law Department as recent as December 21, 1981 by Counsel Cookney. Mr. Cookney issued the following: "Pursuant to Sec. 706 of the Stamford Charter, every person appointed to office shall be and remain a resident-elect of the City of Stamford." Said Section goes on to provide for a waiver or suspension of this requirement. It provides in specific cases, that the Board of Representatives may suspend this requirement by majority vote of its entire membership. The vote requirement was added by referendum in 1977. Twenty-one (21) affirmative votes of the Board is required to suspend the resident requirement.

MR. DIXON MOVED for Suspension of the requirement to consider the appointment of Mr. Fraser for Corporation Counsel. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY. (Voice vote)

MR. DIXON stated that Mr. Fraser has lived in the Riverside-Greenwich area for the past 34 years. Mr. Fraser has served many years in Stamford. Mr. Fraser also served as Assistant Prosecutor, Circuit Court, and is presently associated with Fraser, Bello and Lapine Law firm. MR. DIXON further stated that Mr. Fraser has an excellent background and much knowledge of our Law Department.

MR. DIXON said that the Appointments Committee approved Mr. Fraser by unanimous vote. MOVED, SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to confirm Mr. Fraser. APPROVED by a vote of 28 YES, 1 NO, and 7 ABSTENTIONS.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (Continued)ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARDTERM EXPIRES

(4) <u>WILLIAM MORRIS (D)</u> 33 Fenway Street	Replacing H. Kohn whose term expired.	Dec. 1, 1984
---	--	--------------

MR. DIXON stated that Mr. Morris has been a resident of Stamford for 30 years. Mr. DIXON gave a brief resume of Mr. Morris' background and said that Mr. Morris is a member of the American Boatbuilders and Repairers' Association, member of the Connecticut Marine Trade Association, member of the U. S. Coast Guard Auxiliary and a member and guest panelist of the Oceanic Society. Mr. Morris is employed at Yacht Haven, Inc., in Stamford.

MR. DIXON said that Mr. Morris has demonstrated a great amount of courage and willingness to serve on the Environmental Protection Board and the Appointments Committee believed that Mr. Morris would be an asset to the City. The Appointments Committee voted unanimously to approved Mr. Morris and MR. DIXON MOVED for confirmation. SECONDED.

MR. WHITE stated that he saw nothing in the perspective that was sent to the Board that would indicate any commitment to environment or ecology. MR. WHITE saw a background which would indicate Marine concerns in terms of commercial aspects. MR. WHITE said that one should have the commitment to stand-up and follow through to the vested commercial development interest of Stamford.

MR. DeLUCA stated that when interviewing Mr. Morris, Mr. Morris stated that he was concerned what happens along the coast, about flood-plain areas and wetlands. MR. DeLUCA said that the Committee felt Mr. Morris deserved a 6-0 favorable recommendation.

MRS. CONTI asked MR. WHITE if he felt that there was anything that would constitute a conflict-of-interest or the appearance of one.

MR. WHITE responded, "no, not really."

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Morris' confirmation. APPROVED by a vote of 31 YES, 1 ABSTENTION and 4 NOT VOTING.

The Consent Agenda was APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. ZELINSKI made a Motion to Suspend the Rules to take-up Item #2 on the Personnel Agenda. MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. GERSHMAN spoke against this Motion as the Chairman of Personnel was not present.

MRS. SUMMERVILLE said she was in favor of the Motion and to consider the audience.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to Suspend the Rules. The Motion was DEFEATED by a vote of 11 YES, 23 NO and 2 NOT VOTING.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock, Chairwoman

MRS. MAIHOCK stated that her Committee had no specific items before the Board this evening. Her Committee was the Secondary Committee on another item on the Agenda and she would address this item when it appears before the Board.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA stated that his Committee met on Monday, February 22, 1982. Attending were Reps. Owens, Franchina, and Recreation Superintendent Bruno Giordano.

- (1) RECREATION DEPARTMENT'S PROPOSED FEES FOR 1982-1983 - submitted by Supt. Bruno E. Giordano 1/28/82. Approval requested. Held 3/1/82.

MR. DeLUCA stated that his Committee voted 3 in favor and none opposed to accept the fees with some changes that were approved by the Supt. Giordano and members of the Recreation Board. The changes would be under Paddle Tennis (per hour) \$5.00 minimum per court, original fee was \$3.00. Non-residents \$3.00 per person, original fee was \$2.00. Also, Swimming Pool, Westhill High School \$1.50 adults, original fee was \$1.00; \$ 1.00 high School students, original fee was \$.50; \$.50 children, original fee was \$.25; The family of 4 - \$2 maximum is being deleted.

MR. DeLUCA said that these recommended increases would let the user pay for these facilities which would help to relieve our tax burden. MR. DeLUCA MOVED for acceptance of the new fees. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI and MRS. MAIHOCK questioned the fee for non-residents use on the Paddle Tennis courts.

MR. DeLUCA stated that the fee would be \$5.00 minimum per court for residents and \$3.00 per person for non-residents.

MR. LIVINGSTON questioned the fee for elementary students for use of the Westhill swimming pool. He stated that these students should use the pool free-of-charge. MR. LIVINGSTON said these students should be encouraged to learn how to swim. He said a \$.50 fee may discourage some of these students from using the pool.

MR. DeLUCA stated that the ages of these children would be probably between 5 and 10 years old. He stated that these children would probably be accompanied by their parents and did not think \$.50 was an exorbitant fee.

MRS. McINERNEY supported MR. DeLUCA'S proposed fee change of \$.50.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the fees as proposed by MR. DeLUCA. All other fees on the Schedule would remain the same. APPROVED with changes by 36 YES votes (UNANIMOUSLY).

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA said his Committee met with the Parks Commission on Tuesday, March 30, 1982 to discuss funds for Veterans Park and the remaining items on his Agenda. MR. DeLUCA placed items #3, 3A, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7A on the CONSENT AGENDA. The proper motions were made for approval of the Consent Agenda.

(2) PARKS DEPARTMENT'S PROPOSED PERMIT FEES FOR PARKING STICKERS - submitted by Parks Department 3/18/82.

MR. DeLUCA stated that Item #2 was rejected at his previous meeting. He said a letter was received from the Parks Commission requested that everyone except Senior Citizens be \$ 3.00 per car and Seniors would pay \$ 1.00. This would be the first increase in 26 years. Darien has increased their fees to \$ 7.00 per car, and \$ 5.00 for each junior resident. Greenwich charges \$ 7.00 for each adult and \$ 5.00 for each junior resident; 14 years and younger.

MR. DeLUCA said that his Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed for a \$ 2.00 fee and a \$ 1.00 for Seniors and MOVED these proposed fees be approved. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI asked his colleagues to turn down the fees proposed by MR. DeLUCA. MR. ZELINSKI recalled that the purpose of the \$ 1.00 beach sticker fee was to control and maintain that only Stamford residents use the beach facilities. He felt that, at least, keep the beach fee at a \$ 1.00.

MR. WIDER spoke against any increases especially for our Seniors and said that \$ 1.00 was enough for people to pay to drive to the park.

MRS. CONTI spoke to amend MR. DeLUCA'S motion to make the fee \$ 3.00. She felt \$ 3.00 for a car was reasonable, and cost to operate our facilities must be brought more in line with the revenues; and MOVED to make it \$ 3.00 per car. SECONDED.

MR. LIVINGSTON spoke against the amendment and the proposal made.

MR. DIXON was opposed to the amendment and to all fees to use the Parks in the City; not because of the dollars but of the principle. The Parks were built and paid for by taxpayers' dollars; taxpayers should have the opportunity to use the Parks for the dollars they have already spent.

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. CONTI repeated her Motion to amend MR. DeLUCA'S motion that the fee should be \$ 3.00 for a car.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. The amendment was DEFEATED by a vote of 10 YES, 23 NO and 3 NOT VOTING.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he favored the \$ 2.00. He felt that if the Parks Department had more revenue coming in to offset their Operating Budget which would include protection against vandalism, protection when events are going-on in the Parks, protection for the Marinas; the people who use the Parks would also be benefiting from the extra \$ 1.00 for protection.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ROOS spoke in favor of the \$ 2.00 fee. He also thought this would provide for better protection in the Parks. He did not think that the statement that it is a public Park and we should not be paying to use it, is valid. The skating rink and golf courses charge fees.

MR. DZIEZYC asked MR. DeLUCA if he knew how many \$ 1.00 stickers were sold last year.

MR. DeLUCA could not answer that question.

MR. DZIEZYC asked how much it costs the Parks Department to maintain our beaches.

MR. DeLUCA stated that the proposed increase in these fees would bring in approximately \$20,000 extra. This could off-set the security costs that is being discussed.

MR. ZELINSKI made a Motion to amend the proposed fee of \$ 2.00 to \$ 1.00. **SECONDED.**

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a POINT OF INFORMATION. He stated that if the \$ 2.00 fee is defeated, we are at \$ 1.00.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that there may be another amendment for a \$ 1.50 fee.

THE PRESIDENT stated that discussion is on the amendment to reduce the \$ 2.00 fee to a \$ 1.00.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that the Board must think in terms of cost-recovery. We have expenses and they must be met. Taxation is not the only other way. A \$ 2.00 or \$ 1.00 user fee would be in line with utilization of a facility. It should be increased at this point as expenses have risen.

MR. ZELINSKI said that this was double taxation.

MR. GAIPA stated that the money needed for the Parks Department for security is \$50,000 to \$60,000. This must be raised by either taxation or raising the fee from \$ 1.00 to \$ 2.00. Last year, approximately 15,000 people used the beaches. If we do not raise the fees, it means that 87,000 people are going to pay for the use of the beaches. He stated there is nothing wrong with raising the fee by a \$ 1.00 so that the people participating can help in paying that bill.

MR. CONTI stated that the dollar was a control over the fact that the citizens of Stamford would be allowed to use the beaches and the lack of that sticker would keep the out-of-towners off the beaches. If we were to raise money, we could make more money by selling stickers to out-of-towners than to local residents. If we are going to off-set the cost, we should think of a higher fee, not a lower fee. The question now is strictly a control measure. This is not a money raising measure and should be kept at \$ 1.00.

MRS. McINERNEY said it may appear to be a control measure but in order to maintain the parking lots, it cost the Parks Department over \$50,000 a year and another \$20,000 to operate the beach facilities. A \$ 1.00 for the sticker; we are operating under a projected deficit well in excess of \$45,000. Not all residents of Stamford use the beach facilities but are taxed for them. MRS. McINERNEY stated that we must look to other avenues to raise revenues. She supported the \$ 2.00 fee and urged her colleagues to vote against the \$ 1.00 fee.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on MR. ZELINSKI'S MOTION to amend the \$ 2.00 proposed fee to \$ 1.00. The MOTION was DEFEATED by a vote of 7 YES, 24 NO, and 5 NOT VOTING.

MR. DeLUCA repeated the MOTION based on his Committee's recommendation; \$ 2.00 per car fee and \$ 1.00 fee for Seniors. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the main question. APPROVED with 27 YES, 8 NO VOTES and 1 NOT VOTING.

- (3) SPRINGDALE FIRE COMPANY'S request to hang banner across Hope Street in front of Firehouse, 987 Hope Street to announce their annual Firemen's Parade & Carnival from May 24 to June 26, 1982. Requested by Norman Fox, Carnival Chairman, 82 St. Charles Avenue, Springdale, CT 06907.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (3A) SPRINGDALE FIRE COMPANY'S request permission to hold their Annual Firemen's Parade and Carnival scheduled for June 23rd through June 26, 1982. Parade to be held June 23, 1982 at 7:00 p.m. beginning at Hope Street and Toms Road and proceeding to Firehouse. Requested by Norman Fox, Carnival Chairman, 82 St. Charles Avenue, Springdale, CT 06907.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND SYNAGOGUES' request 3/11/82 to hold CROP HUNGER WALK on 5/2/82 to raise funds. Route starts at Scalzi Park, stops at 6 churches, back to Scalzi; as per map submitted for a 12 mile walk. Requested by Jane Holt, Chairman, Arrangements Committee, 628 Main Street, Stamford, CT 06901.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (5) THE EXCHANGE CLUB OF STAMFORD requests to hang banner across Summer Street from IHOP, to announce Annual Bicycle Sale, Saturday, 5/8/82. Banner to be hung April 16 through May 8, 1982. Requested by Frank Sanfilippo, DDS, 13 Church Street, Stamford, CT 06906.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (6) FAIRFIELD COUNTY CHAPTER, MARCH OF DIMES BIRTH DEFECTS FOUNDATION, 57 Danbury Road, Wilton, CT 06897, Ms. Abby Platt, Chapter Rep. phone 834-0386, request to hold SECOND ANNUAL WALK-AMERICA on Sunday, April 25th at Cove Island Park. Start at Cove Island Park, up Weed Avenue to Post Road, then through Darien, on to Calf Pastures Beach in Norwalk, and return along same route to Cove Island Park for the finish.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (7) STAMFORD JUNIOR WOMAN'S CLUB, INC. request permission to hang banner across Bedford Street from April 25 through May 8, 1982 to announce their 14th Annual Arts & Craft Show. Submitted by Rebecca D. Kanan, Publicity Co-Chairwoman, 13 Fenway Street, Stamford, CT.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (7A) STAMFORD JUNIOR WOMAN'S CLUB, INC. request permission to hold their 14th Annual Arts & Craft Show on Saturday, May 8th (rain date, May 9th) at Latham Park on Bedford Street to benefit Hospice of Stamford. Submitted by Rebecca D. Kanan, Publicity Co-Chairwoman, 13 Fenway Street, Stamford, CT.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (8) THE MATTER OF VETERANS PARK - submitted by Rep. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA stated that he would like to reserve comments on this item as the Secondary Committee under Fiscal.

MR. DeLUCA repeated the Consent Agenda. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to Suspend the Rules to take-up item #6 of Fiscal which concerns Veterans Park. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED with 32 YES votes and 4 NO vote being B. Conti, G. Guroian, W. Gaipa and R. DeLuca.

- (6) \$300,000.00 - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - PARKS DEPARTMENT -
by adding a project to be known as #610.891 VETERANS PARK
MODIFICATION: to be financed by taxation. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

MR. ESPOSITO stated that Fiscal met Monday, March 29, 1982 on this issue. This item was recommended by the Planning Board and the Board of Finance. This Modification will link the new Saks Store with Downtown. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention and MR. ESPOSITO so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DeLUCA stated that as the Secondary Committee, his Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed to recommend that the City does not incur any expense for the proposal presented by the Delta Group as it relates to Veterans Park. MR. DeLUCA said his Committee suggested a Task Force to be set-up to explore the following: 1) Negotiate with F. D. Rich and Saks whereby to sell the land in question for \$ 1.00 with the proviso that Rich and Saks carry-out the proposal submitted by the Delta Group. If this failed, the second recommendation would be that URC release their funds to pay for the project since it was primarily through their mistakes that the City does not have a passageway linking the old with the new. This agreement was in their contracts, notes and Minutes dating back 5 or 6 years ago where the URC was suppose to see to it that a passageway existed.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA further stated that his Committee's third recommendation would be that the merchants along Bedford and Atlantic Streets and surrounding areas, who are so concerned about this project, should be assessed per merchant to cover the project. MR. DeLUCA said that this would be their way to show their good-faith that they are concerned about revitalization of downtown Stamford.

