

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED SPECIAL BUDGET MEETING (THIRD NIGHT)

THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1982

17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

An Adjourned (third night) Special Budget Meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1982, pursuant to a "CALL" from the PRESIDENT, JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. This was a continuation of the previous night's meeting of May 12; the first meeting having been held May 11, 1982.

The meeting was called to order by the President at 7:40 p.m.

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

INVOCATION was given by Reverend Hoover.

CLERK OF THE BOARD ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE took the Roll:

There were 38 members present and 2 absent. The absent members were James Bonner (excused) and Philip Stork who later joined the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

The PRESIDENT declared a QUORUM.

CHECK OF THE VOTING MACHINE: The machine was found to be in good working order.

"CALL" OF THE MEETING:

"I, JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, PRESIDENT of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, and pursuant to Section 202 of the Stamford Charter, hereby call a SPECIAL MEETING or MEETINGS of said Board of Representatives at the following times and places: Tuesday, May 11, 1982, Wednesday, May 12, 1982, and Thursday, May 13, 1982 if necessary, at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, Legislative Chambers, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut for the following purpose:

To consider and act upon the CAPITAL PROJECTS and OPERATING BUDGETS for the fiscal year 1982-83; July 1, 1982 through June 30, 1983, as transmitted by the Board of Finance on Tuesday, April 20, 1982, pursuant to provisions of Chapter 613 of the Stamford Charter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: At the conclusion of this Budget Hearing, we will convene the Special Budget Meeting to consider the adoption of the proposed phase-in ordinance. I would remind all the Members, we are still operating under a continuous Motion and I would ask Mr. Esposito and Mrs. Hawe to give the total cuts we have made in the budget in the last few evenings

and what the total budget is to date, as a reminder for the Representatives.

MRS. HAWE: The total number of cuts, so far, and this includes the first section that we've done which is just the Welfare Department out of this grouping, from the very beginning is \$735,689. The total amount approved is \$52,957,931. It's \$53,868,954, including the Welfare Department. That's not including the Skilled Nursing Facility which we have not read the totals on yet. On page 74, the total number of cuts in this department, Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, \$82,000. The total amount approved is \$3,139,858.

Smith House Residents; Fiscal recommended no cuts in this department and the bottom line is \$585,000.

NON-CITY-SERVICE AGENCIES

Code 540, Non-City Social Service Agencies; on page 77, Fiscal recommended a cut in Line 4403, Rape Crisis Center, of \$5,285 which brings that line to \$28,392. The reason for this is that we felt that these service agencies should be kept at the same level as last year. The bottom line for that page is \$57,892.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I think that's an admirable conclusion, Mrs. Hawe. However, if you have noticed the statistics lately, I think it's becoming quite a problem in our Community and I just wonder if you are satisfied to stay at that level?

MRS. HAWE: Are you talking particularly about the Rape Crisis Center? I agree with you and I think that it is very worthwhile, but I feel unbalanced given the situation this year that they can continue. They work mostly with volunteers and I believe they can still be very effective with the same amount they had last year.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to speak to Item 5607, Regional Legal Aid, and I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I feel the Regional Legal Aid Center does provide a great service to the City and at the time it was originally included in the budget, it was undone under the time of large relocations due to the Urban Renewal Development in the City of Stamford. I feel that since the majority of the Urban Renewal has been completed and so has much of the massive movement of people from the downtown area, that this particular account should reflect a reduction by the City and I would move to reduce that account by \$4,000 bringing the total down to \$8,000. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney has made a Motion to delete \$4,000 from Account Regional Legal Aid and it has been Seconded. We will now address that Motion.

MR. ESPOSITO: What was your rationale for the Urban Renewal and Urban Development? That's not the main purpose of Regional Legal Aid. How does that affect the size of their budget?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Esposito, when the City made a commitment, initially to setting-up the Regional Legal Aid, it was during a time when we had plant mass-movement and relocating of people, tenants, into housing facilities within the City of Stamford. Since the tremendous need to make sure the

protection of those people and the movement and relocation of those people has been accomplished, I feel that even though there have been Federal cuts in this item, that the City should be entitled to a reduction of the funding of this particular account. It's my own personal observation, and it's obvious you don't agree with me. Sooner or later some of these items have to become a little bit less of a drain on the City and it's taxpayers.

MR. ESPOSITO: In regards to what the original intent or purpose of Regional Legal Aid was, it is an agency that does take care of non-criminal matters and it is an agency which represents those who cannot afford their own representation. \$12,000 is a minimal amount for the masses of people who cannot afford attorneys in this market place. Mrs. McInerney is correct, the Federal Government is cutting back in this area, so therefore, that leaves this Municipality in this particular budget line as one of the soul sources of support for the poor people and any legal representation they need or desire. Therefore, I would urge my fellow Representatives to oppose this cut. \$12,000 to help the poor with legal matters is certainly well spent money.

MR. WIDER: I echo Mr. Esposito's statement and I certainly disapprove of cutting this because although we have completed URC, the results of URC are still with us. We still have a number of problems with people who are being denied some of their basic rights. That is the right to live here. Legal service is continuously picking up many cases. I could see \$12,000 as being the bare minimum that we could afford to allocate for them. I ask all the Representatives to refuse this cut.

MR. BLAIS: I wanted to address the original cut recommended by the Fiscal Committee and not this particular cut.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would just like to remind everyone that the amount being requested is the same amount, and I believe that amount has been the same for at least 4 or 5 years, and if you take the rate of inflation under consideration, then we are giving them much less today than we were some years ago when we first started funding them. I would like to remind you also, that Regional Legal Aid processes seniors with Social Security problems and veterans. It also helps divorcees, who happen to be welfare clients and so I'm hoping that we do continue to fund them at this minimum amount of \$12,000.

MR. ZELINSKI: Is this Regional Legal Aid connected at all with the Connecticut Legal Services which is located over on the lower part of Summer Street?

MRS. HAWES: I don't believe so, Mr. Zelinski but I'm not 100% sure.

MR. ZELINSKI: To speak on the Motion. I've had personal dealings with Mr. Jack Boeson, who is the attorney who manages that office. He has been of extreme help to constituents in my district who unfortunately cannot afford to retain their own lawyers when they are faced with crucial housing problems. He has attended several meetings, one that I organized here in the Board Chambers, and I feel that even though we have to be cognizant of the taxpayers' money, I feel that this is money well spent and I think it would really be a disservice to cut it because it would be

affecting those people who, because of their economic plight, cannot afford to retain a costly attorney at this point. I would urge my colleagues to please consider that and to vote against the Motion to cut anything from this account.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We will use the machine. We are voting on Mrs. McInerney's Motion to delete \$4,000 from the Account Regional Legal Aid. Use the machine please. The Motion is lost, 16 yes, 19 no, and 3 abstentions.

MR. ZELINSKI: Just a Point of Information. Is Representative Bonner here this evening?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, he is not.

MR. ZELINSKI: I see that he voted to abstain on that vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It will be erased.

MR. BLAIS: I would just like to address the cut recommended by the Fiscal Committee. I am against cutting the Rape Crisis Center because I do not believe that we can hold the number of incidents down to the same level as last year. This happens to be a particularly debilitating type of incident and anybody that has gone through this, should have help because it is usually emotionally traumatic and the damage is far reaching and I think it's a great service to one half of our population. I Move to reinstate the \$5,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you mean the \$5,285?

MR. BLAIS: Yes, Madam Chairman, I Move to reinstate the \$5,285 as recommended by the Fiscal Committee. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to that Motion. We are now going to speak to Mr. Blais Motion.

MR. OWENS: I would like to say that I do support what Mr. Blais has recommended on this Motion. To say that we can't predict how many cases might come up this year, is correct and I would like to have the funds in this group remain the same.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. If you are in favor of Mr. Blais Motion, vote up for yes, down for no. The Motion is carried, 19 yes, 16 no, and 3 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: There are no cuts on that page and the bottom line is \$63,177.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Health Department, page 76, Code 550. Fiscal recommends the following cuts: in line 1110, Salaries, we took an attritioncut of \$10,000, which leaves that line at \$603,482. In the Over-time, that's line 1201, we removed the \$400 because that was for the Block Party. I'm sorry, we took \$350 out of that account because the majority of that was for the Block Party which was eliminated by the Board of Finance. That leaves \$50 in the Over-time Account.

College Tuition, line 1230, we recommend a cut of \$7,200 which leaves that line at \$7,120.

In New Equipment, which is line 2650, we recommend a cut of \$1,800, which leaves that line at \$520.

In the Gasoline Account, 2750, we recommend a cut of \$756, which leaves that line at \$4,700.

That brings the total number of cuts in this Code 550 to \$20,106. The bottom line on page 79 is \$692,572.

MR. TARZIA: I would like to move that we delete line item 1135, the total amount of \$8,210. That's the Permanent Part-time. My rationale being that, if we are asking these departments to reorganize, if you look at the Salaries Account, it's gone up in the last two years quite a bit and I think Permanent Part-time, which has been the logic here to reduce that,...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Tarzia, I must have a Second on your Motion before you go any further. Is there a Second. There is a Second. You may continue.

MR. TARZIA: I think I've said all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. ESPOSITO: In the back-up, it's listed as Part-time Salaries. Let me just read through this, with the Board's approval, because this is really a cost-saving account for the City. Let me try to explain why. Doctor Gofstein indicates that they are requesting the \$8,200 for part-time salaries for part-time nurses, working two days a week who were formerly in the Regular Salary Account but that salary has been moved from that account. Remaining is \$350 which indicates no increase over last year's appropriation. Since part-time activities primarily covers the summer and is used as little as possible, except to provide vacation relief and coverage, we are able to manage on this amount. They usually hire a student in this situation for the part-time, where 80% of their salary is picked up by the parent, the educational institution, and the City's share represents Social Security and 20% of the hourly wage.

We're talking about the part-time nurses that are working two to three days a week for the Health Department. They were previously in the Part-time Salary Account. I would think that this would seriously strap the Health Department in its attempt to do its Charter mandated activities to cut the entire account.

MRS. CONTI: I believe we are dealing with only one nurse, is that correct, Mr. Esposito?

MR. ESPOSITO: That is correct.

MRS. SAXE: Mr. Esposito, did you not say yesterday that the Permanent Part-time Account is incurring fringes on the City?

MR. ESPOSITO: That is correct.

MRS. SAXE: Is it possible, if we are going to keep this person, that we put them in the Part-time Account and not Permanent Part-time?

MR. ESPOSITO: We could do that but the only thing I'm questioning is how we could do that here tonight. We can't move an item from one line to another.

MRS. SAXE: Then should we not leave it to Doctor Gofstein's discretion to reorganize his accounts.

MR. ESPOSITO: He did that as a request of the Finance Department. This was taken out of the Part-time Account but it was taken out of the Salary Account and after taking it out of the Salary Account it was put into Permanent Part-time and if we want to have it put into Part-time, in order for it to go into Part-time, they have to work less than 20 hours a week. Second, we couldn't do that. He would have to ask for a transfer. Somehow we would have to keep the \$8,200 in his budget but have it transferred from Permanent Part-time to Part-time. I don't know how we could do that here tonight.

MRS. SAXE: Then I would suggest that we drop it.

MR. BLUM: Nurses are entitled to relief also when they go out on duty, into sort of a vacation. If the doctor feels that that particular job has to be filled, he's going to take it from the Permanent Part-time Account. He took a certain amount of money from the Salary Account and put it down into Permanent Part-time because they are only going to spend, not a whole week, but probably two days a week. I think we should allow the doctor to relieve nurses who he feels have to be relieved of jobs when they are out on vacation. Certain jobs are not covered. Certain jobs are covered. That's left to the discretion of the manager of the department.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Esposito, we all realize that Permanent Part-time is an employee who works in excess of 25 hours a week and is entitled to fringe benefits. Would you please give us a definition of the fringe benefits that they are entitled to?

MR. ESPOSITO: Medical Insurance, obviously Social Security, vacation.

MRS. McINERNEY: Those are the only fringe benefits they are entitled to?

MR. ESPOSITO: As far as I know, yes.

MR. BLAIS: Madam Chairman, I would like to call on your individual expertise to affirm to this Body that there is a shortage of nurses in the Stamford area. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blais, we are talking about a different phase of nursing that I am involved in. But, yes I would say there is shortage of nurses.

MR. BLAIS: I would remind my peers and the Board of Representatives that last night we went into a long discussion on the Smith House having to go out to employment agencies to be able to find nurses. In addition, I personally know that Stamford Hospital and St. Joseph's Hospital have to beg their nurses to work time and a half and double time, extra shifts, to have adequate nursing coverage. If we deny the Health Department this permanent part-time position, we could seriously jeopardize their ability to carry out their management. Therefore, I do not support this cut.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We are now voting on Mr. Tarzia's Motion to delete \$8,210 from the Permanent Part-time Account. The Motion is lost, 12 yes, 23 no, 2 abstentions, and 1 non-voter.

MR. BLUM: Mrs. Hawe, what's the rationale of cutting \$10,000 out from the Salary Account? What position is that?

MRS. HAWE: It's not a position, Mr. Blum, that's an attrition cut. There was no attrition cut taken by either the Mayor or the Board of Finance. and in a department of this size, it is perfectly reasonable to assume that there is going to be that much in attrition. It's a very miniscule amount of that entire budget and could truly be absorbed through attrition over the year.

MR. BLUM: On the College Tuition, isn't that a contractual item?

MRS. HAWE: It is. Last year, under the last contract, the City had to pay one half of the college tuition and now it has to pay the full tuition. However, judging from what was used this year and looking at the historical use of this, we determined that \$7,120 was going to be enough for this year.

MR. CONTI: As far as I can see here, we have taken a small amount of salaries and have given it back to them in Permanent Part-time. To me, it just doesn't make sense because one seems to be part of the other, so in that respect, I would like to increase the cut in the salaries line which is 550.110, to \$20,000, to make up for the \$8,210 in the Part-time Account.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion has been made and Seconded. We are now addressing Mr. Conti's Motion to delete a total of \$20,000.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question has been Moved and Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will now vote on Mr. Conti's deletion, \$20,000 Salary Account. Please use the machine. The

Motion is lost, 15 yes, 21 no, 1 abstention, and 1 non-voter.

MR. TARZIA: Would it be in order at this time to make the Motion for \$10,000 or does the Committee's recommendation stand?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Committee's recommendation is a continuous Motion.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Item 550.1130, Part-time. Now since the Permanent Part-time has been explained, what is the Part-time.

MRS. HAWES: This Part-time is a work-study program. This is really something that the City is getting a lot of benefit out of. The City only pays 20% of the salary for college students. 80% of their salary is picked up by the Educational Institution. The City share is 20% of the hourly wage. We get approximately 500 hours of temporary part-time assistance over the summer. It's a program that's used in other cities in this state and in New York and it's really quite beneficial to the municipality. The kids come from the colleges and they get paid mostly from the colleges and they work for the City to get some experience. It's really a good deal for us.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to make a Motion to delete \$2,000 from the Permanent Part-time Account, 550.1135. It would leave the balance \$6,210. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There has been a Motion made and Seconded.

MRS. CONTI: Actually, most of us seem to be concerned about the fact that Permanent Part-time includes fringe benefits. If we reduce it by \$2,000, I think this would keep the individual in the range of part-time.

MR. BLUM: I would like to explain one thing. Part-time is 18 hours and below 20. There are times when it's a necessity to have 25 hours. The fact that when you bring a person into 25 hours and there is a fringe benefit that is attached to it, makes it sort of a permanent part-time doesn't mean that the person made that job just for the fringe benefit that's tied to it. It's the necessity of having that nurse there for 25 hours. We made a mistake right here in this office, right in this building, we have a nurse and we cut her out. By law, she has to be there 25 hours.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine for a vote. We are voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion to delete \$2,000 from the Permanent Part-time Account. The Motion is carried, yes Mr. Flounders? No. Ladies and Gentlemen, the machine has calculated the votes, I'm sorry you weren't on the Floor. I started to read the vote and I'm sorry you weren't here but I'll just have to go along with that ruling. The Motion has passed.

MR. TARZIA: Madam President, I believe, as a Point of Order, until the Motion is read into the loudspeaker, it's not official.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I was reading the Motion.