MR. DeLUCA stated that his Committee is in favor of the concept presented by the Delta Group but definitely feel that no expense should be incurred by the City.

MR. DeLUCA'S Committee voted 4 in favor of his report and none opposed. This was total disagreement with the Fiscal Committee's report. MR. DeLUCA stated that on September 8, 1981, the Committee approved a Resolution that the City should not incur any expense.

MS. SUMMERVILLE urged that all reconsider and especially members of the Parks and Recreation Committee to vote for this appropriation. She also has been dissatisfied with things that happened with Urban Renewal. She stated that she was not in favor of setting-up a Blue-Ribbon Panel, and that we had enough planning with our Planning Board and the other Boards that are working with the downtown revitalization.

MS. SUMMERVILLE was presented by the merchants, petitions with over 300 signatures. These signatures come from all over the City; Westover Road, Pepper Ridge Road, Hope Street, etc. She asked that the Board support this appropriation.

MRS. CONTI stated that her position was the same as on the last Board when it was voted not to permit desecration of this Park and also that there would be no expense to the City of Stamford. She opposed any expense on the part of the taxpayers to take care of this Park at this point in time. She said that the residential taxpayer is, once again, being assessed to beautify the downtown for the commercial interest who can well afford to do it themselves.

MR. WIDER stated that we have something that has to be corrected. He spoke as one of the persons who help to build the Park. He felt that if the Park was to be put in good condition, then it was worth more than \$300,000. He asked that the people who are going to use the Park vote to make it something that they as well as out-of-towners would be proud of.

MR. ESPOSITO sensed that there were many issues to be discussed and MOVED that this item be RETURNED TO COMMITTEE. SECONDED.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT asked what would be accomplished by this item going back to Committee.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that MR. DeLUCA raised questions that deserve attention and he had some questions also. MR. ESPOSITO said that he was not convinced that having this \$300,000 and the entrance into the Mall would bring traffic out on Atlantic Street. MR. ESPOSITO said he requested information on signs being placed in the Mall. He got indication that that was feasible. He would want this clarified. Some agreements should be reached before this is approved.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES - ITEM #6 OF FISCAL RE: \$300,000 FOR VETERANS PARK

MR. BLUM questioned why MR. ESPOSITO has a feeling that a concern would put signs up leading away from another place. The 16th Board voted to support the small merchants, keeping their stores and hoping that the Mall would bring people to the City. How do we have to get these people out of the Mall now?

MR. DeLUCA stated there are many unanswered questions. We can reject this item tonight and still negotiate. Saks and the developers are having problems obtaining a building permit. This will delay the project for several months. We have two choices; Return to Committee or reject the funds and we can still set-up a Task Force to negotiate to try to get the three recommendations of the Committee together. MR. DeLuca said that maybe all three groups can divide-up an equal share to pay for the cost. MR. DeLUCA stated that the petition was received but he received many phone calls and met many people that told him to make cuts to the budget and make sure you cut the \$300,000 for the Park.

MR. BLAIS implored fellow members to send this item Back to Committee. He stated that this may be the most important issue facing this Board. He stated that he intended to vote in favor of the main Motion but also saw some detriment in the Motion. He did not think that we could afford to make a hasty decision without all the fact at-hand. 30 days for such a weighty question is not a long time to wait.

MR. BOCCUZZI spoke in favor of sending Back to Committee. He said we should look at the recommendations made by the Parks and Recreation Committee; also, stated that the Board must decide if the \$300,000 is a worthwhile expenditure at this time. He said the last Board made a mistake in turning-down 8 and 9 Blocks and would not want a hasty decision at this time for the \$300,000 would have a long range affect on the City. MR. BOCCUZZI said there was a lot of merit to the Petition brought in by MS. SUMMERVILLE. Also, there are merits to the suggestions MR. DeLUCA made. He stated that the Board would be wise to Return to Committee and wait 30 days. If we reject tonight, it will be two or three months before this appears before us. If a mistake is made, three months may be too long a time.

MR. LIVINGSTON agreed with MR. BOCCUZZI. He was in favor of sending Back to Committee.

MR. GAIPA was in favor of sending Back to Committee for two reasons: 1) further study on how much the activity in the Park will take place from pathways and walks, such as a proposed restaurant that was not on the original plan; entrance to Landmark 6 that was not on the original plan and also advise the Fiscal Committee to take a look at the specifications' list in terms of the cost of each item. He stated that the \$300,000 seems soft because a few things have been added like 20% for contingencies. This may be good operating procedure but he did not know but that is not a definite \$41,000 that will be spent. There is \$20,000 for what is called a "fine arts allowance" and someone should check with the Veterans group to see if they want this added on to the Park. If they don't, \$20,000 maybe saved. There is also \$30,000 for furnishings, etc. May be some garden groups could save us some money here.

MR. GAIPA agreed to send Back to Committee would be a good move.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES - ITEM #6 OF FISCAL RE: \$300,000 FOR VETERANS PARK

MS. SUMMERVILLE stated that listening to MR. GAIPA she said she saw no other reason than to send it Back to Committee because she felt there was misinformation given and we do not fully understand what the \$300,000 is for.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she received a letter from the Executive Vice President of the Stamford Savings Bank. She stated this letter explained much about the Park. This letter was received by all and she hoped that all would read it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE stated to please reconsider sending it Back to Committee.

MR. DeLUCA asked for a Point of Information. He stated a Motion was made to send Back to Committee but did not know what Committee. He recommended that this item go back to the Parks and Recreation Committee.

THE PRESIDENT stated that it would go back to Fiscal and Parks and Recreation Committees. It is a Fiscal appropriation plus the Parks and Recreation Committee is the Secondary Committee.

MR. DeLUCA asked if there was any way that could be worked out for a Co-Committee rather than just a Secondary Committee.

THE PRESIDENT stated that she did not think so; it would go to Fiscal for the appropriation and Parks and Recreation as the Secondary Committee.

MR. DeLUCA stated that it would make a different impact as to who would be the controlling source.

THE PRESIDENT stated that MR. DeLUCA'S Committee was the Secondary Committee and his Committee was needed for approval for that amount of money. It would go back to both Committees. An arrangement with MRS. HAWK, MR. ESPOSITO and MR. DeLUCA would be alright.

MRS. McINERNEY stated that the Board owed all taxpayers and everyone who had a stake in the URC program not to act in haste but to consider and evaluate all the facts carefully before voting. She felt that we did not have all the necessary information at this point in time to make a valued judgment on the need for the \$300,000. She supported the move to return this item to Committee and felt that it was time for the Parks and Recreation Committee to follow some of their steps and made a suggestion to THE PRESIDENT that something be worked out to have that Committee be the initiating Committee in this action.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that he and MRS. HAWK discussed this with MR. DeLUCA and although it would be returned to Fiscal with Parks and Recreation as the Secondary Committee, Fiscal would not really deal with it. Fiscal has budget hearings this month and would be exclusively in the hands of MR. DeLUCA and the Parks and Recreation Committee.

THE PRESIDENT stated she was in total agreement with that if MR. DeLUCA was.

MR. DeLUCA stated, "yes."

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (Continued)

UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES - ITEM #6 OF FISCAL RE: \$300,000 FOR VETERANS PARK

MR. DUDLEY MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MRS. GUROIAN requested a Point of Order: She asked if after voting on this, if there could be a 5 minute recess.

THE PRESIDENT replied, "certainly."

MR. BOCCUZZI requested a Roll Call Vote. SECONDED. CARRIED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE, CLERK called the Roll for the vote to RETURN \$300,000 for Veterans Park BACK TO COMMITTEE. APPROVED TO RETURN TO COMMITTEE by a vote of 30 YES, 6 NO and 4 ABSTENTIONS. (Roll Call attached to back pages of Minutes)

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Paul Dziezyc and Michael Wiederlight

MR. DZIEZYC said his Committee met on Wednesday, March 31, 1982. Present were Rep. Wiederlight, Co-Chairman, Reps. DeGaetani, Dziezyc and Maihock who attended for item #5. MR. DZIEZYC stated his Committee vote to HOLD item #1.

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

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) THE MATTER OF THE MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING, 429 Atlantic St., concerning fire alarm system - from Fire Marshal Carmine Speranza, letter of 12/31/82; also Bldgs. & Grds. Supt. John Strat's response. Held in Committee 2/1 and 3/1/82.

MRS. PERILLO stated that she appreciated the fact that smoke alarm maybe installed in this building but asked if there was an alternate way for anyone to get out of the building without going on the stairs that are here.

MR. DZIEZYC said that he did not know. This would be one of the problems to be investigated and be resolved.

- (3) THE MATTER OF PROPER PUBLIC FACILITIES TO ACCOMMODATE THE HANDICAPPED - LETTER FROM MS. ZWERLING CONCERNING LOCAL HOTEL AT WHICH SHE STAYED AND THE ACCOMMODATIONS THEREIN. Submitted by Rep. Dziezyc. Held 3/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (4) THE MATTER OF THE HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS OF THE STAMFORD PUBLIC SCHOOL PARKING LOTS DURING THE RECENT WINTER STORMS - request from Rep. Tarzia. Held in Committee 3/1/82.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DZIEZYC said he received a letter from Commissioner Spaulding. The Commissioner sent a letter to Dr. Jones. The Commissioner's letter stated that he received an unsigned letter from Mr. Benjamin Reed, Asst. Supt. of Business Affairs. The Commissioner went on to say that it was his understanding that the Board of Education used private contractors who should have had their own salting and sanding capability. He stated that the Dept. of Public Works would be willing to take care of winter maintenance on all school property on only the following conditions: 1) That the Dept. of Public Works be totally responsible for all driveways and parking areas which means that the individual in Public Works responsible for fighting storms will have full discretion as to equipment, salting, sanding, plowing, etc.

2) That the Board of Education makes sufficient personnel available to serve under the direction of Public Works in time of a storm for the purpose of operating and/or assisting in the operation of our equipment.

3) An appropriate and fair method is established to allocate the cost connected with this work and if the above principals are acceptable, the Commissioner would be pleased to assign anyone with John Canavan.

MR. DZIEZYC stated that the Commissioner never received an answer from Benjamin Reed's department.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (5) REQUEST BY REP. AUDREY MAIHOCK THAT SOMETHING BE DONE ABOUT AVAILABILITY OF DRUG PARAPHERNALIA TO MINORS IN STAMFORD.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that REP. MAIHOCK attended the meeting. The Corporation Counsel has sent a letter to the County of Westchester where they have enacted a similar ordinance to get some input and a copy of the ordinance. When this is received, the Committee will then be able to proceed further.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (6) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE FOR HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Submitted by Director Gofstein.

MR. DZIEZYC said that Dr. Gofstein presented the proposed fee schedules which if accepted by the Board, would bring in additional revenue to the City of approximately \$100,000. At present, there is no charge for laboratory fees as most were done by the State Health Department but the State and Federal Governments are assigning these operations, to save money, to the local health departments. This is one reason to impose fees for laboratory analysis. MR. DZIEZYC stated that Dr. Gofstein wants to place most of the fees directly in the hands of those that utilize them most.

Further, sub-sewage disposal system permits and permits for repairs of septic tank systems would also be increased.

MR. DZIEZYC stated that a Public Hearing would be set-up to receive input and everyone would receive a copy of the fees proposed.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. CONTI suggested that the Committee move as swiftly as possible to adopt these increased fees for if they are in place before the Mill Rate is set, it can reduce the Mill Rate.

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

MR. CONTI stated that his Committee met Monday, February 22, 1982 in the Main Room. Present were Rep. A. Conti, Zelinski, Saxe, Fauteux, Dudley, Donahue, Maihock and Owens. Also, Rep. DeLuca and invited to attend and present were Beverly Bowler, Dog Warden; Bill Murray and Mrs. Carrie Hunt representing the Salvation Army.

A work session was held concerning item #2 on the Agenda, which is the Traffic Ordinance was held on March 8, 1982 and present were Reps. A. Conti, McInerney, Fauteux, Donahue, Saxe, Maihock, Zelinski and Dudley.

The third meeting held by the Legislative and Rules Committee was March 29, 1982, and present were Reps. A. Conti, McInerney, Donahue, Saxe, Dudley, Fauteux and Owens. Also, present were James Ford, Mr. Sulik, Bureau of Sanitation, Tom Skidd, Cummings and Lockwood and Reps. DeLuca, Maihock, and Zelinski.

MR. CONTI said that a review was made on all the items of last month's Agenda on March 29, 1982.

- (1) PROPOSED DRAFT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF PERSONAL SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES FOR PURPOSE OF HEALTH SCREENING OF (INDO-CHINA, HAITA, CUBA AND OTHER COUNTRIES) SETTLING IN STAMFORD - AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,500.00, per Mayor Clapes' letter 11/10/81. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/11/82, 2/1/82 and 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated his Committee voted 7 to 0 with 1 abstention and so MOVED. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Resolution. APPROVED by 1 NO vote, B. Conti, and 2 ABSTENTIONS, Maihock and Guroian. (voice vote)

- (2) 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. Held in Committee 2/1/82 and 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated that at the work-session on March 8, 1982, changes were made and sent to Mr. Ford for retyping. Minor changes were made and copies were sent to all. MR. CONTI MOVED for publication so a Public Hearing may be held. SECONDED

MR. ZELINSKI offered an amendment: Page 9 of the original draft, Sec. 20-7 - Penalty Schedule Amend Sec. 1 that reads \$ 5.00 fine for parking meter violation or for overtime parking where posted, etc. The Town Center Mall violation is only \$ 1.00. MR. ZELINSKI MOVED to amend from \$ 5.00 to \$ 2.00. SECONDED.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that it was unfair and unjust for residents to pay a \$ 5.00 fine and those using the Mall to pay only a \$ 1.00.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN asked who received the revenues from the Town Mall.

MR. CONTI stated that the \$ 5.00 would be for street parking and the \$ 1.00 charged is in the garage, that \$ 1.00 would go to the operators of the garage. That \$ 1.00 is to be paid immediately before leaving the garage. If not, it becomes a \$ 5.00 violation and that money would go to the City. The \$ 1.00 fee that is being proposed for the garage violation is totally different from what is proposed for the street violation.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that residents and non-residents park in the garage and on the street. The purpose of the fine is to enable the Traffic and Parking Department to engage in parking enforcement. MR. ESPOSITO stated that it is financially feasible for someone to park on the street, get a ticket; this is cheaper than parking in a garage. You pay only \$ 2.00 for parking illegally on the street. There should be a high turn-over of cars parking at the meters. Long time parking should be deterred.

MR. FAUTEUX stated that the small shop owners depend upon a rapid turnover of customers into their premises. How else can the customers get into the stores on Bedford and Summer Streets if parking is not available. MR. FAUTEUX said that we must make sure that it is a costly venture to park on the street not in a legal place.

MR. DONAHUE stated that on two occasions MR. ZELINSKI attempted to amend this Section, but could not get a SECOND in Committee to do so. The Committee understands that we must restore integrity to our system of fining violators; both for parking and handicapped parking spaces, parking in violation of State laws, and also meter violations. The person who is discriminated against is the person who obeys the traffic regulations and puts money in the meter. MR. DONAHUE stated that there are some \$6 million now in outstanding parking fines. This ordinance not only increasing the amount you pay for a parking violation; it also provides two methods of appeal for those parking violations. MR. DONAHUE stated the \$ 5.00 was necessary.

MRS. McINERNEY spoke against the motion. The Committee over-whelmingly refused to give a SECOND to that motion. The Town Mall Center garage deficits will be picked-up by the developer. The City of Stamford will not pick-up the deficits. By instituting this ordinance, we are hoping to catch the violators.

MR. BLAIS stated that it was hard to believe that a motion is on the Floor that would give justice to breakers of the law. Parking violators should be fined; they cause traffic jams, rob the City of revenue and there is no reason why the violators should not get the fullest fine that this Board deems necessary.

MRS. MAIHOCK MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on MR. ZELINSKI'S amendment to reduce the proposed parking violation fee from \$ 5.00 to \$ 2.00. DEFEATED by a vote of 25 NO, 7 YES, 1 ABSTENTION and 4 NOT VOTING.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI asked for a Point of Personal Privilege. He said that because he tried to make a motion in Committee and it failed, it seemed like the speakers were eluding to the fact that because of that fact, it is not legal or proper to bring it before the Board. MR. ZELINSKI further stated that because it does not pass in Committee does not mean the feelings of the 40 members of the Board may not agree or disagree with them and this is why items are discussed fully on the Floor.

THE PRESIDENT stated that the Chair did not get that impression. Anything could be discussed before the Board.

MR. DUDLEY stated that as a Point of Information, he is a member of the Committee and he believed that everyone there spoke against the motion and that was the position taken on the Floor of the Board here and he did not think that this was meant as an attack on MR. ZELINSKI.

MR. CONTI stated that the MOTION made for publication after Mr. Ford's final revision is incorporated as amended and was SECONDED 6 to 1 in favor and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote for publication of the proposed ordinance concerning regulations of traffic and parking. APPROVED with 25 YES, 9 NO VOTES, and 2 NOT VOTING

MR. CONTI stated that a Public Hearing was scheduled for April 12, 7:00 p.m. This was turned over to MR. ZELINSKI to make arrangements. This is in reference to item 2.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that he checked with the Board's office and found out it would be impossible for this proposed ordinance to be published in a local newspaper before Monday. The Public Hearing will be changed to a later date.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL UP-DATING ORD. #260
RE LEASHING OF DOGS - submitted by Dog Warden Beverly Bowler. Approved by Police Chief Considine 1/6/82. Increases penalties for violators. Held in Steering 1/18/82. Held 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated a motion was made in Committee for publication by a vote of 7 - 0 and he so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI asked if this proposed ordinance was discussed with the Dog Warden and does the Dog Warden feel that they can enforce this.

MR. CONTI replied the Dog Warden attended the meeting. The proposed ordinance was held the first time to get Corporation Counsel's opinion and when the opinion was received, this was taken-up.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that the fine would be increased from \$10 to \$30 for the first offense and not less than \$50 or more than \$100 or imprisonment for the next 30 days.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ROOS asked why the increased fees make it possible for better enforcement.

MR. CONTI stated that raising the fees is not better enforcement but a manner of holding-cost. It cost more to feed the dogs now.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to publish the propose ordinance re leasing of dogs. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote)

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL INCREASING ADOPTION FEES AT DOG POUND - submitted by Dog Warden Beverly Bowler. Approved by Police Chief Considine 1/6/82. Held in Steering 1/18/82. Held 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated that at his first meeting, this was taken off the Agenda as the State Statutes superceded it. At the second meeting, it was found that the Committee could take and discuss this. This was Held to send the new material to Corporation Counsel for updating.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING A TAX CREDIT FOR REFUSE COLLECTION TO OWNERS OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN MULTIPLE UNIT RESIDENTIAL COMPLEXES. Re-submission for February consideration. Held in Steering 1/18/82. Held 3/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDING CODE SECTION 8-18 ANNUAL PICK-UP OF HOUSEHOLD AND YARD DEBRIS - re-submitted for February consideration. Held in Steering 1/18/82. Held 3/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (7) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NO. 429 OVER-NIGHT PARKING OF TRUCKS ON RESIDENTIAL STREETS - submitted by Rep. Marie Hawe 2/8/82. Held 3/1/82.

THE PRESIDENT stated that Rep. Tarzia left the Meeting. There are 35 members present.

MR. CONTI stated the Committee voted 8 - 0 to HOLD. This will be reviewed at the August meeting. The Committee wants to find-out how successful the parking ordinance will be.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (8) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CODE SECTION 18-50 to INCLUDE CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES TO, OR FROM, ANOTHER MUNICIPALITY AND STAMFORD. Submitted by Reps. Betty Conti and Grace Guroian 1/19/82. Held 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated his Committee voted 8 - 0 in favor of publication and MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the MOTION to publish item #8. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL FOR TAX ABATEMENT
For Bethany Assembly of God Church Lot A1 (Card SW2) - their letter
1/18/82; and Tax Assessor James Hyland's note thereon. Held 3/1/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (10) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CODE SECTION 10-23 MAINTAINING
IN A CLEAN CONDITION THE SHARED OR PUBLIC AREAS OF DWELLINGS AND
PREMISES (PART OF ORD. #246 HOUSING CODE) - submitted by Rep. John Zelinski
2/10/82. Held 3/1/82.

MR. CONTI stated that an amendment was included; it read, "and must remove the ice or snow from sidewalks and exterior stairs not more than 24 hours after the end of the precipitation." That was changing 12 hours to 24 hours. The Committee voted 8 - 0 in favor and MR. CONTI so MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO asked MR. CONTI if we didn't already have an ordinance regarding removal of snow on sidewalks?

MR. CONTI replied that we did and it read 12 hours. 12 hours would be changed to 24 hours.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked about the 24 hours, the reason for.

MR. CONTI replied that the precipitation may end in the night and that would not give the owners enough time to remove the snow in a timely fashion.

MRS. GERSHMAN asked for a Point of Information. If this would supercede the Ordinance already on the books?

MR. CONTI stated that it would.

THE PRESIDENT urged the Members to attend the Public Hearings so they may voice their opinions and suggestions at that time.

MR. BOCCUZZI questioned the time-frame in the original ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI read the original ordinance which had no time element in it.

MRS. McINERNEY stated that initially this ordinance was proposed with a 12 hour limit. The Committee felt that 12 hours might be too stringent; it was changed to 24 hours.

MR. CONTI repeated again, "and must remove the ice or snow from sidewalks and exterior stairs not more than 24 hours after the end of the precipitation."

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to publish the proposed ordinance re snow removal from sidewalks and exterior stairs within 24 hours after end of precipitation. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (Voice vote)

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (11) REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE OF \$800.00 REQUESTED BY THE SALVATION ARMY FOR ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO INTERIOR OF ITS PREMISES AT 20 BEEHLER STREET. Permit #60021 dated 1/14/82 paid in the sum of \$800.00. Letter 1/27/82 from Atty. William Murray.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI questioned why the above item was being HELD.

MR. CONTI replied that an ordinance was needed and must be checked with Corporation Counsel.

MR. ZELINSKI said that an ordinance was not needed to waive a building permit fee. All that is needed is a statement that the Board has waived the fee.

MR. ZELINSKI had a letter from Mr. Hennessey of the Corporation Counsel's office stating that was all that is needed.

MR. ZELINSKI made a MOTION to MOVE ITEM #11 OUT OF COMMITTEE. SECONDED.

MRS. CONTI asked a Point of Information; was it just the technical point; was that the reason it was being Held?

MRS. McINERNEY said it was unfortunate that they did not have the letter from Corporation Counsel and said that she did not think that it was imperative that we act on this matter immediately.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that all Representatives received a copy of this letter.

MRS. McINERNEY asked MR. ZELINSKI to leave a copy of the letter so it may be sent out to all Members again.

MR. DONAHUE questioned if this was one of the items that the Committee voted to approve or recommend to approve this item pending determination whether or not an ordinance was needed or simply a vote to grant the waiver?

MR. CONTI replied that there was a vote of 8 - 0 in favor at the first meeting, but at the second meeting it was decided to HOLD.

MS. SUMMERVILLE made copies of the letter.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT felt that MR. ZELINSKI should have consulted with the Committee and discussed this matter before this meeting. MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that we should not act in haste.

MR. BOCCUZZI MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT stated the Motion to MOVE Item #11 OUT OF COMMITTEE.

The MOTION was DEFEATED by a vote of 5 YES, 24 NO, 3 ABSTENTIONS and 3 NOT VOTING.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (12) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO CODE OF ORDINANCES SEC. 6-17(3) - concerning definition of gross income, etc. - submitted by Asst. Corp. Counsel Alice Perry 1/11/82. Held in Steering 1/18 and 2/16/82.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (13) REQUEST FOR PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO RESTRICT AND CONTROL THE AVAILABILITY OF UNDERSIRABLE, PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL TO MINOR CHILDREN. Reps. Betty Conti and Grace Guroian submitted Norfolk, Virginia's local ordinance.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (14) REQUEST FROM REGISTRARS OF VOTERS FOR APPROVAL OF VOTING POLLING PLACE DISTRICTS IN STAMFORD TO BE USED FOR STATE AND NATIONAL ELECTIONS AND PRIMARIES, PURSUANT TO STATE STATUTES SEC. 9-168B and 9-169.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (15) PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR PUBLICATION - RELEASE OF EASEMENT BY CITY TO PITNEY BOWES, INC. AND GRANTING AN EQUIVALENT EASEMENT TO PITNEY BOWES TO CITY ON PREMISES LOCATED ON SOUTHERLY SIDE OF ELMCROFT ROAD.
Per Mayor Clapes' letter 3/10/82.

MR. CONTI stated his Committee voted 5 in favor and 3 abstentions for publication. This was approved by Corporation Counsel. Expenses to be paid by Pitney Bowes. They do not want to put any water mains under their building so they are going to have 30 ft. of fresh water line around and the Stamford Water Company approved this.

MR. CONTI MOVED to publish. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (16) AMEND THE RULES OF THE 17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES by changing the composition of the membership of the following committees; Pg. 4, item #1, COMMITTEES:

XI. Education, Welfare and Government Committee - change from 3 to 5 members.

THE PRESIDENT stated that a two-thirds vote was needed; 35 members present.

MR. CONTI said his Committee voted 8 - 0 for the change and so MOVED, SECONDED

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote (voice). APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY,

XII. Urban Renewal Committee - change from 5 to 7 members.

MR. CONTI stated that his Committee passed this by an 8 - 0 and so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. BLUM asked why we wanted to change the number of members on the URC. He stated that Urban Renewal has been a hinderence to the City.

MR. CONTI stated this was taken care-of by the Leadership of both forces. This was needed for equalization.

LIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (Continued)

CINERNEY stated that when the Committees were organized, there was a understanding what Membership was on one or two of the Committees. One or these Committee's had the dominate party having the minority number of members on that Committee. These are reflections of those changes.

THE PRESIDENT stated that Leadership agreed unanimously to these changes.

MR. BLAIS MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the proposed changes to the Urban Renewal Committee. 24 affirmative votes are needed. APPROVED (voice vote) with 31 YES and 4 NO (Blum, B. Conti, Dziezyc, Guroian) votes.

VI. Planning and Zoning Committee - change from 5 to 7 members.

MR. CONTI stated that his Committee voted the same on this; 8 - 0 in favor and so MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to change from 5 to 7 members on the Planning and Zoning Committee. (voice vote) APPROVED by a vote of 31 YES and 4 NO (Blum, Dziezyc, B. Conti, Guroian).

MR. CONTI made a MOTION to SUSPEND THE RULES to take-up an item not on the Agenda. SECONDED. APPROVED (voice vote) with 4 NO votes (Gaipa, B. Conti, Guroian, Blum) rest YES votes.

(17) AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NO. 1423 TO AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET OF THE STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER BY ADDING THERETO A PROJECT IN THE SUM OF \$138,899.00 TO BE KNOWN AS DUPUIS PROPERTY (ADJACENT TO THE MUSEUM)

MR. CONTI said that each Members received a copy of the above Resolution. It was on the desks. MR. CONTI read the Resolution amending Resolution No. 1423; articles (a) and (b).

MR. ZELINSKI stated that this does not alter Resolution No. 1423 but the proposed resolution is for a technical oversight; authorizing the Mayor to execute any and all documents necessary to carry out the purposed of Resolution No. 1423, etc.

MR. CONTI MOVED to adopt the Resolution. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED by a vote of 4 NO (Gaipa, B. Conti, Guroian, Blum) and rest YES.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT wanted the Records to show that he left the Floor while the discussion and voting was taking place on item #17 of the Legislative and Rules Agenda.

MR. ZELINSKI asked for a SUSPENSION OF THE RULES to consider item #19 of the Fiscal Agenda. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT stated that 24 votes was needed. THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. THE PRESIDENT stated this Motion was DEFEATED; not enough YES votes by the count of hands taken by the PRESIDENT.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

THE PRESIDENT announced that as of this time, MR. STORK has not arrived.

MRS. PERILLO made a MOTION to SUSPEND THE RULES to take-up item #2 on the Personnel Agenda which deals with the Municipal Employees Assn. labor contract. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to SUSPEND THE RULES to take-up item #2 on Personnel. APPROVED by a vote of 27 YES, 5 NO and 3 NOT VOTING.

- (2) FOR APPROVAL - LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN THE MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES ASSN. (MEA) AND THE CITY OF STAMFORD for two years, 7/1/81 - 6/30/83, 8% increase each year - submitted by Mayor Clapes 3/8/82. Board of Finance recommended approval unanimously 3/15/82 letter of L. Laitman, Vice-Chairman. Contract officially received 3/10/82.

MR. HOGAN said he had a "draft" left for him by Chairman Stork in the event that he may arrive late or not arrive.

MR. HOGAN stated that appearing for the City was Labor Negotiator Tom Barrett, and for MEA was President Ellie Yudain, and one negotiator, Joseph Kitlas. This is a two year contract commencing July 1, 1981 and expiring June 30, 1983. Each year of the contract features an 8% pay increase along with improved retirement, clothing and tool allowances will cost \$677,800 for fiscal year 81/82 and \$1,486,100 for fiscal year 82/83 or a total of \$2,163,900 over the life of the contract.

MR. HOGAN stated that the Personnel Committee is on Record having taken a position of not looking favorably on one year contracts and that position has not changed. However, with the burden placed on the Board to instill severe cuts in the City's budget for fiscal year 1982/83, the Personnel Committee has, by a vote of 6 in favor and 1 opposed, elected to reject, without prejudice, this MEA contract with instructions to the City's Labor Negotiator, to re-negotiate the expiration of this contract to June 30, 1982, in order that the MEA membership can get their salary increase for the current fiscal year and in order to align all City contracts time-wise for future negotiations and MR. HOGAN so MOVED. (This was MR. STORK'S MOTION)

THE PRESIDENT stated that MR. HOGAN must state the MOTION in a positive manner.