MR. TARZIA: It has not been read yet, Madam Chairman.

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. You did not declare the vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Parliamentarian for a ruling on that vote. There were two people not on the Floor when the vote was taken.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Point of Order. The vote was not taken until the vote is determined. It's a machine. It takes a while to calculate this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The machine has calculated this. It took me time to write it on a piece of paper. The vote has been calculated in the machine. This is just a question of Parliamentarian ruling.

MR. DONAHUE: Point of Order. The official record of the meeting has nothing to do with the machine. The official record is the results of the vote being read into the record by you. Until that time, anyone has the right to either change their vote or add their vote depending on the circumstances.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, again there is a permanent record and it was recorded on the permanent record of the run-off, not my reading it.

MR. DONAHUE: The official record is your reading the results into the record, which is being taped, I believe.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Have the Parliamentarians reached a decision yet?

MR. ZELINSKI: This seems to be a technical question. However, did the machine finish tabulating the votes?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I ask for a ruling from the Parliamentarian until such time, there should be no further discussion.

MR. ESPOSITO: Thank you, Representative Boccuzzi.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would just like to comment to all the Representatives now. Please try to stay as close to your desk as possible because some of these votes are going quickly and we won't have this difficulty at a later date.

MR. BLAIS: Point of Order, Madam Chairman. I don't recollect a vote being taken by this Assembly to include the computer data as the official record of this Assembly.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will have no comments from anyone. Mr. Hogan, do you have a ruling?

MR. HOGAN: Madam Chairman, I think you'll find in Robert's rules of order, that until the vote is declared by the Chair, that any member may cast his vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you agree, Mrs. Guroian?

MRS. GUROIAN: Yes, but I'm not so sure that anybody can interrupt a reading of a vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, we have two opinions here. Mr. Hogan, would you like to reflect on that? If there are no further comments on this, I would ask the Parliamentarians to make a ruling on this. Comments to the Parliamentarians and the ruling, the technician states that when I push this button, I automatically close the vote, but not read it into the records.

MR. DONAHUE: Point of Order.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, if you want to challenge the Chair, fine. The suggestion was made and the Chair is going to stand by that.

MR. DONAHUE: It's merely a Point of Clarification.

PRESIDENT SANTY: But we are not asking you to clarify it, Mr. Donahue. We are asking the Parliamentarians to clarify it.

MR. DONAHUE: You made the comment a minute ago, that I heard on the Floor of the Board concerning the fact the debate had been closed and you were ready to read the results of the vote....

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, I would ask you please, no comments!

MR. HOGAN: I will read directly from Robert's rules, it's very short, on page 345 under voting procedure: a Member has the right to change his vote up to the time the result is announced. After that, he can make the change only by permission of the Assembly, which can be given by general consent or by the adoption of a Motion to grant the permission which is undebatable.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Then I will accept that ruling. I will go along with that, Mrs. Guroian. If you find anything later that the vote was not read, I was interrupted and did not complete the reading of the vote. Those people who were not here to vote, Mr. Flounders is a no vote and Mr. Livingston has a no vote. Do you know what we are voting on? We are voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion. Mr. Tarzia is a yes vote.

MR. CONTI: I would just like to make a point here, if I may. Robert's rules of order does not take into consideration computers. Also, when a person has the Floor, he is not to be interrupted. You had closed the computer; you had the Floor; you were making an official announcement; and if you had not been interrupted that announcement would have been read into the record and would have been complete. I claim that what is going on now is entirely wrong. The vote has been cast and tabulated.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you making a Motion? My ruling was that I would let these votes go as stated; that they had been read, so I would accept their vote, Mr. Conti.

MR. CONTI: I challenge your ruling. I still claim that your first ruling was correct in the tabulation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti is challenging my ruling not to allow the people to vote before the vote was tabulated and it's been Seconded. We will now proceed to a vote on the ruling of the Chair. You can over-rule the Chair on that ruling.

MRS. SIGNORE: Will the yes vote support the Chair?

PRESIDENT SANTY: My ruling was that we would go along and let these people vote at this time. Mr. Conti said no, we should not have allowed that and that's what we are voting on. For your interest, before you challenge the Chair, were you interested what the vote was?

MR. BLUM: I would like both Leaders of each Party to get together to make sure that both their people are out on the Floor. We would all like to get out of here early this evening. We've been here two nights until one and two o'clock in the morning and you know that old slogan; enough is enough. Let's get on with the business.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti has challenged the ruling of the Chair to allow the votes when I began to read the vote. Now we are voting on that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: A yes vote is in favor of the Chair? A no vote is in favor of the Chair? What is your ruling on this as to what type of vote?

PRESIDENT SANTY: My ruling was to allow them to vote based on the Parliamentarians decision.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I know that, Mrs. Santy. All I want to know is what do we vote to uphold the Chair? A yes or a no?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No. We vote no to uphold the Chair because you would disagree with Mr. Conti's Motion that is was an incorrect vote.

MRS. McINERNEY: I would like to make an observation that at the beginning of these budget deliberations, it was clearly stated to the 40 Members of this Board that if they were going to leave the Floor, they would have to ask permission to be excused and noticed by our Clerk of their action whether it was for coffee, telephone, or what have you. Last night, as we observed several times, there were people off of the Floor, engaged in conversations outside of this particular floor area and who came running back and said they had a vote. They were not here; they did not take part in discussion and if the rules that we accepted at the beginning of this budget process are in effect at this particular point in time, I would agree with Mr. Conti.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That is an exact, true statement and no one, since the beginning of the meetings, has asked permission from Ms. Summerville or notified her, with a few exceptions, that they were leaving. It's very important that you be here. It is now 20 minutes until 9:00, we can be here until 9:30 just discussing this vote, but if you want to go on and

go to a vote, let's do that now.

MR. ZELINSKI: With all respect to you, Madam President and the Parliamentarians, the section that he quoted in Robert's Rules of Order says that a Member has a right to change his vote. As I recall, the three people, with all respect to them, did not change their vote, they were voting for the first time. There is a technical point there. Number two, you were reading the vote; you did not recognize any person from your Chair to speak. Therefore, they were out-of-order; therefore, you did not recognize their right to voice their opinion so I would go along with Mr. Conti and he is 100% correct.

MRS. GUROIAN: Before you were interrupted, you already announced the results of the votes. You said it has carried. That is announcing the results of a vote as far as I'm concerned. But I can't find anything to substantiate what I'm saying, but that's what it is.

MR. DeLUCA: I Move the question. **SECONDED,**

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question has been Moved and Seconded on the ruling of challenging the Chair. If you agree with Mr. Conti, then you should vote no. If you wish to sustain the ruling of the Chair, you vote yes. We will proceed to a machine vote. Mr. Conti's ruling is lost, 19 no, 17 yes, and 2 non-voters.

MR. CONTI: I counted 20 red lights, which is no.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Conti, we have a tabulation here. We will double check the computer. It could have made a mistake. Mr. Flounders, have you voted?

MR. FLOUNDERS: I will make it very clear that I did not vote because it's a conflict of interest. I did not vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The computer print-out reads: 17 yes, 19 no, and 2 non-voters. It doesn't matter what you have counted there. We have double checked it and that's what the computer read-out reads, so we'll have to go with that decision.

MR. CONTI: Which means that my decision has won because yes sustains yours, no is my favor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right. So we are going back to the original vote on Mrs. Conti's Motion without Mr. Tarzia voting, Mr. Flounders voting, and Mr. Livingston voting, and the vote was 18 yes, 15 no. So that Motion was carried and there is a \$2,000 cut.

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. Would you declare at this point exactly when a Representative can either register a vote or change his vote?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Representative has to be on the floor to register his vote at the time we are taking the vote.

MR. ESPOSITO: At what point may he change his vote? Excuse me, until what point?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would go along with Robert's Rules; after the vote is taken then he could change his vote. You have to be on the Floor to vote. We have now discussed this for a long time. We have a long evening; we have hours and hours of work ahead of us, and I know sometimes you have to get up and stretch but try to stay on the Floor and let's limit debate on this. We have important business; we have a City to run and sit here arguing for half an hour because three people wanted a cup of coffee. Try to be on the Floor. I would ask at this time the Republican and Democratic Leaders to try and beckon the people out if they are in the Caucus Rooms. Let Ms. Summerville know if you are leaving the Floor and maybe we could wait a few more minutes until you come back at that time.

MRS. McINERNEY: It is the responsibility of a Representative to take part in the government in which they were elected to serve. They have an obligation to sit in their seats if they want to vote on any particular item.

MRS. HAWES: The total number of cuts in 550 now stands at \$22,106 and the total amount approved is \$690,572.

Code 551, Code Enforcement Task Force, fiscal recommended no cuts in this account, which leaves the bottom line at \$132,401.

MR. WIDER: I would like to Move that \$10,000 be deleted from the Salary Account. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are making a Motion to delete \$10,000 from the Salary Account in line 1110, and there is a Second to that.

MR. WIDER: I feel that we have a number of programs going in Stamford and many of these people are duplicating some of the things that we are doing. I feel that we can cut back on this and the organization should be completely reorganized.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been Moved and Seconded to move the question. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? Will the no votes raise their hands please? We will vote by use of the machine. We need a two-thirds vote. The Motion to Move the question is lost, 25 yes, 13 no, and a total of 26 was needed.

MR. ESPOSITO: Mr. Wider, you mentioned duplication of services. I want to point out that the Housing Code Enforcement Task Force is a very important position; a very important department in terms of providing inspections and especially in rental housing; keeping and maintaining the quality of housing in the City of Stamford; I would like to know where the duplication is and what other agencies are doing this. It is my understanding that the Housing Code Enforcement Officer works with the City Building Inspector^{and} in conjunction both being under-staffed, attempt to make sure that the quality of housing in this City is maintained and that rental housing doesn't deteriorate. I don't know where this duplication exists, perhaps you could explain it to me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Esposito, Ms. Summerville would like to make a point.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would just like to make a note that Mr. Dixon, Mr. Blais, and someone else, who is excused, are not at the meeting at this time.

MR. WIDER: Having helped in the beginning of the Task Force, I understand their responsibility and their obligations. They are carrying them out very well. On the other hand, I feel that there are some areas in which there should be some adjustment made because we have our people that work for the Task Force that do Emergency Service that could be contracted out and should be contracted out. I feel that in cutting this, we can eliminate some of those positions and have them contracted out.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would be against this Motion for very strong reasons. This is a very important part of the Health Department. I do not believe there is any duplication whatsoever in the City relating to the work that they do. This past winter, there were literally hundreds of complaints of lack of heat and hot water, not only in my district, but in several of my colleagues' districts as well, and believe they need more help, not less and if we are to cut the budget in this particular Salary Account, we are going to tie the hands of this particular agency that does good work to go out to check, to verify, that are called on the weekends, and I would be strongly against this cut.

MR. BLUM: One of the other tasks in which the Code Enforcement Task Force does, their inspectors, prior to the Neighborhood Preservation Programs, they go in to inspect deteriorating houses and they condemn them and then from there, the house is taken over by the Neighborhood Preservation and that's one of the first steps that has to be taken in the process in which Neighborhood Preservation takes over the house, restores it, and puts it back into good shape or a livable home.

MR. LIVINGSTON: There is something that I don't have a full understanding on and it's the way we are proceeding with this meeting. I would like to ask you a question concerning the past vote that we just took.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston, we are speaking to the Motion made by Mr. Wider. You can bring this up later.

MR. LIVINGSTON: O.K. If I can bring it up later, I will and I will speak to the Motion. Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question has been Moved and Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed?

MR. DONAHUE: I would like to challenge the Chair, Madam President. Robert's Rules is very clear that a Motion of that kind cannot be made, once comment has been made. It doesn't necessarily have to be about the Motion on the Floor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, could we have a ruling on that? Does he have to speak to the Motion or just speak?

MR. LIVINGSTON: I withdraw my Motion, Madam President, so we can continue with the business.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Livingston.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask Mr. Wider exactly what agency duplicates the work of the Code Enforcement Task Force?

MR. WIDER: The Neighborhood Preservation.

MRS. CONTI: Neighborhood Preservation does not look for health violations such as lead paint and things of that nature. Can anyone tell us exactly what Neighborhood Preservation does?

PRESIDENT SANTY: That is not the Motion. We are going to speak just to the Motion.

MR. TARZIA: I support the Motion for the simple fact that we have fewer and fewer rental units in this town and the number is going down every year and therefore, I think some reorganization in that area can be done and is in order.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I must respectfully disagree with Representative Wider's Motion. In the Health and Protection Committee, we had Doctor Gofstein come before us and discuss various new ordinances he is proposing. In doing so, he explained in detail what his departments do and one is the Code Enforcement Task Force. Indeed, they perform a Herculean task in this City and I feel to take \$10,000 of salary out of this account would, although it is not a terrific amount of money, cripple their ability to act in the best interests of all of the citizens. I feel we should vote no against this Motion for that reason.

MRS. HAWE: I would just like to make a comment about the connection between Neighborhood Preservation Community Development and this Code Enforcement Task Force. They work in connection with each other. Neighborhood Preservation does not do health inspections. However, this section of the Health Department, this Code Enforcement Task Force, does complete neighborhood inspections which involve cellar to attic, and I'm reading now from this memorandum, house to house inspections to determine whether the structure meets code standards. If structures do not meet minimum standards, an enforcement procedure is begun, which involves official Director of Health notice of violation; order to correct and ultimately, the filing of arrest applications to gain compliance. The importance of these inspections is the collective effort of stabilizing a neighborhood from further deterioration. In this regard, they work closely with the Community Development Program, especially Neighborhood Preservation. Between the inspection and enforcement apparatus and Neighborhood Preservation's financial capability, that's what Neighborhood Preservation does, they make grants and arrange loans for rehabilitation at below market interest rates but the Health Department does the inspecting. It's not a duplication of effort with Neighborhood Preservation; they work in tandem with each other.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question has been Moved and Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We are Moving the

question. We will proceed to a machine vote. We are voting on Mr. Wider's Motion to delete \$10,000 from the Salary Account. The Motion is lost, 19 no, 15 yes, and 2 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line for this department, 551, is \$132,401. Page 81, Code 552, Drug Forensic Laboratory, Fiscal recommends no cut in this and the bottom line is \$16,698.

Page 82, Cost Sharing Grant From State, Fiscal recommends a cut of \$10,184 in the Salary Account which brings that line down to -0-. I believe Mrs. Conti has something to say.

MRS. CONTI: I had two lengthy talks with Doctor Gofstein and two brief conversations with Frank Harrison. You must understand Doctor Gofstein's budgeting. He has a tendency to play the shell game with his employees. You never know quite where they are at any given time. In Fiscal, we mistakenly believed that this individual was in the 553 Account. As it turned out, the salary is in the 553 Account but there is nobody there. The body is actually in the 550 Account. We cut it believing that there was a duplicate person. There actually is no person and Frank Harrison did a body check; there are only the three clerk-typists that we had before. The same three bodies. There is no additional body here. If we really cut because we thought it was duplication, then we should change. If we cut because we wanted to cut because of attrition or some other purpose, then we can continue with it. Before you vote on it, I want you to know that Fiscal voted with the misunderstanding that we were dealing with a duplicate person.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, are you making a Motion.

MRS. CONTI: I would make the Motion to restore it. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? There is a Second. We will now discuss that Motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I urge you to vote in favor of it because one, it was a mistake on Fiscal's part and two, because it is so rare to have Mrs. Conti make a Motion to reinstate any money.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of Information. Mrs. Conti, this person is in what salary line, what number?

MRS. CONTI: They are in the 550 Account which we already cut considerably.

MR. BOCCUZZI: If we appropriate this money to 553.1110, what's Doctor Gofstein going to do with it? He can't use it in the 550 Account, can he?

MRS. CONTI: He has the money here but the body is in the 550 area. This 553 is a grant, Mr. Boccuzzi, and Doctor Gofstein put it in here to offset the revenue from the grant. He actually has the person working under the 550 Account.

MR. BOCCUZZI: My question is could he pay somebody in the 550 Account out of money from the 553 Account? If he could do that, that's one thing.

MRS. CONTI: Actually the 553, as I understand it, is really a revenue account of some kind.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Could you pay somebody in the 550 Account with money from the 553 Account?