MR. HOGAN MOVED for favorable acceptance. SECONDED.

MR. RYBNICK asked for a ROLL CALL VOTE.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote for a ROLL CALL VOTE. CARRIED.

MR. ESPOSITO stated he would like to speak out against the Personnel Committee's report. 1) The motion assumes that it has been agreed, in principal, by this Board that all contracts should expire at the same time. MR. ESPOSITO said he questioned that principal and the validity of that statement and also the desirability of doing such a thing. We should discuss this in great detail amongst ourselves. 2) As far as future contracts go, the Board should have input prior to the negotiations of contracts not after they come before the Board. On April 14, the Fiscal Committee will be meeting jointly with the Personnel Committee and Mr. Barrett, Labor negotiator.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO invited all Board members to attend. 3) This contract was negotiated in good faith by both the Labor Negotiator and the negotiators for the Union. MR. ESPOSITO did not think, that at this point, we can change the rules; after negotiating in good faith. MR. ESPOSITO stated that MR. HOGAN correctly pointed-out, the Personnel Committee and this Board has taken a rather strong stand that we are opposed to one-year contracts. That statement has been made repeatedly and now, after negotiations have taken place and the contract is brought before us, we say, "We changed our mind, we want a one-year contract."

MR. ESPOSITO said that he did not believe that it was in good faith on part of the Board to do such a thing. He stated that, therefore, he would vote against the Committee's report and urged his fellow Board members to support this contract.

THE PRESIDENT stated that MR. STORK has joined the Meeting and there are 36 members present.

MR. ZELINSKI said he was in favor of approving this contract. It would be a travesty of justice if it were to be turned-down this evening because of the reasons that were mentioned. He did not feel that, at this time, the Board had the jurisdiction to tell the City Negotiator and the City unions what length of time the contract should run.

MR. ZELINSKI stated that he served as Chairman of the Personnel Committee four years ago and the Committee at that time, had discussions with Mr. Barrett; there is no City contract with any of the Unions that is uniform in all the different sections whether they be pay increases, holidays, sick days, etc. MR. ZELINSKI said that he did not think that at this present point in time that could be done.

MR. ZELINSKI said that he recalls receiving a letter from Mr. Barrett several months ago, which Mr. Barrett asked for any recommendations or suggestions from members of the Board. At that time, it would have been proper to make suggestions and recommendations such as this. MR. ZELINSKI said it would be very unfair to the municipal employees of our City to hold their contract and have it reopened and re-negotiated for one minor point which happens to be the length of time of the contract. If we do this tonight, we will be setting a bad precedent for the future and other contracts. This contract was negotiated in good faith, approved by the Union and City and it would be shameful to have this contract rejected. MR. ZELINSKI urged his colleagues to vote for approval.

MR. DONAHUE stated the issue of negotiating in good faith has been brought up many times tonight. That is a main principal under which all contracts are negotiated. Some of the questions raised by the Personnel Committee and members of the Board concerning the duration of contracts and simultaneous expiration date of all contracts, bears some merit and should be looked into. However, this Board has not taken an official position on those two items and until such time as we do, MR. DONAHUE said he could not accept the fact that the Personnel Committee is justified in assuming that this Board is in favor of those two items at this date.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE stated that this contract was negotiated in good faith for 15 months. It would be improper for this Board, at this time, to change the rules of the game that have already been stated. We have a responsibility to be a part of good faith negotiations. MR. DONAHUE urged that this contract be accepted.

MR. BOCCUZZI stated that he would speak in favor of returning the contract, without prejudice. He had no objection to the first year recommendation or agreements between the Union and the City. That part of the contract should be approved but we cannot approve part of a contract. The only way we can do it is to return without prejudice.

MR. BOCCUZZI stated that the reason he would like to get all contracts in line is simple; the Board, Administration and all concerned with the fiscal management of the City must take a hard look of where we are going with contracts. He felt that the Unions should receive pay increases, etc. for work done. It is now becoming a burden when we start out with one union that is into a following fiscal year on a contract with an 8% raise. He stated that other unions looks at this and say that MEA has 8%, we want 8%. We are stuck with 8%.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that he would like to see some method that we could control salaries. A percentage raise in any department is unfair to the lower half of the scale; if a 10% raise for a person getting \$20,000 and a person receiving \$10,000, the person getting \$10,000 only gets a \$1,000 raise and the person receiving \$20,000 gets a \$2,000 raise. Each year it gets larger and larger. There is a constant large increase at the top of the scale and a small increase at the bottom of the scale. MR. BOCCUZZI stated that maybe we should look at across-the-board raises for everyone in the same amount. This bears looking into. He again stated that he had no objections on the first year of the contract but could not vote on a half of contract. He did not think that the rules were being changed. This Board has never had any set rules as to how they vote on contracts. This Board must take a hard look now as to the future of the salary accounts. It could come to a point where increases are given but we are unable to fund a total salary account and it is under-funded, the only thing the department head could do is release personnel. That is not the road we should take.

MR. BLUM stated that each union has different bargaining points. When the City comes before each union, they treat each one on a different scale. The MEA represents all different categories of workers; they can't all be getting the same amounts of money. If you have percentages, they are going by skills. Collective bargaining, to a point, takes good faith bargaining and at the bargaining table, when you come to a contract, the City (Mr. Barrett) will say we have a contract and he initials that contract. This is good faith bargaining. Our role is to ratify or reject this contract. We have no control as to what goes on in bargaining. This contract went for 18 months; one of the unions went for three years. MR. BLUM said that we should ratify this contract and take a good hard look when we are talking of the budget.

MR. WHITE said he thought this contract should be ratified for reasons that have already been stated. He stressed that the principal of having all contracts fall due at the same time, would seem to establish a devastating coalition with a gun to the head of the municipality. If every contract fell due at the same time, you have put together a coalition that the municipality would be at a distinct disadvantage. MR. WHITE stated he understood the rationale why

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WHITE (continuing) someone would tentatively think about this, but thinking further, that which would be gained by this would be much more outweighed by the enormour disadvantage the City would be placed in by having all contracts of municipal employees including teachers fall due at the same time. Does one realize what kind of a negotiating burden that would put on the City.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he was concerned the way this matter has been handled by the Committee. He stated that Committee is hard working and very conscientious but thought the Committee went over-board in expressing their sentiments thinking it was the sentiments of the entire Board in outright rejecting the contract for, what MR. LIVINGSTON saw, not a very good reason. How can we possibly negotiate with all the unions at one time. The first union to negotiate would hold-out to the absolute last for the highest percentage figure they could receive. He stated that he could not see any union willing to accept less afterwards. MR. LIVINGSTON said that working people should receive raises on a percentage basis. It rewards the people higher-up on the ladder but also is an incentive to the people on the lower part of the ladder to retrain, work harder to take and pass examinations for more responsible positions. MR. LIVINGSTON stated the municipal workers have earned this 8% increase and was in support of this contract.

MR. GAIPA stated he agreed with the first year of the contract. He said it was a shame that the people have to wait over 9 months to receive their money. Anything that could be done to accelerate the bargaining so people get their raises closer to the starting date of the contract should be done.

MR. GAIPA stated he would like to point-out to MR. ESPOSITO that the two year standard that the Personnel Committee established was done just a month ago and the contract was born long before that and so there was really no changing of the rules of the game on part of the Personnel Committee.

MR. GAIPA said that in answer to MR. ZELINSKI and MR. WHITE, 75% of the City budget, which this year will be over \$140 million, is made-up of salaries and fringe benefits and for this Board to approve an 8% for the year starting July 1, 1982 to June 30, 1983, is an announcement to the other 10 unions that they are going to have, at least an 8% raise coming to them no matter what. That is no way to run a ship in these days when we are facing 30, 40, 50, 70% increases in taxes.

MRS. GERSHMAN stated that as part of the Personnel Committee by rejecting this without prejudice, we are still negotiating in good faith. Through the time frame that is suggested, it will give us time to control these salaries and to bring them all in the scale as has been suggested using different methods rather than just a percentage step increase across the board. It would give Personnel more time to equalize the salaries. She agreed with MR. BOCCUZZI'S statements. If we ask them to adopt only the one year contract, they already have the first year of their two year contract negotiated. MRS. GERSHMAN said that she thinks that it is not a valid argument to have all of the contracts come due at one time is a gun to the head of the municipal people. She stated that it brings all personnel more into perspective. She would rather have this kind of a perspective than play catch-up as we have been doing in the last several years.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN (continuing) said that she believed we (the Committee) expressed their sentiments. They did not express the will of the Board because they did not have the will of the Board. These sentiments are thoughtful recommendations that we are making to the Board.

MRS. GERSHMAN stated that it was not an amusing thing to hear someone say that if you work hard and retrain, you will make more money. Through the Step system it does not work that way; the Merit system, it might. We have the Step system. The only way is to look at the personnel throughout the City. She supported to reject without prejudice.

MR. DeLUCA agreed with the comments made by REPS. BOCCUZZI, GERSHMAN, and GAIPA. He stated as a Co-sponsor with REP. BOCCUZZI requesting that all contracts end at the same period of time and also that blanket raises be instituted for all contracts, we are trying to preserve jobs. It is time for blanket raises to be made. REP. BOCCUZZI and REP. DeLUCA requested on November 23, 1981, the expiration dates of all contracts. If this contract was to be approved tonight, this would be the only one that would extend beyond 1982; all other contracts, based on Mr. Barrett's reply, dated November 25, 1981, the Police, Teamsters, Nurses, Custodians, MAA and Firemen expire on June 30, 1982. By rejecting this contract, without prejudice, for one year whereby it would expire on June 30, 1982, it would bring all contracts in line. MR. DeLUCA disagreed about the coalition being a gun to our head.

MR. DeLUCA stated that he believed that it was time for the unions to recognize the fact that relief is needed by the City. To approved this contract, this would give the signal to others to be coming-in for 8% and he stated that he is against future 8% increases. Private industry is laying-off, freezes on salary increases and it is time for the City to institute some of the same measures. MR. DeLUCA stated that this contract should be rejected to bring all contracts in line.

MRS. SAXE stated that we are the Town-fathers of the City of Stamford and a loud cry has come from the citizens and taxpayers of the Town. We must listen and learn and then set policy. In doing this, we must treat the taxpayers' money as if it was ours. We should not run City Hall with deficit spending, therefore, she requested that we find a way to have harmony between the taxpayer and the City. MRS. SAXE stated that we can no longer treat personnel of City Hall; police, fire, Board of Education as they wish. We cannot afford to pay the fringes in their contracts. Business has been holding the line of personnel costs, she believed the citizens and taxpayers of Stamford have to look to the City Hall as business. She called for no vote on this matter. Now is the time to find a solution to the fiscal problems that face the taxpayer, workers and the projects for the City. MRS. SAXE said that she would hope that we would look at the terms of vital issues, budget priorities and tax policies, and she stated that we do not have to be inflexible but we must be responsive to the needs of the taxpayers.

MR. WIDER said that looking around at his fellow Board members, he thought of how many were working people. He said that no working people talk about each other's money like the talk about these working peoples' money. MR. WIDER said these people work for what they are asking for. He stated that we employ a man to negotiate the contract and this was done. MR. WIDER stated that we do not have the responsibility to negotiate the contract; that has been done.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIDER (continuing) We are fighting about the funds. These people are going to get tired of trying to shop with this measly money in the high price stores we have in Stamford. We have to realize we can't eat for nothing and everyone has to buy. MR. WIDER said that 8% in today's economy is not overwhelming. We should pay these people.

MR. STORK stated that with all due respect to MR. DONAHUE, the Personnel Committee did not change or break any rules of the games. One choice the Committee had among several was to reject this contract without prejudice and that happened to be the one we selected; based on what MR. STORK thought on good judgement.

MR. STORK stated that next month, the Board would be charged with a very serious dilemma and that is cutting taxes so that people can continue to live properly in the City of Stamford. If this is one step to help further that cause MR. STORK supports it and he supports the Committee's vote to reject without prejudice this contract.

MRS. GUROIAN said she agreed with MR. WHITE about advantages and disadvantages of all contracts maturing at the same time. Because contracts mature at the same time does not mean that negotiations are completed at the same time. One advantage for having them mature at the same time is that you get a good picture of the fiscal impact of the total number of contracts but she did not know that in practice it would come out that way.

MRS. GUROIAN agreed that this Board should set some policy before it imposes policy on present contract. She said it was a good idea for the Committee to meet with Mr. Barrett and, perhaps, come up with some recommendations as to negotiating policies that this Board can vote upon, but until the pros and cons are decided, she stated that she thought it was a little bit unfair to impose this on the contract before the Board. MRS. GUROIAN said that she agreed with MR. BOCCUZZI. She said that when the Committee speaks to Mr. Barrett, perhaps, there should be a change from blanket percentage increases for all the members of the union equally. She agreed that the 8% for the first year of the contract was alright, but for the second year, is something she would feel that much comfortable working for.

MRS. GUROIAN stated that the Representatives have a responsibility to be fair to the municipal employees and also the taxpayers, who are workers also and these workers will have to work hard to pay their taxes. MRS. GUROIAN said she had mixed emotions on how she was going to vote on the contract and hoped that all the Representatives will weigh carefully all of the implications involved.

MRS. CONTI agreed with MR. BOCCUZZI and MR. DeLUCA. She said that was her first suggestion when she came on the Board and first met with the Labor Negotiator; we should have across-the-board raises in a specific amount because we create a vicious circle when we give the percentage increase because the ones at the top are making more than their supervisors and then we have immediate request to have all administrators salaries raised because the union people are over and above them. It is self-defeating; we are getting nowhere. She said she was reluctant to go into a two year contract at this time. She said she would go along with the first year, but we cannot commit ourselves to another year at 8% as we have so many other unions that we must negotiate with. MRS. CONTI said she felt badly that we must reject any contract, but at this point in time, she felt that she must reject a two year contract.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED with 4 opposed (voice vote)

THE PRESIDENT said the Personnel Committee came out with a vote of 6 - 1 to reject the contract without prejudice. MR. HOGAN came out with a favorable recommendation that we approved the labor contract between the Municipal Employees Association and the City of Stamford. A motion was made previously for a ROLL CALL VOTE which was passed.

MR. ESPOSITO wanted to know how many members were present.

THE PRESIDENT stated that there were 36 present and the majority of those present would be 19.

MR. HOGAN read the MOTION: "The contract between the City and the Municipal Employees Association extending for two years from retroactive from July 1, 1982 through June 30, 1983 be approved by this Board."

MR. DONAHUE stated that the Committee's report is negative but in keeping with the policy of the Board, the motion must be made in a positive fashion.

TELLERS WIEDERLIGHT and STORK were asked by the PRESIDENT to also Tally the ROLL CALL.

THE CLERK called the ROLL for the vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that the contract has been DEFEATED by a vote of 17 YES and 19 NO votes. (4 absent)

- (1) THE MATTER OF /ADDITIONAL TOWN CENTER GARAGE TRAFFIC VIOLATION OFFICERS FOR WHICH FUNDING REQUEST WAS WITHDRAWN BY DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - Code 280.1110 PARKING DIVISION SALARIES - Financing to be shared by Taubman Company and City of Stamford. Peripheral issues to be explored such as social security costs, "perks", etc. per Rep. Gabe DeLuca and others 2/16/82. Held 3/1/82.

MR. STORK stated the above item was taken-up at a meeting held on February 24, 1982 but due to the abrupt early adjournment of the March Board meeting, he was prevented from reporting at that time. The report would have been that James Ford, Director of Traffic and Parking and Police Chief Considine were invited to attend the meeting but both neglected to attend; however, a call was received from Mr. Ford's office that in addition to billing the Taubman Co. for the traffic violation officers' salaries, they were adding a 26% surcharge to cover social security and other benefit costs. Despite that fact, the Personnel Committee was not persuaded that this was the way to go. Even if the 26% figured to cover benefits was sufficient, the City would still be performing bookkeeping and clerical services. For these reasons, it was the position of the Personnel Committee that the City of Stamford should not get in the business of hiring any employees for the Town Center Garage. If Taubman deems it necessary to have this staffing, Taubman should have the full responsibility for hiring and paying in total. The Committee voted unanimously 7 in favor and none opposed recommending that the Board deny City participation in this matter.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (3) REQUEST OF REPS. BOCCUZZI AND DeLUCA 3/8/82 THAT DETERMINATION BE MADE WHY ALL MUNICIPAL CONTRACTS CANNOT EXPIRE ON SAME DATE.

MR. STORK said that Mr. Barrett and MR. BOCCUZZI spoke to this matter and the Committee's vote on the previous item seemed to satisfy the request.

- (4) LETTER OF 3/12/82 FROM FINANCE BOARD CHAIRMAN EVERETT POLLARD ADVISING OF ITS APPROVAL OF SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION URGING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO APPROVE A PENSION FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS MARY V. McCAULEY AND NANCY S. TATANO.

MR. STORK stated that the above item was improperly before the Committee and no action was taken. This request is up for approval at the State Legislature and being successful there, then and only then, come back to the Board for funding.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE said his Committee met on Tuesday, March 30, 1982, with Reps. Stork, White, Signore, and Donahue. Also, present were Mark Lubbers and Martin Levine.

- (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 by City Engineer Wm. D. Sabia. Held in Steering 12/10/81. Held in Committee 1/18/82 2/1/82 and 3/1/82.

MR. DONAHUE said a large peat deposit may run beneath the road. This runs questions about the construction of the road.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) REFERRAL CONCERNING THE ZONING BOARD'S DECISION ON APPLICATION #81-020 TO AMEND HEIGHT & BULK REQUIREMENTS FOR M-L AND M-G INDUSTRIAL ZONES. Applicant is Zoning Board; On 10/19/82 held a public hearing; on 1/18/82 APPROVED their application as modified, to be effective 2/2/82.

On 2/1/82 Zoning Board received 39 page petition referring the Zoning Board's action to the Board of Representatives, pursuant to Charter Section 553.2. On 2/11/82, Board of Representatives received said Referral.

Held in Committee 3/1/82. April meeting will be second regular meeting since receipt of referral.

MR. DONAHUE stated that on February 25, 1982, the Planning & Committee held a Public Hearing concerning this application which affects the M-L and M-G districts throughout South End, West Side, Glenbrook and Springdale.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE continued that Mr. Ralph Antonucci of the Stamford Citizens Action Group raised a point of order concerning the validity of the petition and the propriety of the Referral to this Board at the outset of the Hearing. The Group alleged that under the legal definition of landowners, as outlined in Woldan vs the City of Stamford from 1960, 158 signatures were invalid due to the fact that these signatures only represent one of at least two landowners and sometimes more. According to the law, if the property is owned by more than one person, all owners must sign to make a valid petition. 51 individuals signed as petitioners for property they do not own. 5 persons signed more than once. Also, they alleged that 12 signatures appear to have been signed by an individual other than the petitioner.

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee took this under advisement and proceeded with the Hearing with these charges in mind. MR. DONAHUE stated that within a few days, he met with Mr. Frattaroli of the Law Department and Mr. Richard Ferluto of the Action Group. The process that they used in their investigation was reviewed, and a sworn statement was given to the Law Department and it further stated that their allegations could be verified by reviewing public records on file within the Land Records of the City of Stamford. A formal opinion was requested from Corporation Counsel as to the validity of the allegations with regards to Woldan vs the City of Stamford. MR. DONAHUE continued that after a lengthy investigation of over 10 Court decisions, it was the decision of Corporation Counsel that the allegations made by the Stamford Citizens Action Group were correct as far as what constitutes a valid signature. The Committee was charged with the responsibility with either satisfying itself that the signatures were, in fact, invalid or barring that, we could have made mention of the question of the petitions validity in the Record and considered the application as to its merits leaving it up to the Courts to decided on the validity.

MR. DONAHUE stated that the Committee asked the Action Group to turn-over their back-up material and the Board's researcher was asked to go to the City Records to verify or to disprove the allegations. MRS. MILLER (the researcher) made two significant points in her report; 1) All but one of the 158 signatures listed by the Action Group as invalid as more than one person is on Record as owning the property. Those signatures were not contained in the petition. 2) The second group of 51 signers do not own the property that they signed for. It was included that three should have been placed on the first list as there was more than one person owning those pieces of property.

MR. DONAHUE said that it was the conclusion of the Planning and Zoning Committee by a vote of 4 to 0 that the petition is invalid and not properly before the Committee. This Board cannot act on a petition that has been deemed invalid. MR. DONAHUE stated that this process was reviewed by Corporation Counsel's office from beginning to end and Committee is satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the petition was never validly placed before us.

MR. BLUM said he would like to ask the Committee to consider that a Public Hearing was held and to allow the Board to hear what went on at the Public Hearing and to make some vote upon it. There are loop-holes in regard to the Zoning Board that should be returned to the Zoning Board for further work with the developers with those who have land in the industrial areas. MR. BLUM said that we are sort of putting on a moratorium on other than industrial buildings. He stated that he would like to know where industry of any size is going to come to the City of Stamford. He said that we should hear the merits of the Hearing before we go on.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT maintained that this matter is before this Board whether it be erroneously or not correct. The Steering Committee placed this item on our Agenda. At that point in time, the proper research should have been done on the petition, and as to the signatures being valid or not, we have on our desks two letters; one from Commonwealth Land and Title Insurance Co. and one from Pioneer National Title Insurance Co. which states quite succinctly that the method used to determine land ownership by Mrs. Miller (no personal dispersions cast upon her work as she did it upon directions from the Committee) was not the normally accepted method for determining land ownership. With the method used, land could have changed hands between October 1 and this point in time when the research was done and no mention made of it. That being the case, MR. WIEDERLIGHT quoted from the Corporation Counsel's letter, "If your Committee is unable to conclusively determine whether the petition contains the requisite number of signatures in accordance with Section 553.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford, then you should proceed to entertain the merits thereof leaving the ultimate determination of the validity thereto to the Courts. I, therefore, maintain that we should decide the merits of the appeal and leave the validity of the petition to the Courts."

MR. DZIEZYC said that who can say that the petitions are invalid. Corporation Counsels are not infallible. That is why we have Court cases to solve problems between lawyers. MR. DZIEZYC stated that we should vote on the merits of the application and if there is a Court case, it would be proved either way.

MRS. GUROIAN stated that it was at the Hearing that the charge was made that the petitions were invalid and a statement was made at the consultation with the full Committee by MR. DONAHUE to the affect that the Hearing would go on although we reserved the right to come-in with a judgement as to whether the application was before us with validity or without validity so that the exception was noted both at the Hearing and at a subsequent meeting before the Board.

MRS. GUROIAN said if it was, in fact, up to the Steering Committee to determine the validity or non-validity of a petition, then it would become their responsibility to check the signatures on a petition; because a matter is placed into a Committee, it transfers that responsibility to the Committee and it is the Committee's responsibility to see whether the petition is valid or not and come in with a judgement of its own. MRS. GUROIAN said the Committee decided that the results of the investigation were so overwhelming that even if some error was made in checking the signatures, enough evidence was put forth to substantiate the fact, in fact, the petition was invalid and it was the responsibility of the Committee to come to that judgement and not the responsibility of the Steering Committee.

MRS. GUROIAN went on to say that at the first meeting, she suggested that we seriously considered checking Planning and Zoning and have a researcher check every application as referred to us as to its validity. It is not the responsibility of the Court alone; it is also our responsibility to deem whether a petition before us is with validity or without validity. If we go along with what MR. DZIEZYC said, then why do we have to have signatures at all; three people could sign 50 names and come in with a referral. The referral is to be made by "X" number of valid signatures. MRS. GUROIAN stated that she is in full agreement with the Committee's decision that the petition is not before this Board with validity and this Board should not consider it. It has not, in fact, been referred to us.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

THE PRESIDENT stated that MR. DIXON and MR. LIVINGSTON left the Meeting.
34 members are present.

MR. ZELINSKI referred to Mrs. Miller's research to the Chairperson of Planning and Zoning regarding the checking of the names of real estate assessments. He believed this was an incorrect procedure; she should have went to the land records in the Town Clerk's office. We should decide tonight to vote on this rather than throwing this out on a legal technicality as to whether the signatures are valid or not.

MR. DeLUCA said he agreed with REPS. WIEDERLIGHT and ZELINSKI. He stated we should vote on this item based on the merits of the petition. There are questions as to whether our researcher used the proper records to check the validity of the signatures. To reject this and to say it is not properly before our Committee because a number of signatures were found to be invalid, means we are shirking our duties and are not giving the people that presented the petition ample time to go out and get additional signatures. MR. DeLUCA suggested that all petitions for a reversal of a Zoning Board's decision, should immediately be checked. He said that on the Agenda tonight was as item that affected his District. The petition had 59 signatures on it. If we are going to wait until a Public Hearing to have these signatures verified, and then find out that some signatures are invalid and therefore no longer before our Committee and we cannot vote on it, this would be an injustice to the residents in the area. By not voting on this tonight, we will not be able to vote on this the next meeting which would mean that the Master Plan automatically becomes approved. We have two meetings to act on any application or petition.

MR. DeLUCA said that we should act upon this this evening and reject the Committee's report that signatures are invalid; we are not being fair to the people who wrote up the petition.

MR. ESPOSITO questioned what MR. WIEDERLIGHT said. MR. ESPOSITO asked if in actuality our researcher, Mrs. Miller, did indeed make an error in her interpretation of any signature on that petition.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated he did not have the time to check. He said he had a doubt in his mind.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that we have no verification that any error was made.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that the point is not that we know if any error was made; the point is per the Corporation Counsel's letter whether you think an error was made then you should let it to the Courts to decide. MR. WIEDERLIGHT said that by virtue of the fact, that Mrs. Miller used the wrong method and there is no record as of October 1, to this date, land could have changed hands which would not have been verified by Mrs. Miller according to her method.

MR. ESPOSITO said that that may be correct, but there is no evidence that that has happened. He took question with the statement that Mrs. Miller used the wrong method. She may have not used the best method but he doubted that MR. WIEDERLIGHT make the interpretation that she used a wrong method. We have not verified that fact that the results are not valid. We have verified that a number of names are not valid, therefore, we have to go along with the Committee's recommendations.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. HOGAN disagreed with MR. ESPOSITO as there was no evidence that the signatures on the petition were not valid. Through the Corporation Counsel's letter the possibility of a wrong procedure could have been used in determining the validity of the names. The petitioners should be given the opportunity to be at least recognized before this Board in that it should be discussed on its merits and voted upon and if a challenge has to be made, it can be made through the Courts. This Board should be accessible to the petitioners.

MR. WHITE stated that we are not inaccessible. These people presented a petition to the Board that was improperly drawn and it was verified; may be by not the best process but it probably was the best process. The Corporation Counsel did not tell us to take it to Court; they merely said it was up to us to decide whether this petition was valid or not and if to our satisfaction, we decide it is not valid, then we can reject on those grounds alone; which is what we did. The Organization that presented the material to us did an intensive job checking and we double checked on them based on their sworn statement. No evidence has been presented on the other side that is valid. A mass of evidence has been presented that it is not valid.

MR. WHITE said to turn around and shift this over to the Courts on the basis of that is the way we are going to do it as a general course of action, seems to circumscribe our abilities or powers as a legislature.

MS. SUMMERVILLE stated that the Planning and Zoning Committee are to be commended on the fine job they have done. Mrs. Miller, the researcher, did exactly what the Committee asked her to do. MS. SUMMERVILLE again commended the Committee on the fine job done and supported their recommendations.

MR. FAUTEUX asked a Point of Information about when Mrs. Miller's findings were made known about the number of invalid signatures.

MR. DONAHUE said the transmittal was dated March 29, 1982.

MR. FAUTEUX asked if at that time, did it become publicly known that there was an indication of the invalidity of the signatures and was there any reaction from the petitioners or a representative of the group of petitioners who brought this in front of the Board?

MR. DONAHUE stated that this was a matter of public record. It was printed two days in a row in the Advocate. An attorney involved in the case called MR. DONAHUE about the work that had been done and he was told about it. MR. DONAHUE said that we have a letter submitted by some Company he never heard of before and he did not know what questions they were asked or if they were familiar with the Stamford Charter or the Woldan vs the City of Stamford and the other 8 or 10 cases that were researched with regards to this. Those who have the most to gain or lose never approach the Committee, never ask for the signatures, never ask for any information so that they can go out and present to the Committee a counter argument as to the validity of these signatures.

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee began; he met with Mr. Frattaroli, Law Dept., and they went step by step with the Citizens Action Group as to how they proceeded to come to their conclusions about this petition. In doing so, Mr. Frattaroli concurred with that approach and that is who I have to base it on. There is an affidavit to the method that was used by the Citizens Action Group in regards to this matter.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE said that one thing that must be considered in Woldan vs the City, it is clearly pointed out that the Committee that heard of allegations concerning a petition in the past, 1960 not being valid, was cited by the Judge and questioned in that case because they had not, even though the question was raised, done anything to check the validity of the petition. The questions raised tonight, many of which are without basis and fact. The Committee was given a choice; to either satisfy themselves beyond a reasonable doubt that these signatures were invalid and if that could not be done or if we could have gotten down to a count of 299 or 297, the requisite being 300 for a valid petition, then we should go ahead and hear the merits and read that item into the Record. MR. DONAHUE stated that we are down below 200; approximately 180 to 190 signatures. There is no question that this petition is invalid.

MR. FAUTEUX asked if what MR. DONAHUE was saying that MR. DONAHUE heard nothing from the petitioners side since the indication of the invalidity of the signatures arose.

MR. DONAHUE stated that he was told that they should ignore the validity or invalidity of the petition and consider the merits. MR. DONAHUE found that to be very disturbing. The Charter provides access to a referral process and guards against frivolous appeals. There is a method to be followed. It was known by some who circulated the petition, others did not know that and asked anybody they could find to sign.

MRS. HAWES stated she agreed with MS. SUMMERVILLE that the Committee did a very thorough job in their investigation and in the report that MR. DONAHUE gave. There was a substantial amount of signatures determined to be invalid; not just one or two or even 10. This item is not validly before us and we should move on to the next item on the Agenda.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT wanted to know if MR. DONAHUE had invited the opposition side or the petitioners to sit in on the meeting with the Citizens Action Group and the Corporation Counsel when MR. DONAHUE reviewed the method used for petition as well as the signatures.