MRS. GUROIAN: As I understand it, I would say you can do it. She just works in the department, not the 550 Account. She works in that department but she is paid by the 553 Account, whereas, the others are paid by the 550 Account.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I really fail to see the levity in this situation. Maybe I missed the point. In essence, we're asking to allot \$10,184 for somebody that's supposed to be working in the Cost Sharing Grant from the State Department, but really is going to be doing something else. Is that not misleading, falsifying the information? Could somebody clear that up for me?

MS. DeGAETANI: I can't clarify his problem, but I had something else on this issue.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Since he raised a question, and I think it's important, someone should answer his question. Mr. Blais, do you have the answer to his question?

MR. BLAIS: Yes, Madam President. As a former Federal auditor, I've seen many, many grants that did not involve a full-time person. Stating, especially Federal agencies, like you do in your accounting records, break out grant costs in a separate category. What is happening here, it appears, is you have one person that for two to four hours a day wears another hat that is funded by the grant. The money that's reimbursable for the grant is in this account. The remaining part of their salary, where they work the rest of the day, is in the normal salary account. This is just a detail of a Federal grant and if the Federal grant weren't there and they want to conduct this program, it would be included in another program. It's an artificial breakout and that's all it is.

MS. DeGAETANI: I would just like to ask a question. In the original back-up book that we got that has the personnel listed, on Account 553, they show a vacancy. I don't see a cut for that vacancy.

MRS. HAWES: That's the person we're talking about. I do believe it's been filled. If you'll notice on page 82, last year, their Salary Account was \$25,093. This year it's only \$10,000. Last year there were two people who were being paid out of this account. One was a housing inspector and that person's salary has been taken out of this account and put in another account. From the back-up, it appeared to us that Doctor Gofstein had also moved the other personnel, which is why we cut it, but that turned out to be not true. That clerk-typist in the first book where it indicates there is a vacancy, has been filled.

MRS. CONTI: As further Point of Clarification, there are only three clerk-typists in all of the Health Department. That's the same number that was there last year. There is no new position. There is no new body

there at all.

MR. DONAHUE: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. Please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We will use the machine. I remind everyone that is not on the Floor that we are going to proceed to a vote. We are voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion to restore \$10,184 to the Salary Account. The Motion is carried, 29 yes, 3 no, 1 abstention, and 6 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line in that department is now \$10,184. The next page, page 83, VD Clinic, Fiscal recommends a cut from line 5130, Professional Medical Care, of \$1,000, based on historic usage of that account. That brings that line to \$2,432. The bottom line for this department is now \$7,500.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I make a Motion to, on Account 554.2940, Conferences and Training, cut \$1,000 out of this account. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made by Mrs. Maihock to delete \$1,000 from the Conference and Training Account and it's been Seconded. We will now address that Motion.

MR. BLAIS: Mr. Esposito or Mrs. Hawe, what is the purpose of Conferences and Training?

MRS. HAWE: We're looking, but I don't think we have any back-up on it.

MR. BLAIS: I would like to point out that I have, in the last few weeks, read in various newspapers, such as The New York Times, that there is a major epidemic of venereal disease in the country. There are several new strains; herpes simplex, for instance, that are so new that the treatment of these particular afflictions are not widely known. We could have a very serious problem in the City of Stamford if our people cannot go to the necessary training and conferences to learn what's being done to treat these new diseases, if we cut the funds. Therefore, I would strongly urge my fellow Representatives to not support this cut.

MR. DeLUCA: I Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Question has been Moved and Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. The Motion is on deleting \$1,000 from Conferences and Training. The Motion carried, 21 yes, 13 no, and 5 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The total number of cuts in this department is now \$2,000 which brings the bottom line to \$6,500.

MRS. McINERNEY: Based on Mr. Blais' comments, I think perhaps the account that should have been cut, should not have been cut. I would make a Motion to restore the \$1,000 in Account 5130, Professional Medical Care. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to restore \$1,000 that was deleted by the Fiscal Committee. We are now addressing that Motion. No discussion? We will proceed right to a vote. We are voting on Mrs. McInerney's Motion to restore the \$1,000 that was removed by the Fiscal Committee. If you approve, vote up for yes; if you don't, down for no. The Motion is lost, 19 no, 13 yes, and 8 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The next page, page 84, EPSDT Program. This a grant program for which we get, it's called the Early Periodic Screening Diagnostic Testing Department and it's reimbursed through Title 19, \$3,000 in revenue from this and so Fiscal recommended that we cut the expenditures back to meet the revenues. Therefore, we recommend a cut in line 1110, Salaries, a cut of \$7,234, which would bring that line down to \$2,950. The total budget would be \$3,000 which is what we're getting back for this.

MRS. CONTI: I wanted to say that Doctor Gofstein talked with me at length about this also. He contends we get additional revenue from this program, however, Frank Harrison is unable to confirm it, therefore, I will stay with the recommendation of Fiscal.

MRS. HAWE: Public School Health Program. Fiscal recommends a cut in the Salary Account, line 1110, of \$28,000. We have done this to reflect the fact that if there are going to be schools closed, we feel that with one less nurse and one less dental hygienist, it would be appropriate to take that cut. We cut \$28,000 from the salary line which leaves that line at \$448,064.

For the same reason, we reduced the New Equipment Account which is line 2650. We reduced that by \$800 which brings that line to \$1,173.

Uniforms, also, line 3480, if two less people are going to be there, they'll need less uniforms so at \$200 a person for uniforms, we've cut \$400 from that line which leaves that line at \$4,640.

Line 3710, First Aid Supplies, we cut \$3,000 which leaves that line at \$12,686. That brings us to a total number of cuts in that department of \$32,200 and a bottom line of \$547,793.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Item 560.5150, Professional Consultants, would you be able to tell us what the consultants are for?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, these are for school physicians. There are five of them. Three of them get paid \$6,000 annually and two school doctors at \$4,000 annually. That's the \$26,000 which has been cut by the Board of Finance to \$20,000.

MR. DeLUCA: If we're cutting \$28,000 from the Salary Account based on the fact of schools closing, what is the reason why the Permanent Part-time Account isn't also being cut accordingly?

MRS. HAWE: We felt that even though there will be less schools, there will still be the same amount of children to be served. We didn't want to make too many cuts in this department. The people remaining would be carrying a larger work load. We felt the two people in salary were sufficient.

MR. DeLUCA: I like to be consistent. I would like to make a Motion to cut the Salary Account by \$4,111 and bring it down to \$15,000. That's Account 560.1135. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you making a Motion to add this?

MR. DeLUCA: No, to cut the Permanent Part-time Account by \$4,111 and bring it down to \$15,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are serveral Seconds to your Motion, Mr. DeLuca.

MRS. HAWE: I would just like to point out that the Part-time and the Permanent Part-time last year were in the Salary Account. We're really talking about cutting from the same amount. It's all Salary Accounts and I would urge against this. I think that the \$28,000 is enough of a cut for this department.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to Mr. DeLuca's Motion to delete \$4,111 from Permanent Part-time Account.

MR. BLAIS: Although I respect Mr. DeLuca's reasoning for making the cut, the cut itself does not appear to proportional. It seems to be a cut just for the sake of being a cut. I would like to know what the impact of cutting out two-thirds of this account would be.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Either Mrs. Hawe or Mr. Esposito, would you answer that?

MRS. HAWE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear his question. He wants the figure for what?

MR. BLAIS: My point was that the cut did not appear to be proportional or have any basis for coming up with a number. Therefore, the danger that we take is that we're rendering undue harm to this department. I would like to know if you know of any adverse impact by cutting two-thirds of this particular account?

MRS. HAWE: Two-thirds of the Permanent Part-time Account?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are addressing Mr. DeLuca's Motion and he Moved to delete \$4,111 from this account, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. ESPOSITO: Excuse me, it's one-fifth.

MRS. HAWE: The only thing I can say is that I assume it will happen. What will also happen with the cut that Fiscal recommended is that the people who are remaining, as nurses and hygienists, will be looking at more children than they were. I don't think it's wise to take any more out than Fiscal recommended but I do think that that cut is justified.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been moved and Seconded. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will move to a machine vote. We are voting on Mr. DeLuca's

Motion to delete \$4,111 from the Permanent Part-time Account. The Motion is lost, 17 yes, 21 no, and 1 non-voter.

MR. BOCCUZZI: You keep saying we're making a cut because we're going to close schools. Are we closing schools at this point? Is this a reason for the cut? If we don't close schools, then are we going to be short money?

MRS. HAWE: We can only assume, Mr. Boccuzzi, what the Board of Education told us that night that we had them in, that they were going to go to the option which involved closing schools. We can only go by that and going by that information, I'm sure it's possible they might change their minds, but going from the information we have from them, we made this determination, I think it's reasonable to do that.

MR. BLUM: I would like to make a Motion to restore the dental hygienist in the Salary Account, 560.1110. I want to restore the amount of money cut by the Fiscal Committee. The amount was \$28,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are several Seconds.

MR. BLUM: We have no guarantee that the school system is going to be using option number 2 which is closing whatever number of schools they're saying. Therefore, if they did not close the schools and your reasoning was that in the summertime they're off, and what do you do between the time when September comes around and you don't have that dental hygienist and the nurse; I think that it's very important that these children be looked after in the school for whatever function the hygienist and nurse takes care of.

MR. DeLUCA: For the past five minutes listening to comments from Mrs. Hawe and Mr. Blais, I have become convinced that there is urgency that we shouldn't make any additional cuts because of the over-worked staff and the same amount of pupils will be there and therefore, they convinced me that it is irresponsible and doesn't make sense to even cut the \$28,000 from the Salary Account. Therefore, I would have to agree with Mr. Blum that we should restore the Salary Account. After all, they just convinced me that a \$4,000 cut was irresponsible action. Therefore, it is up to us to see that the \$28,000 is restored for the safety of our children.

MRS. McINERNEY: As was indicated by both Chairmen of Fiscal, it is an assumption on their part and would be on our part to assume that two schools will be closed since, in effect, this Board has no authority as to what the Board of Education would be doing with their money. I agree with Mr. Boccuzzi that it would be foolish to cut this money out on an assumption. I would support Mr. Blum's Motion.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to point out that there are 26 employees in this department and that with a number of Permanent Part-time people, they could very easily be shifted around and hours adjusted to overcome this cut.

MRS. SIGNORE: I heard it mentioned earlier that the concept that if there are two schools closed that means there are two dental hygienists and two nurses that we don't need. It doesn't work that way. The dental hygienists undersigned to buildings are assigned to children and their schedule depends on a certain number of children. Each dental hygienist has 1,400 children to service and so does a nurse. Even if they do close down these buildings, we can't close down children. They are young, warm, bodies out there who have to be serviced from health professionals. I strongly suggest that we keep these people in. As it is, they are already going from school to school.

MRS. GERSHMAN:If you add up those this year and even take the \$28,000 cut, you find that the salaries are \$100,000 more than last year. I do think that the cut could be made.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. Please say Aye, if you agree. Opposed? We will Move the question, using the machine. The Motion is made by Mr. Blum to restore \$28,000 to this account that was deleted by the Fiscal Committee. I would remind all who are not on the floor that we are taking a vote. The Motion lost, 17 yes, 20 no, 1 abstention, and 1 non-voter.

MRS. HAWES: That brings us to a bottom line of \$547,793.

MRS. SIGNORE: Madam President, for the record, I would like it noted that I am leaving the Floor and from all code items under 561.

MRS. HAWES: Code 561, Health Program for Private and Parochial Schools. Fiscal recommends no cut in this account and the bottom line remains at \$919,021.

MRS. MAIHOCK: On item 561.1135, Permanent Part-time, that's in the amount of \$124,528. That seems to be a very high amount for Permanent Part-time. Could you give us an explanation, please?

MRS. HAWES: This is an amount that had been in the Salary Account last year, Mrs. Maihock. If you'll notice the Salary Account is reduced proportionately.

MR. ESPOSITO: If you look at the Salary Account that goes back to the beginning of year, you will see that there has been a significant reduction. Of course, the Salary Account and the end of this fiscal year, \$675,415, that includes the \$48,000 addition to that account. The reason for that is when we renegotiate and reopen the school contract and we gave the teachers the well deserved raise they got and the nurses also got a share of that, half of that went into this year. The following year they get the whole bit of it. So if \$48,000 went in for this past year, \$100,000 has to go in this year just for the salary increases. You will note then that if you work out all the figures, the \$124,528 that's been taken out of there was in the Salary Account last year, was taken out, and those figures should come pretty close.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I believe, and please correct me if I am wrong, that much of this is reimbursed by the State.

MRS. HAWE: It's all reimbursed by the State.

MRS. CONTI: Point of Order. As I see the revenue on the other side of the page, it is not a total reimbursement.

MRS. HAWE: We did mention that to Doctor Gofstein at the time and he said that you get back 100% of what you spend for this program. However, some of the revenue is accounted for in the 550 Account, I believe. Everything that we spend for the private and parochial schools, does come back to us.

MR. ESPOSITO: I would just like to add to Mrs. Hawe's statement. If you look at the revenues on page 261 of the book bounded on the side, under Code 550.5510, you will see revenues for parochial and private school health programs.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line on that page is \$919,021. The next page, Code 570, Shape, Fiscal recommends a cut in the Part-time Account, line 1130, of \$500 which brings that line to \$7,964 and brings the total bottom line to \$40,617

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to know why that was deleted?

MRS. HAWE: Because as you see, the first three accounts are Salary Accounts. Salary, Part-time, and Permanent Part-time. The Permanent Part-time has been broken out this year. So if you'll add up the total amount received last year in all the Salary Accounts and the total amount this year, this year is more and we cut it back to bring it closer to last years and not to have that rise in the part-time.

NON-CITY HEALTH AGENCIES

Next page, Code 581, Non-City Health Agencies, Code 3750, Southwest Regional Mental Health Board, we eliminated the entire amount of \$15,368 and we did that because the State no longer is funding them. That leaves that line at -0-. That brings the total bottom line for Code 581 to \$200,000.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move a cut in line 581.3732. I would like to cut it by \$50,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds.

MRS. CONTI: I realize Drug Liberation is a very commendable program. I realize they do helpful work; however, the taxpayers of Stamford are hurting this year. We're driving them all into poverty. We're facing a serious situation with taxes. The point is we have to be very serious about what we're doing here. We look at a situation where we may have taxpayers come July that will not pay their taxes out of protest. We have people that will not pay them because they cannot afford to pay them and we are going to have to make some cut-backs here regardless, of the commendable nature of some of these programs.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Once again, Mrs. Conti, I can't believe you're saying

that, even though you have a right to your opinion. I would strongly urge this Board to not cut this particular item. The people who run this program are running it with volunteers and everything else. I would like to inform Mrs. Conti and she may already be aware of this, the people who participate and the patients of this program are also taxpayers. It is not only for one type of person.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I was on this Board when Drug Liberation was first formed and the City first started participating in their budget. I remember during that time there was one heck of a drug crises going on in this City. The Federal government made some kind of arrangement with a few foreign countries and we were told five years ago that the drug situation in this City was becoming somewhat under control. Coming up to this date in time, we have been told that the Federal government and foreign involvement have backed out on their commitments and according to some of the articles that we read in the newspapers, there is no question that the drug problem in this City is once again on the up-swing. All of us who have been aware of this problem, I'm sure we recognize that you're going to pay one way or another because of the drug situation. We can nickel and dime Drug Liberation, but you can bet your life it's going to cost you when your car and your homes are broken into. I'm hoping that we continue our commitment to Drug Liberation and allow that program to continue.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: This is really the case of a program that works. It doesn't work on thousands of people because they cannot be accommodated, unfortunately. It does work for a portion of the people that finally do enroll in this program. It has a history of being one of the most effective drug liberation type of programs, not only in the state but in the Northeast. At a conference that I went to, I was told that consultants come from all over the country^{come} to examine what this program here in Stamford has done and how they have used their money and what they have done to effectively decrease the drug problem. God knows it's far from being over or far from totally ending. The money that we spend is far more cost effective than if we cut it out and allowed nothing. I think that that would cause the taxpayer far more and I hope we don't approve this Motion.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I regret that Mrs. Conti is not on the Floor right now, even though she made the Motion. It would be nice for her to hear some of the debate about her cut of \$50,000. Anybody who reads newspapers, periodicals, magazines, will recognize that drug abuse is one of the biggest problems that our society faces today. Drug liberation works, as Mrs. Goldstein said. It serves the people of our community. If we cut the funds for Drug Liberation, it's going to mean that less people can be served. More people are going to be addicted to drugs. There is a direct correlation between drug abuse and the community and crime. Nobody wants crime. I say let's solve the problem before it gets started and let's vote down this cut of \$50,000.