MR. DONAHUE stated that was not within the realm of what the Committee was charged to do. The Committee went to our Corporation Counsel to ask in what manner the Committee should proceed; however, in conferences he had and he was getting phone calls on a daily basis, explained what was going on; the opposition did know what was happening.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT thought then and therefore that MR. DONAHUE and his Committee prejudice themselves and left a neutral position and swung over to one side but not inviting the other side to sit in on the deliberations. MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that it was incumbent upon them to keep both sides informed if they wanted to keep a neutral posture in this matter. MR. WIEDERLIGHT quoted what MR. WHITE said, "We may have not used the best process." If the best process was not used, there is a margin or a question of margin for error; that being the case, there is no choice but consider the merits of the case and not throw out the petition.

MR. WIDER MOVED to go on to the next item on the Agenda. SECONDED.

MR. DUDLEY MOVED the question. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT stated that there was no QUESTION. The Committee made a report that this was not properly before Committee. There was no MOTION on the Floor.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI stated that THE PRESIDENT would have to make a Ruling.

MRS. GUROIAN said that MOVING on to the next question is valid. There does not have to be a Motion on the Floor to Move the previous question.

THE PRESIDENT asked MR. DONAHUE to repeat the Committee's report on Item #2 on the Agenda.

MR. DONAHUE stated there was no Item #2 before the Board and said he believed a MOTION was made and SECONDED to go on to the next item.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT stated that he saw an Item #2 on the Agenda and said to vote on this matter.

THE PRESIDENT stated there was a MOTION TO GO ON TO THE NEXT ITEM AND SECONDED. If this was defeated, we could go back and a motion entertained to take this Out of Committee and placed on the Floor.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT challanged the Chair: He stated it was out-of-order to accept that Motion to go on to the next item since Item #2 has not properly been dispatched.

THE PRESIDENT said that the MOTION TO GO ON TO THE NEXT ITEM HAS BEEN CHALLENGED. A NO vote goes against the Ruling of the Chair. The Ruling is that we will accept the MOTION ON THE FLOOR THAT WE ACCEPT NO. 2 ON THE AGENDA. If you vote NO to this, that means that you want to go back and continue with Item #2 on the Agenda.

THE PRESIDENT stated, "THAT ALL IN FAVOR OF SUSTAINING THE CHAIR, PLEASE SIGNIFY BY AYE." (AYE); OPPOSED to please raise hands; 10 OPPOSED. CHAIR SUSTAINED.

THE PRESIDENT stated the Board would go back to the MOTION made by MR. DUDLEY to go on to Item #3 on the Agenda. She called for a vote. A simple majority was Ruled by the Parliamentarian. The vote was 22 YES, 6 NO, 1 ABSTENTION and 4 NOT VOTING.

MR. ZELINSKI made a MOTION to SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP ITEM #19 OF FISCAL. SECONDED. CARRIED. (voice vote)

(19) \$21,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING A PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$21,000 (REDUCED FROM \$38,000 ORIGINALLY REQUESTED) TO BE KNOWN AS #281.106 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT - SIXTH AND SUMMER STREETS: to be financed by taxation. This funding is only for traffic light signalization. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that this was a request to put a traffic signal at 6th and Summer Streets and to reverse the flow of traffic on 6th Street; one-way from Bedford towards Summer. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that she and MRS. GOLDSTEIN were at the meeting and concurred. Two present and 2 in favor was the report given by MRS. MAIHOCK, whose Committee, Transportation was the Secondary Committee.

UNDER SUSPENSION OF RULES ITEM #19 FISCAL (Continued)

MR. WHITE asked if this was for signaling or is this for improvements where it turns out that the road is wide, the sidewalks narrow, trees chopped down and sidewalks raised? Is this for signaling or is this going to be a massive project?

MR. ESPOSITO stated that this would be for a traffic light. Originally this request for \$38,000; \$17,000 was for street improvements. At this point, it is only to put in a traffic signal.

MRS. GERSHMAN asked if this was to reverse the traffic between Summer and Bedford Streets?

MR. ESPOSITO said that that was correct. That is the intent of the traffic light.

MRS. GERSHMAN stated that she saw no reason for this. This is the only cross-over from Summer to Bedford Street. She could not see where reversing the flow of traffic would improve traffic here. She stated that it was an enormous waste of money for not doing anything and urged her colleagues to vote against this.

MR. BLUM stated that he had seen a copy of the Traffic Commission Minutes. At the last Board, an item was brought up regarding Chester and Urban Streets going the same direction. These streets have been brought up again in Traffic Commission Minutes. The item stated that if this was turned down, what would happen to make one of the street, either Urban or Chester, to go through towards Strawberry Hill. The only way that this could happen, would be to turn this item down by the Board. MR. BLUM questioned why Chester or Urban could not be made one-way to get to Strawberry Hill Avenue.

THE PRESIDENT announced that MR. WIEDERLIGHT left the Meeting and 33 members are present.

MR. GAIPA asked what was the specific purpose of reversing 6th Street necessitating the light.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that if someone is in the rear parking lot of Ridgeway, and they want to go down town, the only way they can get down town is going up to Bull's Head and come down Summer Street. This way creates more traffic and uses more energy. Many people now go through the parking lot of Ridgeway to go on to Summer Street which creates much congestion in the upper parking lot. MR. ESPOSITO said that it would seem reasonable to reverse the traffic flow. If the flow is reversed for all the cars in the back lot, they can simply go out to Summer Street and down town. As far as the people coming from the North country, they only go one block out of their way. The Traffic Commission felt that the one block extra that people coming southbound on Summer would go would more than compensate for the alleviation of the problem of going all around Bull's Head.

THE PRESIDENT announced that MR. HOGAN left the Meeting and 32 members are present.

UNDER SUSPENSION OF RULES ITEM #19 FISCAL (Continued)

MR. GAIPA stated that the Traffic Commission turned this down originally. Their initial decision was reversed. To take the light from where it is now and move it down approximately 20 feet to the intersection where the parking lot exits onto Summer Street, that would have a beneficial effect now without anybody coming from the back parking lot. If we add another traffic signal on 6th Street, in about a space of 100 yards, we are going to have four traffic signals and this is crazy. To have a fourth light in about a 100 yards is a tremendous waste of money.

MRS. MAIHOCK stated that it occurred to her after the Fiscal meeting, that along this same stretch of Summer Street, there is a light in the area of International House of Pancakes and the exit from Ridgeway does not have a stop light; a lot of traffic leaves Ridgeway, therefore, why would it be necessary to add another light at 6th & Summer which is just a block away. With the light at the Pancake House, it is possible for people to cross the street with some level of safety.

MRS. PERILLO MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on \$21,000 for the Department of Traffic and Parking to amend the Capital Projects budget for intersection improvements at 6th and Summer Streets. DEFEATED, 13 YES, 18 NO, 3 NOT VOTING. (Needed 22 votes for a favorable approval)

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (3) REFERRAL CONCERNING ZONING BOARD'S DECISION ON APPLICATION #81-011 TO DENY APPLICANTS (ALEXANDER R. & PATRICIA A. KOPROSKI) CHANGE IN ZONE FROM R-7½ One-Family residence to R-5 multiple family residence on property located on east and west side of Cove View Drive.

MR. DONAHUE stated that there was an error on the Agenda; a line was inserted by mistake stating that the April meeting will be the first regular meeting since receipt of the referral. This was sent to us from the Zoning Board on February 23. We have to consider this this evening.

MR. DONAHUE said that basically, this affects an area that has been heavily impacted by construction of an office building and of heavy traffic due to construction of the Courtland Avenue bridge closing and it is in the process of undergoing a change and the affected intersection, that of Hamilton Avenue, Cove View Drive, Main Street and its realignment with Waterbury Avenue, has not yet begun.

MR. DONAHUE continued that under the City's Master Plan, the area is designated for multi-family use and while there is a sensitivity to the need for more housing units in the City, there are serious questions raised about the traffic and about the density that would be caused by a change of this nature. Basically, the affected properties along Hamilton Avenue and on the Hamilton Avenue end of Cove View Drive would be interested in an R-5 development and Mr. Koproski has expressed a desire to develop apartments or condominiums on his parcels which adjoin each other near the end of Cove View Drive.

The application not only seeks to change the subject properties along Hamilton Avenue and Cove View Drive but to in fact, change the whole of Cove View Drive. Mr. Koproski has indicated that he would be interested in building around 12, 13 or 14 units, there is a potential if this whole parcel were to go to

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE (continuing) R-5, as many as a 100 units being built in this area. There is sentiment from those who live in single-family houses on this street that they do not want their properties changed to R-5; and, this was indicated in a petition sent to the Planning Board with regards to the Master Plan review requesting that they consider a single family designation under the new Master Plan. The Planning Board sent a letter stating that this was in concert with their concerns for the area and to provide multi-family housing.

MR. DONAHUE said a serious point was made by the Traffic Department when it stated that the development of an substantial size multi-family parcels with driveways to Cove View Drive would impact adversely traffic operations at the Main, Hamilton, Cove View, Waterbury intersection. Before any change in zone be considered, a specific development proposal should be presented prior to final action on the zone change.

MR. DONAHUE stated that with this in mind, the Committee recommend by a vote of 4 against the application with none in favor to uphold the Zoning Board and to deny this application. The Committee is asking this Board to vote no on this application but in keeping with past policy, MR. DONAHUE read the specific motion which is phrased in a positive manner. Motion follows:

"I move that the application #81-011 to the Zoning Board by Alexander R. & Patricia A. Koproski for a change in zone from R-7½ single family residential to R-5 multi-family residential for the subject property on the east and west sides of Cove View Drive be approved." SECONDED.

MR. BLAIS commented that there are already a lot of condominiums on the upper part of Hamilton Avenue. A large office building is being built across from this proposed property and he thought that Hamilton Avenue at that point now is not sufficient to handle the traffic. To further develop the density in this area would be asking for real traffic problems; problems with people, confusion and deteriorate the standard of living for the whole area.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if Cove View Drive was the dead-end street with a turn-around. Someone replied that it was. MR. BOCCUZZI went on to ask if that was the street that has the problems with parking from the customers from Twin Faces East.

MR. DONAHUE stated that it had problems with parking. It was posted No Parking and the problems have been abated.

THE PRESIDENT moved to a vote. (voice vote). DENIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- (4) REFERRAL CONCERNING PLANNING BOARD'S DECISION ON APPLICATION #MP-248 WHICH APPROVED APPLICANT'S (GEORGE BONGIORNO) REQUEST TO AMEND THE MASTER PLAN FOR PROPERTY ON WEST SIDE OF LONG RIDGE ROAD FROM RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY PLOTS LESS THAN ONE ACRE TO RESIDENTIAL, MULTI-FAMILY LOW DENSITY, pursuant to Section 522.4 of the Stamford Chapter. A petition containing 59 names was received asking for reversal of this decision; however, we have been unable to determine any one person who brought it in, or who might represent the petitioners; nor does Planning and Zoning Director, John Smith, know who brought it in. April meeting will be first regular meeting since receipt of referral.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE stated that the information about the April meeting being the first regular meeting since receipt of referral is accurate. This will be considered at the May meeting. A Public Hearing will be held.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (5) WHY GROUP WESTINGHOUSE ON WALLACE STREET (HARBOR PLAZA) DID NOT UNDERGO COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT (CAM) REVIEW BEFORE THE ZONING BOARD - submitted by Rep. W. Dennis White 3/11/82.

MR. DONAHUE said that Mark Lubbers appeared before them the last evening to talk about this matter. Some serious questions were raised and the Planning and Zoning Committee will be forwarding a letter to the Zoning Board to ask them to consider a CAM review and also to address this problem which has to do with using a building, a pre-existing building in the Coastal area for use that may or may not be in keeping with the Coastal Management Act.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION PROPOSED ORDINANCE AND RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ZONING THE ZONING BOARD TO EMPLOY A ZONING ANALYST - submitted by Martin Levine 3/19/82.

MR. DONAHUE stated that on the last Board, a zoning analyst was hired and after that, the Board was asked to pass an ordinance and resolution so that the zoning analyst could be paid. A concern as to the propriety was raised at that time. Since it was a short term situation, and contractual employee, this Board acted favorably.

MR. DONAHUE said that tonight we have a similar ordinance and resolution. The contract for the zoning analyst expires the end of April. We would have to consider this this evening. MR. DONAHUE continued that the Zoning Board informed the Committee that they would only need the contractual employee in the process of comprehensive re-zoning for probably a year to a year and a half from the present. This would be the last time that the Board would be considering this. To continue the process already begun, we must pass the ordinance and resolution this evening.

MR. DONAHUE stated the Planning and Zoning Committee voted 4 in favor and none opposed to recommend the waiver of publication of this item and so MOVED. SECONDED.

MS. SUMMERVILLE stated for the Record, that it was now 1:20 a.m.,

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to waive publication. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (voice vote)

MR. DONAHUE stated that the Committee recommended by a vote of 4 in favor and none opposed for final adoption of this ordinance and MOVED. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked why Margaret Brady, the present Zoning Analyst, why was not her name used or was it possible that she would not be the person who will be the zoning analyst.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. DONAHUE stated that it is expected that Margaret Brady will continue on in the position for at least another year; but there is always the possibility that she could leave the services of the City or something could happen in between time that would require it. The position is created, not necessarily with Margaret Brady in mind, although she is serving in this capacity at this time.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the final adoption of the proposed ordinance to employ a zoning analyst. APPROVED by a voice vote with 26 YES, 3 NO (M. Perillo, Boccuzzi, DeLuca) and 3 ABSTENTIONS (Gaipa, Summerville, A. Perillo).

MR. DONAHUE said his Committee recommended approval of the companion resolution by a vote of 4 in favor and none opposed and so MOVED. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the proposed resolution. (voice vote) APPROVED 26 YES, 3 NO (M. Perillo, Boccuzzi, DeLuca) and 3 ABSTENTIONS (Summerville, Gaipa, A. Perillo).

MR. BOCCUZZI asked a Point of Information: Is 21 votes needed to adopt an ordinance or a simple majority?

THE PRESIDENT replied we had 21 as there were not that many NO votes.

MR. BOCCUZZI requested to use the machine to record the above voting.

THE PRESIDENT again announced the vote as 26 YES, 3 NO and 3 ABSTENTIONS. (This was the voice vote and 32 members were present)

THE PRESIDENT announced that MR. RYBNICK, MR. OWENS, and MR. BLAISE left the meeting. There are 29 members present.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that in view of the fact that so many members left and a heavy snowstorm is anticipated, she made a MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. DEFEATED. 11 YES, 17 NO.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Burtis Flounders and Alfred Perillo

MR. PERILLO said his Committee met on Thursday, April 1, 1982 at 8:00 p.m. A quorum was present to conduct Committee business. Present were Reps. Peter Blais, Robert Fauteux, Burt Flounders and Al Perillo, Co-Chairmen, Reps. Mary Lou Rinaldi, John Roos, and Ann King Saxe; Rep. Boccuzzi and Public Works Commissioner Bruce Spaulding, Joe Black of the Public Works Dept. also attended at the request of the Committee.