MRS. GUROIAN: Just out of curiosity, listening to what Annie Summerville said about volunteers running this program, who gets paid the \$200,000?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The only problem here is one portion of my statement. I said they get a lot of volunteers. When I say volunteers, I mean doctors.

I'm not talking about people cleaning floors or anything, I'm talking about professionals that volunteer their services as doctors and psychologists and things like that, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: Who gets paid the \$200,000?

MS SUMMERVILLE: The Staff.

MRS. GUROIAN: How many on the Staff get paid \$200,000?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would refer to the Co-Chairman, I'm sure they have the back-up.

MRS. HAWES: The total salary comes to \$700,000. What Stamford is contributing is only a portion of this. They get money from the Federal government, from the State, from other people. I'll read a list of the people that are paid salaries. Clinical Director, Methadone Physician at the Clinic.....

MRS. GUROIAN: Are there amounts next to those names?

MRS. HAWES: The Clinical Director, \$28,000; Physician \$5,000, obviously that's not full-time; Clinical psychologist, 50% of his time at \$15,000; nine Program Directors, two Assistant Directors, one Director of Nursing, one Head Nurse, Nurse Methadone, 2 nurses part-time, one Program Coordinator, three Senior Counselors, one Court Liaison, 16 Counselors, three Night Supervisors, one Pharmacist, three Family Therapists, Support Personnel, one Executive Director, one Executive Secretary/Administrative Assistant.

MRS. GUROIAN: How much does the Executive Director get?

MRS. HAWES: \$40,000. There are also one Full-Charge Bookkeeper, one Assistant Bookkeeper, and four Secretary/Receptionists.

MR. WIDER: I just want to oppose any cut in this because I think this is a very small amount for the City to contribute to those six people that we have. Believe me, they are not all there yet. We have many more out there that need to be in the liberation program and we must enlarge our program in order to save parts of our City.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I would like to support those who are speaking against this cut. This is, as pointed out, a critically important program. Yes, I wish we didn't have it and I wish it wasn't necessary to invest this money but it is. It's like a cancer in our society and it's unfortunate. Every year this program takes 200 heroin addicts off the street. The police tell us that it costs them \$200 a day to support their heroin habit and they say that 90% of the people who have the problem must steal to support it. If they take 200 off the street, that means they don't have to steal what they estimate to be around \$15,000,000. It's an incredible impact on the society. I think it would be extremely short-sided and inhuman to arbitrarily cut this program by \$50,000 and I move that we do not.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been Moved and Seconded. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. We are voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion to delete \$50,000 from Drug Liberation Account, 581.3732. The Motion is lost, 6 yes, 31 no, and 2 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line for that Code 581 is \$200,000.

Page 89, Shell Fish Commission, Fiscal recommends no cut in that. The bottom line is \$1,200. This brings us to a section total.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Guroian, will you use your adding machine, too, please? Mrs. Signore, are you now present at the meeting?

MRS. SIGNORE: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have you marked absent for the record, so now we will have you present for the record. You will be present as of that vote. Point of Information, any time you would like to leave the room because you feel there is a conflict and you don't want to participate, we will mark you absent for that particular area and then when you come back, we will mark you present.

MRS. HAWE: The total amount cut from this section is \$161,408. The total amount approved, the bottom line approved in this section is \$7,267,044.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to reconsider an item which we have considered previously. Department group 20 on page 20, Chief Executive.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sure we took that up at our Tuesday meeting and I would have to Move that that Motion to reconsider is not in order. According to Robert's Rules, section 36, we must reconsider the previous evening if it is a succession meeting. It cannot be considered later than that.

MR. TARZIA: I think it would be in order at this time for us to take a five minute recess. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your Motion for a five-minutes recess has been Seconded. All in favor of a five minutes recess, please say Aye. Opposed? All right, we will have a five-minute recess.

PARKS DEPARTMENT

MRS. HAWE: We are on page 90, Parks Department. Fiscal recommends a cut in line 2332.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mrs. Hawe. Yes, Mrs. Conti?

RECONSIDERATION OF AN ITEM IN PERSONNEL DEPT.

MRS. CONTI: I would ask to be recognized to request reconsideration for an item we voted on last night in the Personnel Department.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, we voted on it last night?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, we did.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Then the Motion is in order.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move to restore in the Personnel Department, in the old book on page 139 or page 38 in the new book, Code 270.1135, Permanent Part-time Salaries, we deleted \$4,000 last night. I would like to Move to reconsider that \$4,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are several Seconds to Mrs. Conti's Motion. We will now direct discussion to Mrs. Conti's Motion to restore \$4,000, Permanent Part-time, page 38, Section 270.1135.

MRS. CONTI: This line item covers one nurse who works for the Personnel Department. She presently works 18 hours a week. They have budgeted her for 25 hours a week for next year because of the fact that they have added additional duties to her position. They have added the duties of teaching a heart-saver course to the employees and also to do all the annual physicals for the classified people. We're supposed to give physicals every year for people over 50 and they get one annual check-up. The people under 50, get a check-up every five years. These are all running very far behind. Also they have taken on the burden of doing the pre-employment screening for the Smith House personnel and they are also giving annual physical examinations for the Smith House personnel which wasn't done before. The reason for addition in the line item account was so that the nurse could continue these and also be on duty 25 hours a week here in the City Hall for any personnel that are taken ill on the job. I would move to reinstate this \$4,000.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to support this restoration. Our philosophy started out being that we were going to cut many salary accounts to force reorganization of departments but over the last three evenings, we have not done this. I think that any restoration in this particular department is well-founded.

MR. OWENS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. I will remind the Representatives that are not on the Floor, we are going to proceed to a vote on Mrs. Conti's Motion to restore \$4,000 to Account 270.1135. We will use the machine. The Motion is carried, 20 yes, 12 no, and 7 non-voters.

MR. ZELINSKI: Point of Information. I did vote but I didn't see anything on the board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. We will check the machine. Mr. Zelinski and Mr. White, your votes will be recorded as yes votes.

MRS. HAWES: We are doing the total again for the Personnel Department on page 39. The total amount approved in the Personnel Department is now \$304,838. The total amount for General Government Section on page 48, that is in cuts, is \$443,037 and the total amount approved is \$14,459,884.

PARKS DEPARTMENT

Now we are on page 90, Parks Department, Code 610. In line 2332, Pest Control, Fiscal recommends a cut of \$5,000 in that line, which would

bring that line down to \$1,400.

In line 2650, New Equipment, Fiscal recommends a cut of \$2,000 which brings that line down to \$8,000. That's a total amount of cuts in the Parks Department of \$7,000 which brings the bottom line to \$1,051,582.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move a \$15,000 cut in this Salary Account as a means of reorganization. There are 31 employees in this department. I don't consider them one of the more vital departments in the City. I would therefore, move a \$15,000 cut out of the Salary Account and then I would like to be recognized for another Motion. SECONDED

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to your Motion, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: I'm Moving it mainly as a means of reorganization. It's a department that has 31 permanent employees and it is not one of the more vital departments in the City. I think we could stand a little reorganization here towards declining staff in the future. Possibly there might be attrition here because there are 31 employees.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I would like to speak against that Motion. I realize Mrs. Conti doesn't like any of these parks or recs but there are people in this City who do use the parks and we have a great deal of acreage that the Parks Department has to take care of. If you're going to start telling them to reorganize, you're telling them to lower their staff, you're assuming a lot of things could happen and in the meantime, the parks are so bad, we can't get anything done. You start cutting their Salary Account and they have to either reorganize or let somebody go; we're going to get less done. Because one doesn't think a department is important, doesn't mean that it isn't important and it should take a cut. The parks belong to the whole City of Stamford, not just Betty Conti.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I do somewhat agree with Mr. Boccuzzi on the importance of keeping the salaries in the Parks Department and I would note that in the summer, we expect a lot from Cummings Park and Cove Island and year round maintenance of those facilities is what keeps Stamford looking the way it does. I would not support a reduction of this account.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would like to remind the Representatives that we may disagree with each other but let's respect each other. As Pastor Hoover said today, we don't have to like each other or agree with each other but let's have some respect at all times.

MR. DONAHUE: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question by use of the machine. We're voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion to delete \$15,000 from the Salary Account. The Motion has lost, 26 no, 12 yes, and 1 non-voter.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I'd like to find out what exactly does the Pest Control Account encompass? Does that deal with the spraying for Gypsy Moths?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, it does. That's the amount that was removed.

MRS. MCINERNEY: You removed the money for gypsy moths?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, the money to spray for them next year.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I would like to make a Motion to restore the amount of money that was cut by \$5,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have a Motion to restore \$5,000 to that account and several Seconds.

MR. BLAIS: I would like to know if this amount also includes amounts for rat control?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, it does. That was the \$1,400 that we left in. We don't like rats but we like gypsy moths.

MR. BLAIS: I would say in either case, I know in my district along Weed Avenue, they do have a big problem with rats because people insist on feeding the ducks and it's not good for ducks. I would also say that these parks help differentiate our fair City from another concrete jungle not too far away. If we don't do things to protect the scenic beauty of our parks, and they're very lovely parks, they're not going to be there anymore. Then we're into a Manhattanization of Stamford. I'd like all the Members to consider this before they delete this item.

MR. GOLDSTEIN: I'd like the Board to understand the reason that Fiscal took \$5,000 from this account. Mr. Cook, informed the Committee that we could make that cut and he can function very well without the \$5,000 for this item. That's why we cut it. He has material left from the past and he feels that the infestation this year is far, far less than in the past, which it is.

MR. WHITE: The question of spraying, I'm very glad it was cut out, although I'm disappointed he still has spray left over, is not the way to deal with gypsy moths. All that does is kill every other kind of insect and, in fact, is rather dangerous to birds. There are other ways in which this problem may be dealt with. It's about time that we begin to give incentive to the Parks Department to do precisely this. I would urge that this item be kept out.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We are going to Move the question and the question is the Motion to restore \$5,000 to Pest Control, item 610,2332. If you agree with the restoration vote up for yes, if you disagree, vote no. The Motion is lost, 24 no, 4 yes, and 1 abstention.

MR. ZELINSKI: I have a question on line item 2110, Maintenance of Grounds. I note that the appropriations for last year were \$25,650 and this year we're up to \$41,000; approximately a \$15,000 increase. What is the rationale?

MRS. HAWES: The increased portion was formerly in the capital budget to maintain the ball field. The Finance Department felt it was not proper in capital and so it was put in operation this year. That's the increase, the whole \$15,000

MR. ZELINSKI: Line item 2112, right underneath there, Planting, Turf, and Flowers, again there has been an increase of \$3,000 over last year.

MRS. HAWES: I will read you what Mr. Cook has to say about that account. This is to continue to provide annual flower and bulbs, that's \$5,400 for the flower beds in sidewalk planters and minor tree care and plantings. The increase in this account is to provide for additional trees and shrubs in new road-side planting areas as a result of City-wide traffic realignment projects, as well as replacement and additional trees and shrubs in parks such as Scalzi Park, Cummings Park, Triangle and Kiwanis Park. Continued enhancement of the down town areas is also a grave concern of this department, as well as timely replacements due to active vandalism. Annual flower beds and planters amount to \$4,500. That is a total of \$10,000.

MR. ZELINSKI: What is the unencumbered balance in that account as of the latest date?

MR. ESPOSITO: \$98.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to make a Motion to cut line item 2112 by \$3,000 which would reduce that account to a total of \$7,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion. Several Seconds.

MR. ZELINSKI: I certainly am for the beautification of Stamford; however, with the economic times we have, I think we have to forgo something and this is not a necessity, it is a luxury. I think it's an area that can be cut without losing any services for our citizens.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I believe that with Veterans Park there are more calls for plantings; there is a beautification program going on in down town Stamford which is the whole point of bringing people into down town Stamford and we need more money for more planting.

MR. GAIPA: I would like to speak about this as I am opposed to it. The total budget for the Parks Department is only 1% over last year. This is a well run department, providing a very valuable service and a 1% increase by this department from last year, compared to all the other departments we've had, is most unusual.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I believe that our Parks Department does a great job making Stamford beautiful. I feel that trees and shrubs are part of God's beauty in this world and God's beauty is never a luxury, Mr. Zelinski. I think we're all uplifted by beauty and I would like to see this amount stay the same. I think they deserve it. They've done a magnificent job for the City.

MR. WIDER: I'm certainly opposed to any cut in this. As a matter of fact, I think this department is very conservative. The figure is very conservative

according to what we are getting. We have one of the most beautiful inter-cities anywhere around and I give the credit to the Parks Department and their hard work. I would be opposed to making any cut in this department.

MR. BLUM: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The question has been Moved and Seconded. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We are addressing Mr. Zelinski's Motion for a \$3,000 cut in line item 2112, use the machine. The Motion is lost, 30 no, 8 yes, and 1 non-voter.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move a \$20,000 cut out of the Seasonal Salary Account. Line item 610.1140. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to the Motion? There is a Second.

MRS. CONTI: It isn't that I don't like what the Parks Department does. It isn't that I don't like parks and trees as well as anybody else but we've got to try to conserve in some areas here. We have to remember the kind of a situation we're facing here in Stamford. With that thought in mind, I would Move for the \$20,000 cut.

MR. LIVINGSTON: This Seasonal Account gives the Parks Department a chance to do the most of its work during the summer months. I would like for all of you to keep in mind the people who have these seasonal jobs. For the most part, they're college students, a sprinkling of high school students, and without those jobs you just may be jeopardizing someone's education in the future. The Parks Department has demonstrated to this Board time and time again that they run a very tight ship. Mr. Cook needs to be congratulated. I think this Board should support his budget proposals.

MR. DeLUCA: I would have to be opposed to any cuts in this department or even any future cuts for the Board of Recreation when we come to that next. The Parks Department, as Mr. Gaipa said, only has a 1% increase over the previous years budget. Bob Cook, and the Park Commission have done a fantastic job with the limited amount of people they have. Our parks are considered the best in the State and the work they have been doing is fantastic. For a department that has been holding-the-line for the last couple of years and still keeps the parks in the condition they have been in, a cut in the Salary Account or any account would be ridiculous.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I agree with what Gabe has said. I would also like to point out that in hard economic times, people don't have the opportunity to vacation in the summer. Certainly our parks and our beaches will be utilized this year more than they have in the past.

MR. BLUM: I'm sort of suprised to hear what came out of the mouth of Mr. DeLuca. When the people cry, I don't think they really look at trees. They may go to the park once in a while but 1% of a million is only \$100,000, Gabe. Can't we cut just a couple thousand from the Parks and Recreation?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, do you have a question on figures for Mr. DeLuca?

MR. BLUM: I'm asking him inasmuch as he is the Chairman of Parks and Recreation, maybe he can best tell us where we can really cut. Maybe he does know where we can really cut.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, the Motion here is the deletion of \$20,000 from this account. That is the Motion that we are addressing. We are not speaking to anything else on this item, except that Motion. I can't see how that pertains to the Motion but if you want to go on further and explain to me how it does, fine.

MR. DONAHUE: Move the question. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been Moved and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor? Opposed? Will the no votes please raise their hands? We will Move the question. We are voting on the deletion of \$20,000 from the Seasonal Account as proposed by Mrs. Conti. The Motion has lost, 28 no, 9 yes, and 2 abstentions. We are still speaking to this line item.

MR. DeLUCA: I just want to clarify something for the records. What percent would be \$100,000? This is not even a 1%; it's only a \$3,000 increase.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line in the Parks Department, total amount approved is \$1,051,582.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Before Mrs. Hawe goes on to the next department, I'm going to Move that we take something else out that is out of order. I'm going to Move that we take the Board of Education budget up out of order. **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Motion made and Seconded to take the Board of Education up next on the Agenda, which would be out of order. Our Agenda that we have voted on, this will require two-thirds vote. We need 26 votes. We will proceed to a vote on whether we take the Board of Education up next. We will proceed to a machine vote. I will remind all the Representatives that we are taking a vote. The Motion has lost, 16 yes, 20 no, 1 abstention and 2 non-voters.

TERRY CONNERS SKATING RINK

MRS. HAWE: We're on page 92, Code 620, Terry Connors Rink. Fiscal recommends no cuts in this department which leaves the bottom line at \$304,804.

We took into consideration in making our recommendations, the fact that the Terry Connors Rink is estimated to bring in \$256,850 a year in revenue for this coming year. This, from what I understand, is quite unusual among ice rinks of this sort around the country to be making up that much of their expenditures in revenues.

MRS. MAIHOCK: On item 620.1201, Over-time, it's a small amount, \$2,000 but I realize they have salaries, \$92,000 and also the Seasonal is \$47,000. Have you any explanation as to the necessity for this Over-time?

MRS. HAWE: They don't say in their back-up exactly who gets paid the over-time but I would assume it's for the custodians or someone like that who have to work over-time on some occasions. I really can't tell you definitely though, Mrs. Maihock. I'm sorry.

MR. GAIPA: The rink is open from 5:00 a.m. until 1:00 or 2:00 a.m. on some days and they cannot always schedule people properly. Therefore, it takes some over-time to cover such a wide number of hours.

MR. BLUM: I know this for a fact that the Welfare Department and the ice rink have something going between them because I have been told this is where Work Fair takes place. If a person on welfare needs a couple of dollars one day, they send them to the ice rink to clean or whatever they need done and the money comes from the Welfare Department. So therefore, I would like to cut this seasonal amount at least by \$7,258. Line 620.1140, I make a Motion that we cut \$7,258 and after a Second I will give my reason. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second.

MR. BLUM: I remember at one time Mr. DeVos sat before us and he is now long gone, how he brought out things about the Work Fair Program. He instituted it in Stamford. One of the places that I know of where people can work off the money given to them by the Welfare Department, is at the ice rink. They sweep and do other duties given to them. That is where they go to work. I don't know how much work they do but I know the money comes from the Welfare Department. Therefore, I make a Motion that we cut \$7,258 from that Seasonal Account.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Gaipa, earlier talked about the use that this facility gets in the City of Stamford. If we could possibly open it more hours a day, we could get more use. Mr. Blum has already stated that he does not know how many work hours Terry Connors Rink gets from Welfare; if in fact, they get anything on a daily basis, hourly basis, or a weekly basis. In line with Mr. Blum's thinking, the amount of money could be negligible, the amount of time could be negligible, and if in fact anything substantial is happening over there, which I doubt, because of the Work Fair Program, maybe it has kept this figure that's in the budget to this amount and has kept it lower than it would be otherwise. I recommend that we deny Mr. Blum's Motion.

MRS. PERILLO: Mr. Blum, do you have proof on this or is this just hearsay?

MR. BLUM: This is not hearsay. When Mr. DeVos was here, he told us of this and I knew of some people that did go down there under that Work Fair Program who were unemployed and had run out of their unemployment insurance. They went to the Welfare Department to receive some remuneration and that's where they went to work; to work off that particular program.

MRS. PERILLO: You say Mr. DeVos? Mr. DeVos is long gone from here.

MR. BLUM: He is long gone but the program is still going on.

MRS. PERILLO: Do you know this for a fact that it is going today?

MR. BLUM: Yes, I believe it is.

MRS. PERILLO: Do you have the proof to give us tonight so we could make an intelligent judgement on this?

MR. BLUM: No, I do not.

MR. ESPOSITO: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We will proceed with a machine vote on Mr. Blum's Motion to delete \$7,258 from the Seasonal Account. The Motion is lost, 11 yes, 22 no, 1 abstention, and 5 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: That leaves the total for this department, 620, at \$304,804.

BOARD OF RECREATION

Page 94, Group 65, Recreation. Fiscal recommends the following cuts in the Recreation Department: Line 1124, Differential 7%, we recommend a cut of \$150 which brings that line down to -0-. We recommend a cut from line 1126, Differential 15%, of \$400 which brings that line to -0-. Line 1130, Part-time, we recommend a cut of \$5,000 which brings that line down to \$92,050. Line 1140, Seasonal, we recommend a cut of \$12,730 which brings that line to \$218,000. Line 1201, Over-time, we recommend a cut of \$4,000 which brings that line down to \$11,000. In line 2112, Plantings, Turf, and Flowers, we recommend a cut of \$300 which brings that line down to -0-.

No cuts on the next page or on the next page and none for the rest of the department. The total number of cuts is \$22,580 and the total for department 65 is \$722,462.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I'm going to make a Motion that the Seasonal Account be restored. That's line item 1140. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston has made a Motion to restore the whole \$12,730 to Seasonal and it has been Seconded.

MR. LIVINGSTON: I would like for our Board to understand how this particular account, and I believe the other account, was cut by Fiscal, despite the fact that I made the argument that the seasonal help is really young college students for the most part. We were told by Mrs. Conti that the Chairman of that particular Board spoke with her and told her that he felt that these cuts could be made, despite the fact that he had appeared with his Director and I'm sure they went through the budget and in my opinion that kind of a statement from the Chairman of that department, to me, it was just like sabotage. If they were not presenting this Board with the realistic budget, then it should have been pointed out then and there, not wait until after we had interviewed that department and it had progressed to that stage. I feel very bad that someone, especially a member of any board or commission, would deliberately go behind that board and sabotage that particular budget. I'm hoping that this Board will do the same thing we did on the other Seasonal Account and recognize that these are young people and they do provide a good service and I'm hoping we can overlook some of the personalities that are involved with this and really judge this on the merits of that particular account.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to ask Mrs. Conti a question. In Fiscal, I was one of a number of people who voted for this cut. I voted for this

cut based on what Mrs. Conti had related regarding the Chairman of the Board of Recreation's recommendation. I would appreciate it if Mrs. Conti could explain to the group why those cuts were recommended and then the group could understand why we made it and why we didn't feel it was a sabotage cut. I don't believe that the chairman of a commission would want to sabotage the very commission of which he is chairman.

MRS. CONTI: I would be very glad to explain that. The Chairman felt that there would be cuts made in the budget anyway, so he told us that he felt they could sustain the cuts in these areas rather than in some other area and these are what he recommended to me.

MR. TARZIA: I am actually opposed to the entire series of cuts here because when I look at the total, the bottom line figure as approved by the Board of Finance, it's \$749,420. That's the amount approved by the Board of Finance. If we look at last years appropriation, there is \$775,000. That's a reduction of approximately 4%, I believe. If we go with the revised figure, you're reducing that department by 7½%. I don't think we're doing that with the other departments and I don't see the logic behind this whole thing here.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? I would like to remind the Members that are not on the floor that we are going to proceed to a vote. We are going to use the machine. We are voting on Mr. Livingston's Motion to restore the funds. The Motion is carried, 20 yes, 11 no, and 8 non-voters.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to restore \$5,000 into the Part-time Account, line 1130 which would bring that back up to \$97,050.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Second on that? It has been Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA: Once again, my rationale for restoring this is the fact that evidently the Chairman of the Board of Recreation was just living within the mandates set down by the Mayor to reduce his budget 7%. As a result of coming with a 7% reduction in this budget, the Board of Recreation this year will close down 18 evening summer playgrounds, 14 fall afternoon playgrounds, 14 spring after school playgrounds, and the summer playgrounds will be reduced by 50%. To keep on making additional cuts into this account would more or less destroy our recreational program in the City. It's amazing how the Chairman of the Board of Recreation would even recommend further cuts, especially when they have additional duties; to take care of Cubeta Stadium, Heroy Recreation Center, Hatchfield, Scofieldtown Park, and other areas. I think it is irresponsible action on his part and I would definitely recommend restoring this \$5,000 into the Part-time Account.

MRS. GUROIAN: I Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion had been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will move the question. We will use the machine. The Motion is carried, 21 yes, 11 no, and 7 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: That brings us to a total number of cuts in this department of \$4,850 and the bottom line which we approved is \$740,192.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a comment and then I do have a Motion. In the light of reorganization of the departments that we have been asking, I would Move that from the Salary Account 1110, we delete \$21,101. This is administrative. This is not hands-on recreational care. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to your Motion, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I think that this is an administrative budget. I have looked over the personnel that are in the administrative office and I think that it could be reorganized. It is not the hands-on care of playgrounds and that sort of thing. The comment I would like to make is to Mr. DeLuca's previous statement that with these budget cuts, playgrounds etc... are going to have to be closed. I notice that there are a lot of adult ball programs of various kinds, softball, volleyball, basketball, etc... so I do think it is up to the department to decide which they want to cut and I think they might give some thought to cutting some of the adult programs to keeping some of the childrens programs. That was my comment but it was not really speaking to the Motion I made.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to Mrs. Gershman's Motion to delete \$21,101 from the Salary Account.

MRS. GUROIAN: As I understand it, the Board of Finance did not take any cut for attrition; they just eliminated the three personnel. Anybody who knows the history of the Board of Recreation appreciates the fact that at any given time, there are any number of vacancies that haven't been filled and are waiting for people to fill them simply because they are not kept very long by the administration or because they find it uncomfortable working in the Board of Recreation. Be that as it may for whatever reason, there aren't any number of vacancies in the Board of Recreation that the cut proposed could easily absorb between the time when the job is vacated and someone else comes to fill it in. For instance, I know of one position, I think it's the Office Manager, where people have not worked longer than six months. That is the history of that department. I think we should take advantage of the proposal and vote for it.

MR. ESPOSITO: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? We will procede to a vote of the deletion of \$21,101 from the Salary Account made by Mrs. Gershman. The Motion is lost 12 yes, 19 no, 1 abstention and 7 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The bottom line remains the same. Department group 66, Recreation Area Maintainance, Fiscal recommends no cuts in this department group and so on page 100 the bottom line total remains the same at \$64,651.

Department group 67, on page 101, Ethel Kveskin Theater, Fiscal recommends a cut in Account 5150, Professional Consultants. We recommend a cut of \$3,000 which would leave that line at \$3,656 and that brings the bottom line total down to \$55,158.

BRENNAN GOLF COURSE

Page 102, 670, Brennan Golf Course. Fiscal recommends no cut in this department and on page 103 the bottom line remains the same for a total of \$238,749.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to move a cut from 670.1140, Seasonal, a cut of \$5,000 from this account. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There has been a Motion made to delete \$5,000 bringing that total to \$49,768. There is a Second to Mrs. Conti's Motion.

MRS. CONTI: Here again, it's an effort to try to save money. I'm not saying that the golf course isn't lovely and it's an excellent spot, however, we have to try to save money in areas that are not extremely vital.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been Moved and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will continue with a machine vote. We are voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion to delete \$5,000 from the Seasonal Account, Brennan Golf Course. The Motion is lost, 18 yes, 20 no, and 1 non-voter.

MRS. HAWES: We have come to a section total. It is \$2,455,136 and the total amount of cuts in this division is \$14,850. The total amount of cuts so far is \$907,947.

MR. BLAIS: Point of Information. Why do we regard the product of our work for the last three nights in terms of budget cuts? It's almost like a ritual that we have to cut.

PRESIDENT SANTY: People are interested in what we have done to date on the budget.

MR. FRANCHINA: How much has been approved to date?

MRS. HAWES: The total amount approved to date is \$62,684,111.

FERGUSON LIBRARY

We're on page 104, Code 710, Ferguson Library. Fiscal recommends in line 4320 a cut of \$50,000 which would bring that line down to \$2,854,300.

MR. FRANCHINA: Would a minority report be in order now?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Franchina.

MR. FRANCHINA: This is minority report from Betty Conti, John Hogan, and Joe Franchina. We won't dispute the fact that the library plays a very important role here in Stamford. We feel that we have an excellent library. In keeping up with the prevailing moods of the taxpayers, we must try to hold-the-line on spending especially this year with the reassessments and the unemployment rising as it is; these are rough economic times. I make a Motion to delete \$100,000 out of the 710.4320, Ferguson Library Account, leaving a balance of \$2,754,300. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Franchina. There is a Second to your Motion.

MRS. HAWE: Point of Information. Is he talking about an additional \$100,000 over and above the \$50,000 cut which Fiscal recommended?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. ESPOSITO: If we were to approve this, that would leave the Ferguson Library with \$4,000 more than they have this year to run the entire new library. We on this Board, have made a commitment to extend the library. We've put millions of dollars of capital money into that library. It's beautiful from the inside as long as you wear blinders as you're walking into it and don't have to see it from the outside. That's really beside the point, though. The point is that they have a beautiful, large, extended, facility that we have made a major investment in and now we're saying run that extended facility with the increase in energy costs, and labor costs, with the same amount of money you've had all along. I was on this Board when we approved the capital money and I voted with the full knowledge that we would have to support that large addition, not only for the increase in energy but also for the increase in labor. I was on the committee when we voted for the \$50,000 and that was a great effort and I supported that simply because I realized that the taxpayers have an extremely heavy burden this year. However, I voted for that reluctantly. I think another \$100,000 cut would be to destroy the very essence of what that new library is all about and everything that this Board has supported in the past.

MR. TARZIA: I, too, recognize the problem that we are having; the economic condition we're in. Therefore, I would like Mr. Franchina to consider a total of \$100,000 rather than \$150,000 which he is asking for. Would it be in order to make an amendment at this time?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Tarzia.

MR. TARZIA: I make an amendment to cut \$50,000 plus the recommendation of Fiscal, which is another \$50,000 bringing the total amount cut to \$100,000. SECONDED,

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to that Motion to amend Mr. Franchina's Motion to delete \$50,000. We are now speaking to Mr. Tarzia's Motion.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the question please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. We are voting on Mr. Tarzia's amendment which is \$50,000 from the Ferguson Library. The Motion passed, 20 yes, 19 no, and 0 non-voters. We will now procede to vote on Mr. Franchina's Motion.

MRS. HAWE: The line is \$2,804,300.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I have something that I need to clarify. We voted on the amendment. On the Floor now, is the Motion made by Mr. Franchina. The way I understand it, there is a Motion on the Floor to cut another \$100,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is still a Motion on the Floor and we do have to vote on it.

MR. FRANCHINA: I withdraw my Motion.

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Boccuzzi indicated that we voted to accept the amendment, so we have presently before us a total cut of \$100,000.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Franchina's Motion was withdrawn so we now have a \$50,000 cut not a \$100,000 cut.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, what was the Fiscal Committee's deletion?

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee recommended a cut of \$50,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, Fiscal recommended a cut of \$50,000. Mr. Tarzia's amendment to the original Motion was an additional \$50,000 making it a total of \$100,000 from this account. There is no main Motion because Mr. Franchina withdrew the Motion.

MR. BOCCUZZI: The original Motion was to cut \$50,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fiscal's report was also \$50,000, then Mr. Franchina made a Motion for an additional \$100,000. That would make the total \$150,000. Mr. Tarzia amended Mr. Franchina's Motion for cutting \$50,000 making the total cut, with Fiscal and Mr. Tarzia's amendment as \$100,000. That passed. There was a total cut voted with the amendment made by Mr. Tarzia of \$100,000.

MRS. HAWE: As I see it, we voted on Mr. Tarzia's amendment and now Mr. Franchina's Motion is amended to be \$50,000 in addition. Now we have to vote on Mr. Franchina's Motion but since he withdrew it, there is no Motion on the floor so the Fiscal Committee's recommendation stands.

MRS. GUROIAN: Mr. Tarzia did not ask for a \$50,000 reduction of Mr. Franchina's Motion. He asked for \$50,000 over and above Fiscal Committee's recommendation which makes it \$100,000 which is what passed.

MR. DONAHUE: Mr. Franchina made a Motion. Mr. Tarzia made an amendment to Mr. Franchina's Motion. That Motion passed. Now we are dealing with the amended version of Mr. Franchina's Motion. If we want to call it the Tarzia Motion now, that would be fine. We still have to deal with main Motion that was on the Floor as it is now amended. We still have to take another vote on that amount. He can't withdraw it once it's been amended.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Could I have a Parliamentarian's ruling on this, please? We now have approved a \$50,000 amendment to Mr. Franchina's Motion making it a total cut with Fiscal and the Tarzia amendment of \$100,000.