- (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. 2/1/82 Regular Meeting, Committee recommended Lay on the Table. Held in Committee 3/1/82.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. PERILLO stated that Item #1 was discussed. Differences of opinion continued to exist in the Committee regarding the specific need and timing of the decision, Commissioner Spaulding reiterated his position that in the interest of prudent budget administration, he made the decision to accomodate the \$90,000 funding cut which was made by the Board of Finance. The consensus of the Committee was that this particular issue has become increasing academic with the passage of time and that the work of the Committee should now focus on more immediate issues affecting the Public Works Department such as the future streamlining of services including garbage collection in order to keep a lid on the 1982/83 budget needs. Accordingly, this item is being removed from the Public Works Agenda.

- (2) THE BOARD ISSUE OF GARBAGE COLLECTION - submitted by Rep. Flounders 2/1/82; to include collection at condominiums previously submitted by Rep. David Blum. Held in Committee 3/1/82.

MR. PERILLO said that it was agreed that the Public Works Committee is obligated to re-examine the proposed ordinance that calls for a tax credit for refuse collection to owners of residential units and multiple unit residential complexes and come to a program that is fair to the multiple residential complexes as well as to all Stamford taxpayers. Effective with the next Public Works meeting, a tax credit refuse collection ordinance will replace the broad issue of garbage collection on the Public Works meeting agenda.

- (3) LETTER FROM ROBERT S. WEISS & CO. REGARDING WHITAKER PLACE AND ROAD WORK NEEDED THERE, per their letter to Rep. Flounders. Held 3/1/82.

MR. PERILLO said this item was removed from the Agenda and not discussed at the meeting. Prior to the meeting, arrangements were made with Commissioner Spaulding to meet with Mr. Weiss to resolve the matter. Removed from Agenda.

- (4) FLOODING PROBLEM AT FAIRFIELD AVENUE AT A PREVIOUS CITY LANDFILL SITE. Submitted by Rep. John Boccuzzi 3/19/82.

MR. PERILLO stated that item #4 was also removed from the Agenda in favor of a meeting with Rep. Boccuzzi and Commissioner Spaulding to discuss the operational problems associated with the matter. Removed from Agenda.

MR. PERILLO continued that Commissioner Spaulding reviewed his 1982/83 Continuation and Reduction budget proposals with the Committee in order to apprise the Committee of the consideration that went into the Department's planning for the next fiscal year.

MRS. MAIHOCK, Chairwoman, of the Environmental Protection Committee spoke on item #4. Her Committee was the Secondary Committee. She stated she received a communication from Comm. Spaulding that this was an administrative matter and was in the hands of the Corporation Counsel and she advised MR. FLOUNDERS that she would not, therefore, under those circumstances appear as the Secondary Committee because there was nothing that would have been on the Agenda.

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - Co-Chairmen David Blum & Lathon Wider

MR. WIDER said his Committee met on March 30, 1982. Present were Reps. Blum, Co-Chairman, Ann King Saxe, and Lathon Wider, Co-Chairman. Also, present were Robert Johnson, Richard Gitlin, Nancy Mitchell, Nathan Sumpter and Len Gambino of WSTC.

- (1) QUESTION OF FINANCE BOARD POLICY #6-1 TO BE REVIEWED BY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT REGARDING AUDITING POLICY. Submitted by Rep. Lathon Wider at Steering 2/16/82. Held in Committee 3/1/82.

MR. BLUM said that a letter was received from the Board of Finance, from the Vice-Chairman, Marilyn Laitman. MR. BLUM read as follows, "The Audit Committee of the Board of Finance consisting of Michael Locking and myself, met with John Brown to discuss the resolution of a problem that has the concern of us for sometime; the audit of Components of CTE. Mr. Locking and I are in agreement that the CTE should undergo a comprehensive audit. This will be to their own best interest and in the interest of the Community.

Mr. Brown agreed that he would cooperate and send us a list of all the programs of which CTE is involved including any audits that have been made and the amounts of any funds which are available to pay these audits. He was also to contact the City auditors, Arthur Young & Co. to ascertain if it is feasible to add the CTE audits to the City. The fee and resolution of any outstanding bills owed to Arthur Young & Co. also were to be discussed with Mr. Robert Brennan of the Arthur Young Co. In addition, Mr. Brown is to send us information concerning two additional auditing firms who are capable of undertaking a comprehensive audit.

I would like to emphasize that Mr. Brown was cooperative and we look forward to getting the information we have requested as soon as possible in order to a final resolution of Community Development Budget may be determined."

MR. BLUM stated what when the Board of Finance receives the information and material, the Committee will further discuss the letter. The Committee voted 3 to 0 to HOLD this item.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) THE MATTER OF PERSONNEL POLICIES OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. Held in Committee 9/9 and 10/5/81. Held in 10/26/81 at Mayor's request to hold for an additional month. Held in Steering 12/10. Held at Special Meeting 1/19/82. Held 2/1/82, and 2/16/82.

MR. BLUM stated that the Committee had a letter from Community Development regarding their personnel policies. The matter is now under the jurisdiction of the Personnel Department pending receipt of Atty. Gallant's report on unclassified employees.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT (Continued)

- (3) REP. PAUL DZIEZYC'S LETTER 3/17/82 REQUESTING INFORMATION ON CONGREGATE HOUSING SECTION 8 CERTIFICATES, STATING 70 ARE IN NANCY MITCHELL'S POSSESSION AND 45 BEING HELD FOR WILLARD PROJECT, and how does this relate to availability of Park Manor units.

MR. BLUM stated that from their Committee meeting, it was explained that Section 8 certificates were for moderate rehabilitation, therefor not applicable to Park Manor. Park Manor presently has Section 8 certificates from the Housing Authority producing over \$5,000.00 income.

(Some dialogue lost due to turn-over of tape)

MRS. PERILLO asked if there was a law that says the City must refer to Park Manor? If we got this straight, may be we would not have so many questions asked. It is constantly being asked.

MR. WIDER stated that the City has no authority to refer to any place. All the City can do is to distribute those certificates and the person has a right to go to any place where they can get accommodations; can be paid for with that certificate at 25% of their income.

MRS. HAWK stated that when the Willard School appropriation was taken-up, that was discussed with the Welfare Department and the situation was that when people are turned away from the Smith House Residence because there is no room there, they are given a list of all the available senior housing in the City and Park Manor is on that list along with the Homestead, Eagle Towers, and any other place that houses seniors in the City. The City is not in a position to be a referral agency for any one institution. They list all the available options and the seniors then are able to choose and look someplace else if they want to. That is really all that the City can do. It can't pressure people into choosing one over the other. It can just give them the option which it does.

MR. BLUM turned the Floor over to MR. WIDER who in turn asked MR. ROOS to read item #4.

- (4) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE 8TH YEAR APPLICATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO U. S. DEPT. OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT.
Submitted by Nancy Mitchell, Director, 3/15/82.

MR. ROOS stated that all had a copy of the Resolution. The Members agreed that it did not have to be read.

THE PRESIDENT announced that 29 members were present.

MR. ROOS MOVED for adoption of the Resolution. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. APPROVED by 16 YES, 10 NO, 2 ABSTENTIONS and 1 NOT VOTING.

CHARTER REVISION, ORDINANCE COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen Robert Fauteux & Jerry Livingston(1) MAYOR'S REQUEST FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION TO INITIATE A CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION.

MR. FAUTEUX stated that he and MR. LIVINGSTON scheduled a meeting, an organizational meeting for Charter Revision, on Wednesday. Unfortunately, it conflicted with the High Holydays of Passover. The meeting will be rescheduled as soon as possible.

HELD IN COMMITTEEEDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Robert Fauteux and Mary Lou Rinaldi(1) REP. DeLUCA'S REQUEST OF 3/8/82 THAT FUTURE SYSTEM FAILURES BE AVOIDED BY DETERMINING WHAT CAUSED THE MAILING OF THE "BOGUS REASSESSMENT NOTICES" RECENTLY REGARDING REAL ESTATE RE-EVALUATIONS AND NEW ASSESSMENTS.

MR. FAUTEUX said that on March 29, 1982, E, W, and G had a meeting. Present were Reps. Fauteux, Gaipa, members of the Committee and Rep. DeLuca and Rep. Tarzia. Assessor Hyland was present also and presented his side of the situation.

MR. FAUTEUX stated that at the conclusion of the meeting, it was decided to invite a representative of the Corporation Counsel's office, Alice Perry, and also Harry Alter, the Chairman of the Board of Tax Review. This meeting will be scheduled for April 13, 1982, and talk to these people and we hope to come to a conclusion as to a report on this matter.

HELD IN COMMITTEETRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein - NO REPORTFISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Paul Esposito and Marie Hawe

MR. ESPOSITO said that his Committee met on Monday, March 29, 1982. Present were REPS. ESPOSITO, B. CONTI, FRANCHINA, FLOUNDERS, HAWE, HOGAN and GOLDSTEIN.

MR. ESPOSITO reported that a Sub-committee of Fiscal met within the past month to discuss the budgetary process. There will be some changes. Deliberations will begin on Monday, April 12, 1982. All should have received a copy of the full schedule that starts on April 12 and concludes on May 12. One change in the process will be that in the past years, we would go through the hearings, interview all the department heads, etc. and then wait until the final Saturday before the full Board voted to hold our deliberations; instead we are going to have deliberations throughout the process. Dates and times are marked on the schedule.

MR. ESPOSITO said that the Public Hearing on the Budget with the Board of Finance will be held Tuesday, April 6, 7:30 p.m. at the Cloonan School if weather permits.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

THE PRESIDENT announced that 28 members were present. MR. ROOS left the meeting.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to place the following items on the Consent Agenda: Items #5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, and 18. On items #7, 14, and 16, Education, Welfare and Government Chairman made a motion to WAIVE the Secondary Committee Reports. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED. All other Secondary Committee concurred. The proper motions were MOVED, SECONDED and CARRIED to place the above items on the Consent Agenda.

- (1) \$ 25,000.00 - DATA PROCESSING DEPARTMENT - Code 245.5160 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTER SERVICE - Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 11/30/81. Necessary due to inability to fill two vacant Programming positions, and require outside help. Board of Finance approved 12/17/81 Held in Steering 12/28/81 and 1/18/82. Returned to Committee 3/1/82.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said this request from Data Processing Department was for someone to come in and do some programm This would be a replacement for a programming position they have not been able to fill within the last few years. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed and so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. STORK stated that by a vote of 3 in favor, 2 opposed, his Committee concurred.

MRS. GERSHMAN stated that she felt that the process for finding this computer service was not done in a proper manner. It was not published nor did it go through proper channels. It was more or less word-of-mouth that it was found. She felt that they did not really try to fill this position; they were trying to do it piece-meal and she was opposed to outing a position at this point in the budgetary process.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that this was to hire outside professional computer services; an outside person who would do the work. In the past, the position was in the budget but the Department was not able to fill the position. In the past year, Fiscal voted to cut-out the funding for the position. They are requested not to re-instate the position but simply to be allowed to hire someone from the outside to deal with the work as it came along.

MR. FAUTEUX asked if this was an outside person acting in a consultanting capacity to do some of the priority programming and other jobs that had to be done?

MR. ESPOSITO stated that that was correct.

MRS. McINERNEY MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on \$25,000 for the Data Processing Department. DEFEATED by a vote of 17 YES, 8 NO, 2 ABSTENTIONS and 2 NOT VOTING.

THE PRESIDENT said that there were 28 members present; 21 votes are needed for every appropriation.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL "FOR THE CREATION OF A SPECIAL CAPITAL FUND TO FINANCE CAPITAL PROJECTS" - requested by Mayor Clapes 10/6/81 and 8/31/81 (to Finance Board). Returned to Committee 11/16/81. Held in Steering 12/10 and 12/28/81. Held in Committee 1/18/82. Held 3/1 at request of Commissioner Marra.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted 7 opposed and none in favor and MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to accept. SECONDED.

MR. FAUTEUX asked why?

MR. ESPOSITO stated that in a brief discussion with the Finance Commissioner, he did not think that he wanted to do this now. He questioned the whole idea of it. It was at his request.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on publication of the proposed ordinance for creation of a special capital fund to finance capital projects. DENIED UNANIMOUSLY. (voice vote)

- (3) \$ 8,000.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Code 240.5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS (to establish an Accounting Manual). Approved by Board of Finance 11/12/81. Held in Steering 12/10, 12/28/81 and 1/18/82. Held 3/1 at request of Commissioner Marra.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted 7 in favor of rejecting this and made a motion to approve. SECONDED.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that the Commissioner of Finance did not think that this was necessary at this point in time.

MR. FAUTEUX stated that Education, Welfare and Government Committee asked for a Waiver of the Secondary Committee. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on item #3. DENIED UNANIMOUSLY by a voice vote.

- (4) \$ 39,214.00 - NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS" "RETROACTIVE" INCREASES. Held in Steering 2/16/82, and Returned to Committee 3/1/82 for clarification and additional detail. (Approved \$110,649.00 at 3/1/82 meeting.)

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MR. ESPOSITO stated that Fiscal voted 7 - 0 to HOLD this item.

MR. STORK said that Personnel Committee voted to HOLD upon the report of Fiscal.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (5) \$250,000.00 - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET(S) per DPW Commissioner Bruce Spaulding's letter 3/15/82 and Mayor Clapes' letter 3/15/82 requesting top priority and delineating urgency;

Contingent upon approval of Finance Board.

TRANSFER FROM:

#310.163 Railroad Underpass Improvements	\$250,000.
--	------------

TRANSFER TO:

#341.860 Chlorine Handling Facility	\$ 32,000.
#341.864 Repairs to Pumping Stations	218,000.
	<u>\$250,000.</u>

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (6) \$300,000.00 - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - PARKS DEPARTMENT - BY ADDING A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #610.891 VETERANS PARK MODIFICATION. To be financed by taxation. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

SUSPENSION OF THE RULES TO TAKE UP THIS ITEM AFTER #7 OF PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE. SEE PAGE 10 OF MINUTES.

- (7) \$ 8,011.00 - BOARD OF TAX REVIEW - Additional appropriation dated 3/9/81 (original request for \$6,215 was withdrawn) - approved by Board of Finance 3/11/82, for the following:

119.1130 Part-time salaries	\$5,696.00
119.2922 Postage	1,400.00
119.2930 Miscellaneous	195.00
119.2920 Legal advertising	500.00
119.2923 Photo copying	220.00
	<u>\$8,011.00</u>

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (8) \$ 2,500.00 - E. GAYNOR BRENNAN GOLF COURSE - Code 670.2210 BUILDING MAINTENANCE - Additional appropriation requested. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (9) \$ 35,067.00 - VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS - Additional appropriation to grant salary increases to paid members of volunteer fire departments listed below in line with those granted recently to City Fire Department: Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

GLENBROOK (NEW HOPE) FIRE DEPARTMENT

Code 470.4340 \$11,414.00

TURN-OF-RIVER FIRE DEPARTMENT (2 STATIONS)

Code 470.4360 \$23,653.00
\$35,067.00

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (10) \$ 6,710.00 - STAMFORD AMBULANCE CORPS - Additional appropriation - Code 470.4380 Water, utilities, medical and life insurance expenses. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (11) \$140,179.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - Addition appropriation to fund through September 30, 1982. This amount includes the \$56,050.00 defeated by Bd. of Reps. Board of Finance approved in January and also 3/11/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC stated that Health and Protection voted 3 to 2 to deny this appropriation.