MR. HOGAN: The Parliamentary situation here is that once a Motion is made and is stated by the Chair, it becomes the property of the Assembly. In order for a maker of a Motion to withdraw his Motion from the Floor, he does have to have the sanction of the Assembly. He is allowed to do this unless there is an objection from the Floor. There does seem to be some objection. If there are no objections and Mr. Franchina does withdraw his Motion, then there is no main Motion on the floor to be voted on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Chair is ruling that we are going to go back. We already voted on the amendment. We are going to back to the main Motion and vote on it. It is Mr. Franchina's \$100,000 in addition to Fiscal's recommendation which would make it \$150,000.

MRS. GUROIAN: I really can explain it but I don't want to confuse you any more. What, in affect, Mr. Tarzia did was propose a substitute Motion because you cannot change a dollar figure. He proposed a substitute Motion. I didn't want to make an issue out of it because it's late and I didn't want us all to debate three hours. He put a substitute Motion in which passed and the other Motion is now dead.

MRS. HAWE: The Ferguson Library line is now \$2,804,300. We will now go to Code 720.4310, Stamford Museum. Fiscal recommends a cut of \$25,000 in this account which would leave the Stamford Museum bottom line at \$465,066.

MR. DONAHUE: I think we're doing something wrong here. We did in fact vote for what Mr. Tarzia called an amendment. It's really a substitution. We voted for that. We substituted one Motion for the other. Now Mr. Tarzia's Motion has passed and that's on the Floor before us now for discussion and for a vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, the Parliamentarians have ruled that it is over. We have voted on a \$50,000 cut. It is finished. If you want to over-rule the Chair go ahead and do it.

MR. DONAHUE: In order to clarify the matter and to make sure the cut is in fact legal, I will challenge the Chair and I don't think there is any need for any extra discussion.

First of all, what is Mr. Tarzia's substitute Motion? What is the cut that is now on the floor according to Mr. Tarzia's Motion, not Mr. Franchina's. Does the Chair have a record of what that last vote was?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, \$50,000. On top of the Fiscal Committee making it a total of \$100,000.

MR. DONAHUE: So now what we would have to vote on is whether or not this Board is going to delete that additional \$50,000 in addition to what the recommendation was. That's all we have to do. We never took a vote on it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, you are challenging the Chair. I say the vote is over and done with. We have voted on \$50,000 with Mr. Tarzia; with the addition of Fiscal's recommendation which is \$100,000 total. There is a Second to the ruling. We will use the machine. Vote no if you agree with Mr. Donahue's challenge of the Chair. The decision of the Chair stands, 19 yes, 15 no, and 5 non-voters.

STAMFORD MUSEUM

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Madam President, let the records show I'm leaving for discussion of the Museum, please.

MRS. HAWE: 720.4310, Stamford Museum. Fiscal Committee recommends a cut of \$25,000 which would bring that line down to \$465,066.

MR. FRANCHINA: This is a minority report from John Hogan, Betty Conti, and Joe Franchina. We're not here to discuss the need for a Museum and its function. However, in this fragile economic situation we're in, we must find ways to curb our expenses to give some relief to all of our taxpayers. I feel that the cut I am about to propose can be overcome by the Museum from the private sector. Therefore, I make a Motion to delete \$24,000 from the 720.4310, Stamford Museum Account leaving a balance of \$441,066. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to that Motion. So everyone understands. You are Moving for an additional deletion in addition to what the Fiscal Committee as already deleted of \$25,000.

MR. FRANCHINA: That is correct.

MRS. GUROIAN: Madam Chairman, I think it would simplify matters if people said exactly the deletion they want, rather than an addition. They're voting for a total deletion. Fiscal's will stand regardless. Just have them say the amount that they want deleted and nobody will get confused.

MR. ESPOSITO: This is our third night; we're going on our third morning, restoring cuts that Fiscal has made in various departments when we have cut particular departments where we are cutting bodies that we know we're cutting, whether they are firemen or police officers, when we have line item control. When we get to the accounts where we don't have line item control, it becomes ^{easy} to start lopping off the big figures. We all know we have bigger figures coming tonight. I have a feeling that this is more destructive than beneficial. I'm opposed to this simply because here we are taking a total of \$49,000, which is 10% of this budget, without really knowing the exact affect. Throughout the last three nights, when we cut from an account, for example we cut a New Equipment Account and we cut typewriters, we know what we're cutting. We know the affect of that cut on the budget of that department. We cut a secretary or we cut a police officer; we know the effect because we have line item control. Whether I would agree with those cuts or not, at least that is a more reasonable cut. We just cut \$100,000 from the Ferguson Library that was already cut \$50,000 by the Board of Finance. I wonder, those who voted for it, how many have looked through the detailed budget of the Ferguson Library and know exactly what it is going to be.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Esposito, we are speaking now to the Stamford Museum and not the Ferguson Library.

MR. ESPOSITO: I wonder how many people have looked through the detail of the Stamford Museum and know where that \$49,000 is going to come from; whether it's going to come from Salaries, Fuel, Maintenance of Equipment, or what. It's so easy to just take a big budget that's 2 or 3 million dollars or \$490,000 and say let's take \$50,000 out of there. That's a really easy move to make and it makes our final figures look very good in terms of cuts. There is also a blind type of irresponsible cut and if people are going to make that kind of cut, I would hope that they would look at the detail of the budget and maybe give some indication as to exactly what they would like to see cut. Just looking at the detail of the budget, would give some ideas as to what these departments do and what they need the money for.

MRS. HAWE: I would just like to point out that the Stamford Museum has made a real effort over the past couple of years to increase the revenue that they've obtained from other sources. They have had a large membership drive which has been quite successful. They project an increase of 28% revenue over last year. This is revenue that they have gained from their own efforts and I think this is quite commendable. I think they have been able to do this because of the continued support of the City. I think this is something that we should encourage and encourage among all other organizations such as this; to go out and to try to get money on their own which they have been doing. I strongly believe that we should leave the cut at the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee and defeat this Motion.

MR. BLAIS: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been Moved and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. We are voting on Mr. Franchina's Motion to delete \$24,000 from the Stamford Museum.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Point of Order, please. Wasn't that \$49,000?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are not discussing Fiscal. His Motion was \$24,000. That is the Motion.

MRS. McINERNEY: Then the difference is only \$1.00 less than the recommended cut by Fiscal, if we vote on it that way.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Franchina's Motion is on the Floor and that is what we are discussing. Mr. Franchina, would you state your Motion again?

MR. FRANCHINA: The Motion was made in addition to Fiscal.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Parliamentarian asked you to read your Motion just for clarification, just the amount that you were deleting, not in addition.

MR. FRANCHINA: I'm sorry, \$24,000.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, what is the total deletion?

MR. FRANCHINA: Leaving a balance of \$441,066.

MR. BLAIS: Point of Information. If the maker of a Motion misstates the amount that he wants to cut, doesn't the amount that he misstated stick as the Motion?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No. Mr. Franchina's Motion, which he stated very clearly, was to delete \$24,000 from this account bringing the total to \$441,066, and that is what we voted on. The Motion passed, 19 yes, 16 no, and 3 non-voters.

MRS. HAWES: The total on that line is \$441,066. The total deletion is \$49,000 and that line is now \$441,066.

CULTURAL EVENTS

Code 730, Cultural Events, Fiscal recommends a cut in line 3393, Stamford Arts Center, of \$40,000 which would leave that line at -0-. I would like to say something about this. This is a start-up of operating costs for the Stamford Cultural Center. Fiscal has recommended that we keep that amount for the Cultural Center in the capital budget. However, we didn't feel at this time that operating funds were needed; plus we explored in great detail the possibility of the City setting up a coliseum authority to pay the operating costs for the Cultural Center and for these reasons we have deleted this operating amount. The bottom line for Code 730 is \$50,025.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would like to note now that Mr. Wiederlight has returned and is now recorded as present.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to cut line 730.3350, The Hartman Theater, by \$15,000 bringing the total down to \$10,000 which is the previous amount. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to your Motion.

MR. DeLUCA: We started off by giving them \$5,000, it went up to \$10,000 and gradually keeps going up and up. I think it's nice to start these organizations off and it's up to them to generate fund-raising projects and the City can no longer continue to start something and increase their payments.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to recommend that whatever monies are given to the Hartman Theater Company are contingent upon their producing a complete season and not a mini-season or a shortened season.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Gershman, we are speaking to Mr. DeLuca's Motion to delete \$10,000 from the Hartman Theater Account. Excuse me, \$15,000 bringing the total to \$10,000.

MR. ZELINSKI: Mr. DeLuca, I wonder if you would entertain a friendly amendment to delete the whole \$25,000?

MR. DeLUCA: I don't believe that I want to be that severe. We're talking about \$10,000 to show good faith in the program and rather than just wipe it all out completely, I think we should leave some of it in for the best interests of the City.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, would it be proper at this time to make an amendment for the other \$10,000 or wait until this Motion passes? What would be the proper procedure? I feel very strongly and I will give my rationale.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You could do it, but you would have to have a Second to your amendment? We would have to vote on the amendment first.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think it is important, so I would make a Motion to delete the \$10,000. Would that be proper at this time?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That would be a substitute amendment.

MR. ZELINSKI: The Parliamentarian said I should make a Motion to delete the whole \$25,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, the Floor is yours. If you would like to do that, then that is fine.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I would like to do that and I will if I get a Second. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski is making a Motion to delete \$25,000 as a substitute Motion to Mr. DeLuca's for a \$15,000. Is there a Second to that? There is a Second.

MR. ZELINSKI: If I may, just for the benefit of my colleagues, there have been articles written pertaining to the Hartman Theater that they are in severe financial trouble to the amount of millions of dollars and I cannot see at this present time voting any amount of money with the possibility of the Hartman Theater closing and where is that \$25,000 or \$10,000 going to go? I think we should think very seriously of this before we vote any amount for that. As a matter of fact, I received a copy that came out of this office, the Board of Representatives Office, with the number 45, we all received copies; unfortunately I did not bring it, but it was quoted from a local newspaper or magazine and the figures are there that they are in severe financial trouble and they may not open. Why should we vote any money with the possibility that it is not going to be spent or not used for the puposes that we intended it to be used for.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to Mr. Zelinski's Motion to delete the complete \$25,000, Hartman Theater.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Moved and Seconded to move the question. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed? We need a two-thirds vote to Move the question. We will use the machine to make sure. We are voting now to Move the question. The Motion to Move the question has lost, 21 yes, 17 no, and 1 non-voter.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: We voted to cut funds from our library, from our museum, and now from our theater. Despite the fact that the Hartman Theater is in financial trouble, it is scheduled to open; the corporations in this City have contributed and are continuing to contribute heavily to it; it is a beautiful theater; it adds a great dimension to our City, I don't think \$25,000 is too much for the City to contribute to such an asset. I don't think more would be too much. I hope we don't cut anything, no less the full amount.

MR. ESPOSITO: I agree with Mrs. Goldstein. I would also like to correct some of the statements that Mr. Zelinski made. The Hartman Theater has been in a financial bind but I have been assured by Mr. McGary, who is Chairman of the Board and I asked him this question when they came before the Fiscal Committee and he publicly stated that beyond a doubt, the Hartman Theater will have a full season next year. If the Chairman

has said that, and I've talked with the treasurer of the Hartman Theater; he also assured me that the Hartman Theater will have a full season. Therefore, I don't think we should base our vote on that issue and somewhere this past week or so, I remember reading that the private corporations in this City have come together and are going to pay the debt of the Hartman Theater but I can't place where I read that. Therefore, I feel that it is very important to not cut the whole thing, but not cut this at all and show our faith in the Hartman Theater. The private corporations of this City can come together and the corporate loans of \$150,000 have been forgiven so that private industry has shown its support for the Hartman Theater; the public has shown its support, and in 1982, the corporate loans will be \$150,000 that are forgiven and in 1983, the corporate loans will be \$112,000. That's \$162,500 that private industry in this City has felt that they should contribute to the survival of the Hartman Theater. As I started to say, the public has shown its support through 8,000 subscriptions at approximately \$60 per and the support of the City is just part of that total process. There are no free rides for anything. There are no free rides for the library, no free rides for the Parks Department, there are no free rides for Public Works, and there are no free rides for the theater or education. If private industry and the public show their support, I think that it's important that the City also show its support. The Hartman Theater is one of the few institutions in the City of Stamford that draws people from outside the community; people from the entire Stamford area come to down town Stamford to go to the Hartman Theater. This is their contact with the City of Stamford and they also spend money down there. I think we should show our faith in the theater for that reason.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I feel badly that Mr. Zelinski is not here to hear the rebuttal on his Motion; nevertheless, I will continue. I sometimes wonder where our priorities are. We cut money from the library, as Mrs. Goldstein mentioned, we cut money from the museum, we're working to cut money from our only theater in town but we don't cut money from garbage. I don't know. We're being asked to vote 0 appropriation for this item as it stands right now on hearsay evidence. There has been no substantiation in black and white that this theater will not open up. I don't think anybody in good conscience, just because one Member says something, or heard something and cannot substantiate it, can vote 0 appropriation for such a valuable asset to our Community as our theater.

MR. BLAIS: I really would have a question for all Members of the Board to ask themselves: What is it that we are here to do tonight? Are we here just to create a place to live, a very drab place to live or are we here tonight to maintain the City of Stamford in an effort that people before us saw fit to make Stamford one of the great American Cities. Tonight, what we are proposed to do, is to make Stamford a cultural wasteland. That means that we are leaving this City in worse shape than we found it before we took office and I think that is a sad state of affairs.

MR. FLOUNDERS: It's difficult to follow the eloquence of my colleague, Mr. Blais. I would heartily endorse what he said, what Representatives Goldstein, Esposito, and Hawe said. We're acting as if the City is for sale. We're acting as if we're ready to hang out the for sale sign and dismantle the entire City. Bricks and mortar and garbage collection are one thing, quality of life is something else. We are absolutely irresponsible. If we destroy the good things that this City has done and our predecessors have done in forward planning and thinking to care about the citizens, to care about the quality of life in this City, it's absolutely unconscionable that in one fell-swoop, as they say, in one evening we could destroy everything that we have built up in the way of culture and we really haven't gone that far but we've made some very important steps. To sit here tonight after three long nights of conversation about nothing at all, and destroy the intangible thing that holds this City together, and it's going to make it important in the future, is absolutely insane in my humble opinion. I absolutely urge my colleagues to vote against this reduction of the Hartman Theater. The corporations, private individuals, they are doing one heck of a lot more than we are and if they're ready to stick with it, we, at the very least, can stick with them.

MR. WIDER: Mr. Flounders echoed my sentiment. I'm not a real theater goer but I really did enjoy Mahalia that was down there. I think it adds something to the inter-City. I think we would be very small if we reduced for \$1.00 this little \$25,000 that we are being asked for.

MR. OWENS: Could we Move the question, please? **SECONDED.**

PRESIDENT SANTY: There has been a Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We are now voting on Mr. Zelinski's Motion to delete \$25,000 from the Hartman Theater. The Motion is lost, 6 yes, 28 no, 2 abstentions, and 3 non-voters. We will now go back to Mr. DeLuca's Motion.

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. Wasn't that a substitute Motion?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It was defeated so we can go back to the original Motion.

MR. ESPOSITO: A separate Motion means that you are substituting for Mr. DeLuca's Motion which is not on the Floor any more.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca did not agree with it and the Motion was lost and I ruled that we could go back to Mr. DeLuca's Motion.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion at this time rather than go through this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You don't have to, Mr. DeLuca there is a Motion on the Floor made and Seconded. We will now have discussion on Mr. DeLuca's Motion. His Motion is to delete \$15,000 from this account leaving a total of \$50,000.

745.4390, Yerwood Center, we recommend a cut of \$10,000 which would bring that line to \$45,000.

In line 745.4391, ROSSCO, we recommend a cut of \$500 which would bring that line to \$5,300.

In line 745.4393, Southfield Community Center, we recommend a cut of \$6,366 to bring that line to \$34,200.