MRS. GERSHMAN stated that you could not deny food, shelter and clothing to people.

MRS. HAWK made a MOTION to Hold in Committee. SECONDED.

MRS. SAXE asked where the funds were coming from.

MR. ESPOSITO answered that they came from the Federal government.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to HOLD, APPROVED to Hold in Committee by a vote of 18 YES, 10 NO, 1 NOT VOTING.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (12) \$ 3,000.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 550.7530 FAMILY PLANNING MEDIA PROJECT - Additional appropriation - to be funded by a grant from State Dept. of Health Services to develop 5 video cassette informational and spot messages concerning human sexuality aimed at Stamford teenagers to be broadcast on new cable tv network. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted 5 to 2 to HOLD. MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC stated Health and Protection voted 3 to 2 to deny this.

MRS. HAWE said that after the Fiscal meeting, later in the week, she spoke to Sandra Gilbane, the Grants director, and she indicated that the State must know within a short period of time, whether we want to accept this money or not. She felt that if we Held this another month and it was rejected at the next meeting, the State Health Department would then lose the fund and the credibility of Stamford in applying for other grants would be damaged.

MRS. HAWE made a MOTION to TAKE OUT OF COMMITTEE so it could be voted on at this meeting. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote to Take Out of Committee. APPROVED by a vote of 19 YES, 6 NO, 1 ABSTENTION and 3 NOT VOTING.

MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to approved \$ 3,000 for the Family Planning Media Project. SECONDED.

MRS. PERILLO stated that each time Dr. Gofstein receives a grant, he seems to hire people. Will anyone be hired?

MR. ESPOSITO stated, "No, this is to develop video cassette information spot messages." MR. ESPOSITO said that consultants would be brought in. He thought that about \$600.00 would be for outside consultants to come in to direct this, acting fee, production assistant; technical consulting fees. The production assistant makes-up the bulk of the grant, \$1,000.

MR. STORK asked MR. DZIEZYC the rationale for Health and Protection's denial.

MR. DZIEZYC stated that this would interfere with the parents' concern for their children. If this information is not gotten from the home, you cannot get an outsider to discuss something that should be gotten at the home. Abortion will be discussed and MR. DZIEZYC stated that that was against his Faith and that is one reason why he voted against this.

MRS. GERSHMAN said she spoke to Dr. Gofstein about this project. She questioned the Dr. about the program. Dr. Gofstein stated that it would dwell mostly on what happens to teenagers who have children; do they have to quite school, who supports them, what are the responsibilities, the health hazards, also health hazards to the young baby? These things rather than the moral issue. This would be to dissuade teenagers from having children.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. ESPOSITO pointed-out that the intent of these spots would be to discourage teenagers from engaging in sexuality and to advise them of the consequences of pregnancy. The content of the cassettes would be determined by the Stamford Health Council. The Council includes Stamford Family Unit, St. Joseph's Hospital, American Cancer Society, American Lung Association, 7th Day Adventists Church, YWCA, Family & Children Services, New England Food and Dairy Council, March of Dimes, Stamford Health Department, Department of Income Maintenance, and other MR. ESPOSITO mentioned.

MR. DeLUCA MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the appropriation of \$3,000 Health Department for Family Planning Media. DENIED by a vote of 8 YES, 13 NO, 3 ABSTENTIONS, and 5 NOT VOTING.

(13) \$ 2,500.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 550.7515 REFUGEE HEALTH SCREENING
Additional appropriation - to be funded by a grant from State for identifying, monitoring and coordinating health services to refugees. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and so MOVED. SECONDED.

MR. DZIEZYC said that the Health and Protection Committee concurred.

MR. CONTI questioned this item. He said that under Legislative and Rules, they had just about the same thing. It was passed. There it said "an amount not to exceed \$2,500.00." In this other one, the Health Department is asking for another \$2,500. MR. CONTI said he believed that this and item #1 under L & R was the same.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that this was the appropriation for the Resolution. The Health Department must do this screening regardless of whether they get this money or not. This money is found money. By State Statutes, they must go out and screen the refugees and without this money, they must use City funds.

MR. WHITE asked if these refugees that will be screened, would they be the ones that came here from the "Freedom Flotilla?" Is any attempt made to determine whether or not they are illegal immigrants? Will they be screening people who are in the Country illegally?

MR. ESPOSITO said that they may be. Dr. Gofstein's said he was not immigration.

MR. WHITE said there were "millions" of people that are in the Country illegally and getting all kind of services and screenings. Something is wrong.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that if they come in with tuberculosis, just because they are illegal aliens does not mean that they are not going to spread it to Americans.

MR. WHITE said if we have this problem, may be this will force the officials to take a tougher look at the entire question.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK stated that this was discussed in the Legislative and Rules Committee meeting. Dr. Gofstein indicated that this did not particularly apply to any of the non-legal entries into our Country. These were the people who legitimately were here.

MRS. SAXE said that if illegal aliens show up in these cross checks, they are reported to immigration.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked about what percentage of refugees are we talking about in the City of Stamford. How many has the Doctor treated in the past?

MRS. MCINERNEY said that came to the L&R Committee when this was discussed with Sandra Gilbane and Sandra went back to Dr. Gofstein and he said that the number was in the single digit numbers. MRS. MCINERNEY said it was 7.

MR. WIDER asked if we had any Polish people being screened and was this going for all kinds of people. He did not want to vote on anything that would just take care of one type of person.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that this was not restricted to any ethnic group.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that we did get the information of 7 from Sandra Gilbane. Then, Dr. Gofstein said that they had like about 132 in 1980. He also indicated that Bridgeport and Hartford have a greater number than Stamford. Her personal opinion was since the number in Stamford seems to be less than Hartford and Bridgeport, it would seem that perhaps those areas could better use the funds but Dr. Gofstein said they would be used here.

MRS. SAXE stated that we are the sending and receiving area for Bridgeport, New Haven and the entire geographic area because for some reason Dr. Gofstein set it up in the State. We are the receiving area. If there is a problem and it has to be checked out in Bridgeport, all of the records are kept here in Stamford and all information is sent into Stamford. The reason for the grant is that we keep all the bookkeeping here. We are handling the refugees in the geographic area that has been set-up by the State. There is a difference between an alien, refugee and immigrant. This is for refugees.

MR. GAIPA MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the \$2,500 Health Department for screening.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a Point of Information. He asked if we did not appropriate this money through a grant, are we still going to have to give this service?

MR. ESPOSITO said that Ms. Gilbane told him "yes."

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked if we did not pass this grant, would our obligations still be to continue to keep the records?

MRS. SAXE replied that that was correct. This grant is what we are getting back for the work that we are already doing.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

THE PRESIDENT moved to a vote. DENIED by a vote of 20 YES, 4 NO, 2 ABSTENTIONS and 3 NOT VOTING. (21 votes were needed)

MR. ESPOSITO asked a Point of Information. He said that if Corporation Counsel comes out with a ruling that we only need a majority, does that mean that this then passes?

THE PRESIDENT said that the ruling at this point is that we do need a 2/3's. We all got the ruling in the mail. It is being researched more. Corporation Counsel's office now feels strongly that this is money expended regardless.

MRS. SAXE said that this was the last year for this grant.

- (14) \$ 90,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Code 230.5110 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES -
Additional appropriation - approved by Board of Finance
3/11/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH 1 NO VOTE (MR. STORK)

- (15) \$ 3,500.00 - CONTROLLER'S OFFICE - GROUP 24 - 5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS -
Additional appropriation to pay for additional appraisal time
with the recently organized Fixed Asset(Property) Accounting
System to conform to a State mandate. Board of Finance
approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted to HOLD this item.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (16) \$131,000.00 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT - Code 510.360; CASH RELIEF - Additional
appropriation. Approved by Board of Finance 3/11/82.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (17) \$ 30,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS
TRANSFER BUDGET BY ADDING THERETO A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #280.100
PARKING GARAGE & ELEVATOR REPAIR - to be financed by transfer
from project known as #280.822 Bedford Street garage light
repair. Approved by Board of Finance 3/11/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (18) \$ 20,655.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS
TRANSFER BUDGET BY ADDING A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #280.819 RAILROAD
STATION - to be financed by transfer from project known as
#280.822 Bedford Street garage light repair. This transfer
to close out the Bedford Street garage light repair #280.822.
Approved by Board of Finance 3/11/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

- (19) \$ 21,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING - AMEND THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET BY ADDING A PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$21,000.00 (reduced from \$38,000 originally requested) TO BE KNOWN AS #281.106 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT - SIXTH AND SUMMER STREETS - to be financed by taxation. This funding is only for traffic light signalization. Board of Finance approved 3/11/82.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

ABOVE ITEM TAKEN-UP UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES AFTER ITEM #2 OF PLANNING AND ZONING. SEE PAGE 37 OF THE MINUTES.

- (20) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SIGN AGREEMENT WITH STATE DEPT. OF HUMAN RESOURCES FOR TITLE XX SUMMER BUSING FUNDS - submitted by Mayor Clapes 3/1/82.

MR. ESPOSITO stated that Fiscal voted 4 in favor, 2 opposed with 1 abstention and so MOVED. SECONDED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. APPROVED with 20 YES, 4 NO, 3 ABSTENTIONS and 2 NOT VOTING.

- (21) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT WITH STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER FOR HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROJECT NOT TO EXCEED \$12,000 - submitted by Mayor Clapes 3/11/82.

MR. ESPOSITO said that Fiscal voted 3 in favor, 3 opposed with 1 abstention. This vote was to defeat this. MR. ESPOSITO MOVED to approve this Resolution. SECONDED.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked why this was voted to deny.

MRS. CONTI said that it was a grant not to exceed \$12,000. It would apply to a very limited amount of property in the City. If a person has a historic place, he can go and ask for a loan. We have to stop going around looking for all these grants and she was opposed to any of it.

MRS. GERSHMAN said that we should support this. A grant is found money. She said that this would apply to approximately 200 homes in Stamford and these are homes which can be used as living quarters. Many places have been renovated.

MR. DZIEZYC said a grant is either State money which is collected from us through sales tax or other means and the Federal government gets money from us through our income tax; a grant is from our pockets.

MR. BLUM said that the Neighborhood Preservation uses this officer in all the housing they have to preserve. This program has to have certain documents of certain housing that they are preserving and this officer is used frequently. MR. BLUM said he would rather see something old coming up rather than something new all the time.

MRS. HAWK said she agreed with MR. BLUM. Each grant should be judged on its merits and this is a worthwhile investment; to help preserve the older housing stock in the City. It is cheaper to do that than to build new housing.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continued)

MR. FAUTEUX MOVED the question. SECONDED. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote. A majority is needed. APPROVED 22 YES, 5 NO, 0 ABSTENTIONS and 2 NOT VOTING.

MR. ESPOSITO went through the Consent Agenda. MOVED. SECONDED. CARRIED.
MR. STORK wanted to be recorded NO on Item #16.

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairman Gerald Rybnick - NO REPORT

COMMUNICATIONS FROM MAYOR - NONE

PETITIONS - NONE

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION REGARDING HALSEY MOORE - submitted by Rep. John Zelinski 1/18/82. Held in Steering. Held 3/1/82.

MR. ZELINSKI MOVED to accept this Resolution. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION SUPPORTING BILL #5175 ESTABLISHING VIETNAM HERBICIDES INFORMATION COMMISSION NOW BEFORE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. Submitted by Rep. David Blum 3/16/82.

MR. BLUM MOVED for adoption. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM OSCAR COWAN POST #3, AMERICAN LEGION REGARDING A VETERANS MOBILIZATION. Stephen J. Vitka's letter 2/20/82. Submitted by Reps. B. Conti & Guroian.

MRS. CONTI MOVED for adoption. SECONDED. APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY by a voice vote.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

January 11, 1982 Regular Board Meeting

January 19, 1982 Special Board Meeting

February 1, 1982 Regular Board Meeting

March 1, 1982 Regular Board Meeting

THE PRESIDENT stated that there is no Acceptance of the Minutes. Mrs. McEvoy was in the hospital for a couple of weeks and was re-admitted this morning.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - NONEOLD BUSINESS - NONENEW BUSINESS - NONE

ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business before the Board, upon MOTION duly MADE, SECONDED and APPROVED, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 a.m.

ak

By Anne A. Kachaluba
Anne A. Kachaluba
Acting Administrative Asst.

APPROVED:

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

Roll Call Vote Item #6- Fiscal Return to com. 4-5-82

Seat No.	YES	NO	Ab-stain	Ab-sent	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.	Seat No.	YES	NO	Ab-stain	Ab-sent	Also Return to R.R. Cmt.	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.
1		✓			CONTI, Betty	R-7	21	✓					LIVINGSTON, Jeremiah	D-5
2	✓				GUROIAN, Grace	R-7	22	✓					BOCCUZZI, John	D-2
3				✓	FLOUNDERS, Burtis	R-13	23	✓					HOGAN, John J., Jr.	D-12
4	✓				WIDER, Lathon	D-3	24	✓					FRANCHINA, Joseph D.	R-10
5		✓			SAXE, Ann King	R-13	25		✓				DZIEZYC, Paul	R-15
6	✓				McINERNEY, Barbara	R-20	26	✓					FAUTEUX, Robert	R-20
7	✓				GERSHMAN, Elizabeth G.	R-19	27	✓					DIXON, Handy	D-2
8	✓				OWENS, Bobby	D-3	28				✓		GOLDSTEIN, Sandra	D-16
9	✓				ESPOSITO, Paul	D-4	29	✓					PERILLO, Mildred	D-9
10				✓	STORK, Philip R.	R-15	30	✓					DUDLEY, James L.	D-6
11		✓			ROOS, John	R-10	31	✓					ZELINSKI, John R., Jr	D-11
12	✓				DeLUCA, Robert "Gabe"	R-14	32				✓		SIGNORE, Mary Jane	R-18
13	✓				DeGAETANI, Barbara A.	R-17	33	✓					PERILLO, Alfred	D-9
14		✓			CONTI, Anthony	R-11	34	✓					BLAIS, Peter R.	D-8
15		✓			TARZIA, Joseph	R-17	35	✓					RINALDI, Mary Lou	D-5
16	✓				WHITE, W. Dennis	D-1	36	✓					RYBNICK, Gerald	D-4
17	✓				MAIHOCK, Audrey	R-19	37	✓					DONAHUE, Donald	D-8
18	✓				GAIPA, Walter E.	R-14	38	✓					WIEDERLIGHT, Michael	D-16
19	✓				BLUM, David I.	D-12	39	✓					HAWES, Marie	R-1
20	✓				SUMNERVILLE, Annie M.	D-6	40	✓					SANTY, Jeanne-Lois	R-18

TALLY: 30 YES
6 NO

ABSENT: 4
PRESENT: _____
DATE: 4-5-82