That a total amount of cuts of \$16,866 and brings the bottom line to \$84,500.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move to delete the whole \$55,000 from Yerwood Center and if there is a Second, I will explain. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to that Motion.

MRS. CONTI: Yerwood Community Center does excellent work but they do have paid staff there and the withdrawal of these funds would not require the closing of the Center. They could use their staff part-time, instead of full-time, or they could make other efficiencies but I do feel that the taxpayers of Stamford are so put upon that we have got to give them some relief and I think we could do it in this way.

MR. GAIPA: I would like to disagree with Mrs. Conti. Someone mentioned something about improving the quality of life in the City of Stamford when we were discussing the theater. There is one way we can help to improve the quality of life and that's through the Yerwood Center and also ROSSCO and the Southfield Community Center.

MR. LIVINGSTON: It's an odd thing that Mrs. Conti has decided to save an awful lot of money at the expense of Yerwood Center but I didn't hear her mention anything concerning Glenbrook Center. I am not going to go into a long detail concerning the necessity of Yerwood Center but these funds are not used for staffing and programming. These funds are used strictly for utilities.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Mrs. Conti says they will have to make other efficiencies; they'll have to make the ultimate efficiency and close the doors. It would be a sad day if the Yerwood Center has to close and all the people in the Community that it serves will no longer be able to utilize the facility. I think it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to close this Center with the other two Centers right below it. I don't think it is anybody's intent on this Board to reduce the quality of life for the people that we have been elected to serve.

MR. DIXON: Because of inflation in Stamford which has had its effect and impact on every phase of life in the City of Stamford, it certainly has done its number on the Yerwood Center. Because of inflation, the Center has been put in a position where it really depends on the aid and assistance that it receives from the City. We're talking about

quality of life and in so doing, we must consider the quality of life in the Yerwood Center area and the effect that it has on that total area. We are quickly approaching a long hot summer and the kind of programs that the Yerwood Center provides for the young people certainly keeps them off the street and out of mischief and much trouble. If the \$55,000 is denied to the Yerwood Center, then I do honestly believe that it will throw us into another kind of a situation where with the services being denied that it provides so many people, could reflect in the total area and be transformed into some kind of damage by the kids and people that will have been denied a great amount of service and will just have a lot of spare time on their hands with nothing to do but come up and down the streets. I believe that we should approve this \$55,000 intact as it is and I certainly hope that the Members of this Board will support this \$55,000, intact. (End of Tape).

MR. WIDER: I can't afford to move the question when there are so many people out there who are paying taxes and using the Yerwood Center and looking our way to try to keep it intact. I can't say that I will move the question because I have a feeling for those people. I'm afraid that sometimes we become really penny-wise and dollar-foolish. When we can see what a Center, like the Yerwood Center is doing for a total area, like the west side of Stamford, then I think to talk about \$45,000 is talking about tennis because we have more people paying more taxes on the west side of Stamford because of that Yerwood Center than we do in a lot of other areas that I know about. I would hope that this Board will feel obligated to try and keep this Center with first class service for a neighborhood that's really in desperate need of it.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't want to belabor the point, but I would ask my colleagues to vote in favor of this Motion with the understanding that there are centers in this City and in the City budget, mainly the Public Works budget and under the Glenbrook Community Center, there are items listed for informational purposes, and I would hope that you would vote with us on this Motion. I am bound to the wishes of the Fiscal Committee because of some of the reasons Mrs. Conti said; the fiscal condition that the City is in. I understand that. I would think that in all fairness, we are asking for \$45,000 which isn't very much, and I support the recommendation of Fiscal. I understand her, but I am speaking against her Motion, but agreeing with her that we are in financial trouble.

MR. OWENS: I would like to go back and note what the other Representatives have spoken on as far as this Yerwood Center. The Yerwood Center as of this date, is working with the bare minimum of staff. All of the operational funds that I'm quite sure the City could give to this Community Center is very well needed. For instance, the Brennan Golf Course over-time alone could pay for this \$55,000 or this \$10,000 you want to take out. I would encourage everyone to please support the whole \$55,000 that they are asking for.

MR. BLAIS: I am listening to this debate about cutting these various community centers and a thought crossed my mind. I can see the need for certain Members of this Board to react to perceived and real

MR. DIXON: Can we clear that up just a little further? You stated that Mr. DeLuca's Motion had been substituted. A substitute Motion replaces the original Motion. An amended Motion changes a Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Parliamentarian moved that an amended is the same thing as a substitute Motion. The Motion was defeated.

MR. ESPOSITO: Point of Order. I don't thing that was what Mrs. Guroian said. Is a substitute Motion the same as an amended Motion?

MRS. GUROIAN: How could it be. An amended Motion is an amended Motion. A substitute Motion places another Motion on the Table at the same time but if the one passes, the other one cannot be entertained.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's what happened with the other case. This time, this one did not pass so we can go back to the original Motion. It was two different instances. Mr. Tarzia's passed, Mr. Zelinski's did not pass. We are going back to the original Motion of Mr. DeLuca's. We are now acting on that \$15,000 to delete from the Hartman Theater.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, I don't mean to differ with you but I do think, Mr. DeLuca, in order to make this legal, should make his Motion again.

MR. DeLUCA: To simplify that, I would like to make a Motion to cut this line item by \$15,000, 730.3315, Hartman Theater bringing it down to \$10,000 which it was the prior year. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. There are several Seconds. There is a Motion to Move the question and it has been Seconded. All in favor of moving the question on Mr. DeLuca's Motion, please say Aye. Opposed? We will use the machine. We are voting on Mr. DeLuca's Motion. The Motion passed, 19 yes, 18 no, and 2 non-voters.

MRS. HAWE: The total for that line is \$10,000 and the total amount approved...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, before you go any further, there are some other people that wish to speak so don't give a total yet.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to make a Motion to reduce line item 730.3340, State Opera, by \$5,000 bringing it back to last years \$5,000 as a means of showing good faith that we're interested in the State Opera. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to your Motion.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would just say, I think it's another mistake.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I believe that in all fairness that if we gave \$10,000 to the Hartman Theater, we should give \$10,000 to the State Opera.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think that with the cut and with the amount recommended, at least it's a fair compromise that the public should not be allowed

to have to subsidize so much money for benefits that maybe only a few will use.

MR. OWENS: Move the Motion. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? We will continue with a vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion to delete \$5,000, State Opera. Use your machine. The Motion is lost, 19 yes, 20 no.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to make a Motion to reduce the same line item, 730.3340, by \$3,000, bringing the total to \$7,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second to that.

MRS. CONTI: It's all in the same vain that we are sitting here cutting out existing jobs and yet we're willing to give this money to cultural things which very few will enjoy in the community, at least not the majority of people. Our priorities are all mixed up.

MR. STORK: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor say Aye. Opposed? We will Move the question. We are going to use the machine. If you agree with Mrs. Conti's Motion, to delete \$3,000 from this account, State Opera, vote up for yes. If you are against the reduction, vote down for no, and until this button is pushed and locked in, you may change your vote. I will let you know when I am pushing the button. The Motion has carried, 20 yes, 19 no.

MRS. HAWES: The total amount of cuts in this 730 Account is \$58,000 which leaves the bottom line at \$32,025.

MRS. SIGNORE: I would just like to comment on something. Under Cultural Events, all of our various community activities are listed in here and the one that has held their budget constantly since 1980 is the Stamford Historical Society. I would like to commend them publicly for that.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to reconsider. I was on the prevailing side and I would like to reconsider the Ferguson Library and Move that we restore the cut. That's line item 710.4320. I Move that we restore \$50,000 of the cut. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are several Seconds. You're Moving to restore \$50,000 that has been deleted. We need a majority vote for reconsideration. There is a Second to your reconsideration. All in favor of reconsidering, please say Aye. We are going to use the machine. This is a majority vote. I'm sorry, Mrs. Gershman, your Motion has lost, 19 yes, 20 no.

COMMUNITY CENTERS

MRS. HAWES: On page 105, Code 745, Community Centers. In an effort to bring these Community Centers back in line with their last years appropriation, Fiscal made the following recommendations: In line

financial problems with the City. I can appreciate that. However, in our endeavor to save money, I'm not so sure that we're not forgetting something. There are services rendered by certain departments or agencies of the City that are very intangible. Garbage, as you can see, can be picked up; police are visible on the street; firemen are by their fire hoses, but you do not see the good, the problems that are solved by these community centers. I personally believe dollar for dollar among the best buys that the City gets are these community centers. I would employ all my fellow Representatives to consider that visibility does not equate with effectiveness.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been moved and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question on Mrs. Conti's Motion, please say Aye. Opposed? We will vote the question. We are now voting on Mrs. Conti's Motion. I would ask all the Representatives to come and vote. The Motion is lost, 4 yes, 30 no, 2 abstentions, and 3 non-voters.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Line item 4390, Yerwood Center, I do feel since we cut the other two centers down to the figure at which they were in 1981-82, that it would be unfair to have preferential treatment, if you might, given to this item. I think Southfield Community Center needed the extra money as well so I would make a Motion to cut it back \$20,000 to the figure of last year at \$35,000. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your Motion has been Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: You mentioned Southfield Community Center. I don't like to compare centers because I know they're all needed. For your information, Southfield gets funded from the Federal government and United Way, the same as Yerwood. The building and facilities which we are paying for; heating and other things to keep the building going, is just for the upkeep of the building not for staff and things like that. You can't compare the two when it comes to the funding. You can't say just because you're cutting Southfield you're going to cut Yerwood, you can't compare the two facilities and the facilities are what we're dealing with here.

MR. TARZIA: I just wanted to add that the Committee did consider \$20,000, as I recall because I was present, but they finally decided on the \$10,000 figure.

MR. DeLUCA: Move the question. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Second. All in favor of Moving the question, please say Aye. Opposed? We are voting on Mrs. McInerney's Motion. You may use the machine. The Motion is lost, 12 yes, 25 no, and 2 non-voters.

MRS. HAWES: The total number of cuts in this department, 745, of \$16,866 and a bottom line of \$84,500.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of Information. Why isn't Glenbrook Community Center listed the same as the rest of the centers?

MR. ESPOSITO: The Glenbrook Community Center, whatever the City supports it with is contained within the buildings and grounds of Public Works. The building is owned by the City; the gas, electric, and utilities are paid by the City through the Public Works budget. The Yerwood Center is a separate building. It owns itself. The people who are on the Yerwood Center Board own the building. ROQSCO is part of Rogers School and the Southfield Community Center is in the Housing Authority Building. They don't get any other source of support from the City and that's why they come to the City for these nominal amounts. The Glenbrook Community Center does get funding from the City through the Public Works Department.

MRS. GUROIAN: The Glenbrook Community Center and the Southfield Community Center both are owned by the City. They are only leased to the trustees of the two centers for a dollar a year. The Yerwood Community Center property was given to the trustees. They own that property. The City does not own that property; they own that property. Aside from that, the Yerwood Community Center gets other funds such as community chest. The Glenbrook Community Center does not. The only thing that the Southfield Community Center gets is rent from CTE. The Glenbrook Community Center does not get any help in that way. The only items that are paid for by the City budget, in the Public Works Department, is the building itself, the snow plowing, and the daily maintainance of the enter is paid by the Community Center trustees. They have no director, they have a maintainance man who makes repairs and cleans up; that is paid by the Center, not by the City. Even if you want to paint a room in the Glenbrook Community Center, you have to get permission from the City in order to purchase the paint yourself and paint it yourself. The permission has to come from the City. All those expenses are assumed by the trustees whereas the land which has appreciated considerably is still held by the City.

YOUTH SERVICE BUREAU

MRS. HAWK: We're on page 106, Code 792, Youth Service Bureau. Fiscal recommends a cut in line 792.1110, Salaries, of \$1,200 which would bring that line to \$27,002 and brings the bottom line down to \$40,000. The reason we did this is because of the money that is reimbursed through a grant. The City gets \$20,000 back, if the City contributes \$40,000. Over and above that, we don't get anything back. That's why we brought it down to the \$40,000 mark.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I noticed on the Telephone Account which is 792.2740, there is a telephone bill of \$2,012. Could you give me some explanation for that please?

MRS. HAWK: I really do not know, Mrs. Maihock. Their back-up does not break it down and we didn't ask them that question when they were in.

The bottom line for Youth Service Bureau is \$40,000.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, Would it be appropriate while we are trying to get a section total to declare a five minute recess before we start the next item? SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion has been made and Seconded to have a five minute recess. All in favor, say Aye. Opposed? We will have a recess.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Meeting will come to order.

MR. DZIEZYC: Considering the lateness of the hour, I Move for Adjournment. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to the Motion to Adjourn? It's not debatable. There is a Motion on the Floor to Adjourn. Mr. Dziezyc, are you aware of the "Call" of the Meeting? And you're still Moving for Adjournment? There's has been a Motion to Adjourn and it has been Seconded. It's not debatable; it's on the Floor. You are aware that if we Adjourn, and if the vote passes, that the budget is not adopted by us

MR. DZIEZYC: O.K. reconsider...

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're with...

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move for a Recess, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's been a Move for a five-minute Recess. That's been Seconded. All in favor of a Recess say AYE. There's a Motion to Recess. All in favor say AYE. Opposed? We are going to put this to a vote.

MR. BLAIS: Madam President, the Second did not withdraw the Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Second did not withdraw the Motion to Adjourn and the Chair rules that there is a Motion before this body to Adjourn. I will proceed to a vote, if there is any problem, please state it now. I want you to understand the consequences of the action tonight. It's not debatable. We are going to use the machine.

MR. DUDLEY: Point of Information. Am I correct in assuming that if we Adjourn this budget as a total budget for the last three days, stands as it is?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No. Our action is null and void because it has not been adopted by the appropriation resolution. The budget that stands is the one that was passed down by the Board of Finance. It means that the work we have done for three nights is completely wiped out. I hope you all understand that we are going to put this Motion to a vote. We are voting on whether to Adjourn. The Motion to Adjourn is defeated, 30 no, and 8 yes. Let us get on with the business.

MRS. HAWE: The section total for the 700 group which is Community Services the total amount of cuts is \$225,066. The total amount approved is \$3,401,891. To date we have cut \$1,133,013. We have approved \$66,086,002.

MRS. McINERNEY: This afternoon I had the opportunity to consult with one of the assistant corporation counsels on the matter of the school budget and in his opinion, he felt that since I have pending litigation with the Board of Education that it would create a cloud of conflict over any action on this budget. I would therefore, disqualify myself from voting on the issue of the Board of Education budget this evening. I will have the Record show that I have left the Floor.

MRS. GUROLAN: Point of Order. What do we do with the Debt Service? Don't we add that on to the \$66,000,000?

MRS. HAWE: The Debt Service comes after the Board of Education budget in our book.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney and Mr. Donahue will be recorded as absent. They are leaving the floor.

BOARD OF EDUCATION

MRS. HAWE: We're on page 108, Code 810.7110, Board of Education. Fiscal recommends a cut from the Board of Education of \$1,600,000 which would bring that line to \$51,957,689.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Chair has been notified that there are two minority reports. I have discussed this with the people giving these reports this evening.

MR. FRANCHINA: This is a minority report from Betty Conti, and Joe Franchina. We cannot allow our Motions to override our responsibility to the already over-burdened taxpayers of this Community. We must base our decision on the Community's ability to pay. Let us not forget the more than 1,200 taxpayers who came to Cloonan School recently for the public hearing to express their views on the budget. Their message was loud and clear - cut the budget. Many spoke in opposition to the Board of Education budget. We must remember that the proposed fiscal 1982-1983 budget of over 56 million dollars which shows no mercy for the over-burdened taxpayer. It is 10 million dollars more than the budget for just four years ago. Yet, four years ago the student population was in excess of 16,500 students compared to today's declining enrollment of less than 14,000 students. However, the professional staff has contrived to escalate from 1,300 four years ago to over 1,400 at the present time; half of whom are not in the classrooms.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Franchina, we want your remarks but would you give your motion first. This is the precedent that we have been doing and then go back to speak to it.

MR. FRANCHINA: All right. I make a Motion to delete from the Board of Education's Account No. 810.7110, the total sum of three million dollars leaving a balance of \$50,557,600. SECONDED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several Seconds. Mr. Franchina, go back to speak to your Motion.

MR. FRANCHINA: Continuing. An example of how the taxpayer's money is being spent is illustrated by the fact that there are approximately five administrative positions below the level of superintendent who are presently earning more than the Mayor of this City of Stamford. Though we cannot dictate to the Board of Education where the cuts should be made, it is obvious that a reorganization of their administrative staff can be accomplished without affecting the quality of education. It must be realized that the financial burden for education in this City is being assumed by an ever-increasing number of taxpayers having no children in the school system. And a significant number of those taxpayers are in fact senior citizens living on a fixed income. We are in a recession. To help the taxpayer we must curb spending, and that's why I propose that cut.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Franchina. There is a Motion on the Floor to delete three million dollars from the Board of Education account. We will address that motion at this time. there were several seconds to that.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. It seems more than ever this year with regards to the Board of Education budget, that we're damned if we do and we're damned if we don't. Citizens from all walks of life

senior citizens, children of senior citizens, retirees, heads of households, and single taxpayers, have spoken out at two recent public hearings and have all sent the same message. Cut the education budget! Let me make my position perfectly clear. I support, wholeheartedly, the Motion to reduce the Board of Education budget by \$3,000,000. Madam President and members of this Board, to cut one dollar less would be a great disservice to the majority of taxpayers in the City of Stamford as well as providing a mandate to the Board of Education that they can run rampant with this City's money and continue to promulgate a luxurious educational system. Why luxurious? One example, the pupil/teacher ratio in the middle schools is 14, and in the high schools, 15. When I went to school, it was extremely rare to have less than 30 students in a class plus we had no teacher aides. I don't believe I came out of that system illiterate. And I'm not suggesting our students should be 30 to a class. But a number more realistic than 14 or 15 is an area the Board of Education can consider and at the same time restore some of its credibility in the eyes of the taxpayers of the City of Stamford. In conclusion, Madam President, I recently wrote a letter to the editor of this City's daily newspaper putting the education lobby in its place and assuring this City's taxpayers that I would sharpen my scissors and vote to cut the education budget. I wasn't kidding, and here are the scissors. You can believe they are extremely sharp, and I again urge the ladies and gentlemen of this Board, to be responsive to the desires of this City's taxpayers and vote yes to cut three million additional dollars from the budget of the Board of Education. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I would also have to agree with the \$3,000,000 cut. During the past few days many people have been harrassed by members of the terrific lobby of the Board of Education. A prime example is a letter that was sent out reading: "Dear Parents: We strongly urge you to telephone as many of the following representatives as possible today. Please ask that they support the Fiscal Committee's recommendation of 1.6 million dollars to be cut from the Board of Education budget. We cannot afford to sit back and allow the Board of Representatives to take a larger cut. The Board of Representatives will be voting on the Board of Education budget this evening. Please make your voices heard. Thank you. Ronnie Wiederlight, PTA Council." Shelisted names of the Board of Reps to be called to swing their vote towards a 1.6 million dollar cut or even less. Can the Board of Education stand a \$3,000,000 cut? I firmly believe they can. Young teachers have been intimidated saying that they will lose their jobs if additional cuts are made. The question is, why must the young teacher go. Do you realize that if you were to lay off eleven of the over-loaded staff down at Hillendale Avenue with an average salary of approximately \$45,000 apiece, we would be talking about roughly \$460,000 whereby you can save a teaching staff of approximately 36 people at an entry level of \$12,000. It seems that whenever we hear about cuts, it's always the little person that must go first, especially the way the Board of Education and the staff at Hillendale Avenue has been coming out in the paper saying that teachers will be let go, but you don't hear any mention of administrative,

principals, or assistant principals. Enrollment goes down, but yet teacher aides go up to the point where we got 249. Administrative staff is up to 89. Instead of coming down, it keeps going up. We can go on and on, why cuts can be made. We have heard that an additional \$3,000,000 cut will deteriorate our school system, people will no longer move in, people will be moving out. If this were to happen, I would say that the Board of Education and the staff is irresponsible if they cannot provide quality education with a \$50,000,000 budget. If we were not to cut an additional \$3,000,000 and our taxes went up, our senior citizens would be moving out. Our young people will be moving out. I have seen senior citizens move in with their children and vice-versa because they cannot stand last year's taxes. And I can just foresee what will happen if we do not do our job tonight, as mandated by the public hearings that we have just heard in the past. I can foresee Proposition 13 beginning if we do not do what we were mandated by the public. You may ask the question, why weren't the senior citizens out there lobbying? Unfortunately, these people are afraid to come out at night. They must stay in their homes, no means of transportation at times, but you can rest assured the Board of Education did their job by getting the students out here for the past 3 nights, chanting SOS, Save Our Schools. I'd like to say, SOSC, Save Our Senior Citizens. Let's make it bearable for them to stay here. A \$3,000,000 cut by this Board will not place any hardship on the Board of Education.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MISS DeGAETANI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to comment initially on the letter that Mr. DeLuca just read from Mrs. Weiderlight. My name appears at the top of the list of names. And I would like to say that I feel that this is harrassment to pester and bother people with an onslaught of phone calls starting as early as quarter of seven in the morning to a select group of this Board, including one whose wife is ill. I think it's an attempt at manipulation. Additionally, misinformation as to the powers of this Board to control the policies and decisions of the Board of Education were spoonfed to both parents and children. There was a deliberate attempt to mislead and misuse the volatile emotions of teenagers by making them feel that this Board was responsible for the cutting of programs and the possible closing of Rippowam High School, when in fact, those decisions can only be made by the Board of Ed. Further, never has this Board before felt the need for police protection but because of this unconscionable lobbying on the part of a few leaders, this protection became necessary and has become an added burden, a financial burden, on this City. The procedure has added no new information to assist us in making deliberations, and in fact may have moved some Board members to react in a less supportive manner. I would hope that in future years, cooler heads will prevail and no similar efforts to exert such forcible pressure will be made. That said, I would like to say that I too support the \$3,000,000 cut. I am in accord with what Mr. Stork said and with what Mr. DeLuca said. I think it's

time that we hold the line. I think the Board of Ed can sustain the cut. I think they've lost their credibility, and I think that with honest effort by the people on that Board, they can sustain the cut without damage to the children's education. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. DeGaetani.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Thank you, Madam President. The action that we take tonight on the Board of Education budget directly affects the lives and the futures of over 14,000 young people in this City of Stamford. How we vote tonight, however we vote tonight, we must be convinced in our heads, more importantly in our hearts, that the actions we take are sound and are based on firm fiscal footing. I am also well aware that every action we take tonight and in fact, every action we take in all this week will directly affect the lives of Stamford's taxpayers. But judging from the magnitude of the Board of Education budget cut proposed tonite, I think we are playing, absolutely playing with fire. I'd like to point out that the \$2,000,000 Board of Finance cut already taken from the Board of Education budget; just parenthetically, Mrs. DeGaetani was talking about us being blamed for the cuts made by the Board of Finance, that's understandable. Kids, lots of people who are in the City who are adults don't know the difference between the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives, and I don't blame them. I mean, that monolith up there that's called the City Government. It's understandable that they would think that we might have had something to do with it, too. But the fact is that the Board of Finance has already taken a \$2,000,000 cut. When you add that to the nearly \$4,000,000 contract settlement which was heartily approved by this Board last year, the current money remaining in the 1982-83 request is already three percent under the 1981-82 fiscal year appropriation. If we made no additional cuts tonight, we're already under by three percent the 1981-82 appropriation. Stated another way, if we made no further cuts, keeping in mind again the contract settlement of almost \$4,000,000 and the \$2,000,000 Board of Finance cut, the 1982-83 budget is already \$1,568,000 under the current fiscal year. With another \$1,600,000 cut as proposed by the Fiscal Committee, it will be six percent under the 1981-82 fiscal year. With the \$3,000,000 cut proposed a few minutes ago, it will be nine percent under the current fiscal year. The observation was made earlier by Mr. Esposito that those budgets over which the Board has no line-by-line control are fair game for arbitrary cuts. Arbitrary cuts, ruthless cuts, thoughtless cuts. To say that a huge cut of the magnitude proposed will not affect the quality of education is convenient wishful thinking. It is a convenient justification for an arbitrary, uninformed action that has no basis and fact. To say that the Board of Education is therefore irresponsible, if they can't do what they're doing today with \$4,500,000 less than they have this year, is an outrageous conclusion based on misinformation and ignorance. I heartily support and urge the members of this Board to just sit back for a minute and give this at least a second thought and please support the \$1,600,000 cut proposed by the Fiscal

Committee. That will make the Board of Education's budget six percent less than the budget that they have lived with this year. If indeed the Board of Education implements the school closing program, the elementary schools and the high school and phase the latter in, the implications of those cutbacks will be more important in the next fiscal year and subsequent fiscal years. This is a major, this would be a major change and a major giant step toward the kind of efficiency consolidation and tightening-up that this Board has been wanting. Again, all I can say is, \$1,600,000 is a lot and, in my personal opinion, too much; but at the very least, let's support that, not \$3,000,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Flounders.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Tonight we find ourselves in a no-win position. No matter what we do, that is to make the cuts or not to make them, we have been made the scapegoats, that is, the bad guys and the bad girls. I attended the joint meeting at Cloonan School and heard the voices, the cries, and yes, the shouts of taxpayers of Stamford; and I attended the public hearing on the phase-in, as a lot of us did. All I heard that evening was again "make cuts, make cuts." The citizens want us to make cuts, so they can continue to live here; the senior citizens to fill out their golden years and not have to worry about what the future will bring. I did take the time last Thursday for approximately four hours to tour four schools: Stamford High, Springdale, Dolan, and Toquam; with, and at the request of Beatrice Forman, a conscientious and hard-working member of the Board of Education to see first-hand the conditions in our schools. However, I believe the reason we are in this situation tonight and the parents and students are faced with the education crisis, is the short-sightedness of some members of the present Board of Education and past members of the Board of Education. These are difficult times, indeed hard times. I have received telephone calls and spoken personally with approximately 80 constituents in my district. The consensus was: 10 not to make cuts, and about 70 to make cuts. I have also received as late as today in my mail pertaining to the Board of Education's budget. One letter briefly stated: "As an informed interested resident and voter in Stamford since 1965, I am writing to express my thoughts on the recent budget and tax increases. I have difficulty in understanding the very large proposed budget. I find the large increase in the Board of Education budget indefensible in view of the significant decline in enrollment in the past few years. I realize you cannot cut line items here. While there has been a decrease in the number of teachers, there has been no decreases in administrators, staff development, and similar over-filled positions. I would strongly urge you to reduce the education budget and direct the Board to redesign their operation to reflect the reality of their situation."

Another letter regarding the Board of Education: "This Board has expanded faster than the Social Security Administration by trying to be all things to all people. College level courses are given

in the high schools causing the taxpayers to help pay for college education of selected students. Examples are advanced credit, math, physics, chemistry, and biology, that I am aware of. I am quoting, "Other high school courses cover such subjects as How to Watch TV, How to Read Comic Strips, Science Fiction Literature, etc." They have no educational value; they are just used to keep students occupied, surely a waste of time and taxpayers' money. Many courses overlap or are almost duplications under different titles. For instance, there are half a dozen different vocational typing courses which I'm sure if they would be consolidated, would require fewer teachers. In light of the poor spelling, reading, and math skills of the high school graduates, the school should get back to basics and to do away with the excess specialization. (Again, I am still quoting from the letter). The Board of Ed has been conducting a scare campaign ever since their budget was cut \$2,000,000. They would save that amount by closing one high school or two elementary schools. However, their big problem is the overburden and overload who occupy Martha Hoyt's school and part of Belltown. A big clerical staff and assistants likewise keep costs high. The school system comprises 15 elementary, 3 middle, and 3 high schools. The proposed threat to close one high school and three elementary schools would constitute a minimum of 15% of the school system (and this is very interesting in his letter). If 15% would save \$2,000,000 which is equivalent to an operating cost of \$3,000,000, then the whole list of schools would be run for \$20,000,000. This contrasts with a budget of \$56,000,000. Obviously, the Board has exaggerated that many schools would be closed to save \$2,000,000. The school budget must be cut deeply to force a less-frills type of school system. Please do not be influenced by Saturday's demonstration of Rippowam students; they were just tools to the vested interest groups who like to soak the rich and the middle as well. I know my school system by experience. Five children went through it. We need a new Board of Education.

I hope we can come to some type of a compromise this evening. I do caution and warn the Board of Education to hear the message loud and clear this evening. Plan and plan well for the future so we will not have to be put in this precarious position next year or the years to come. Plans must be made ahead with the school population declining and to have a gradual phase-out rather than the disruption of students.

PRESIDENT SANTY:

MR. BLAIS: I, personally, view a \$3 million additional cut to the Board of Education budget as irresponsible. However, I would like to address this Assembly the real problem with the Education budget. Tonight we sit here and quibble about the amount of money to be allocated to the Education department when the real problem with the budget is that the City does not have a sufficient tax base to properly support the required mandate for services of our school system that are mandated by the State.

From what I understand, a majority of the dollars spent by our Board of Education are spent on State mandated programs. In other words, if we cut the budget, we still have to provide those services. The other side of the coin is the State also severely restricts the City's ability to have a sufficient revenue base to support these programs. It's inconceivable in United States for a city of a 100,000 people to rely solely on property taxes.

MR. BOCCUZZI: First of all, I've been on this Board many years and for many years I have fought to keep the education budget at a position or a point where they indeed could handle and could provide the famous word "quality education." But this year I had to stand back and take a hard look at this whole budget. And by the whole budget, I mean the whole book, not just the Board of Education's budget. When I come to a budget meeting, I look to see how many dollars we can afford and try to put those dollars in the places where they'll do the most good. This time when I looked over the budget and I noticed some departments actually came in lower, some departments - the heart was cut out of the police department by the Board of Finance - are coming up short in salary accounts, equipment, and they're going to have to live with it, just like I have to live with the taxes. I come to the Board of Education's budget, and I see the amount of money that passed over last year. Yes, Mr. Flounders, I admit we approved the contracts under pressure; and again that pressure is being put on us not to take a big cut which I don't consider is a big cut by a select organized group on the outside.

Over the past few weeks I have received, and I got to admit I called them "robot" telephone calls. It seemed like these people were programmed to say certain things. How could 30 or 40 people think actually the same things, same numbers, same reasons? Somebody organized. I received one night, when I came to this Board for a meeting, an envelope with approximately 200 letters in it that were all typed out, my name was put on the top of them, and I had a few that were in there by mistake. Who allowed this pressure group to use all this school stationery? Who allowed this pressure group to have 5,000 or 10,000 little messengers from home, to come home with these letters? Who allowed this? Who put this Board under that strain? This is what I'm objecting to. You who are organized, and use the facilities of the Board of Education's school system, who sent your message home, had a big advantage. A big advantage over the little old lady who lives across the street who's a widow and has nothing to protest with, except maybe a telephone call and she can't even finish the call because she breaks down and cries. Do you think it's fair to be organized with your great power to come to this Board and harass this Board in that manner? Do you think it's fair to the small taxpayers, small homeowners? I don't. I think you worked at a great advantage. With a 2-year \$2,000,000 cut, close 4 or 5 schools. If this is the case, we should have had schools close last year. You should have been planning ahead, you shouldn't be put in this fix today that you're in. It should've been started a couple of years ago. You knew the enrollment was going down. God knows you have people running around making figures. You knew that the population wasn't growing, it was coming down. But yet, you did nothing about it. And now the ax is going to fall. I don't know if it's going to come for \$3,000,000 or not. I hope it does.

We all can play the numbers game. Department heads, not only here but at the Board of Ed, all department heads, they can bury you with numbers 'cause they got them and you're sitting here listening to them. I look at this budget only one way. I got so many bucks to hand out and I'm trying to do my best. I don't think I'm going to hurt the school system. I don't think I'm going to hurt those kids who have been chanting for 3 nights. I don't think I'm going to hurt anyone. What is going to come from this is I think the

Board of Ed should go to the teachers and ask them what programs are good for the kids. I think the Board of Ed has got to start listening to the people who are right close to the kids. Don't listen to the people who are not educating your children. Don't listen to the pressure group outside who's only thinking of their own child. Listen to the group who is working with your children. They know what the child needs. Sure, everybody wants a Cadillac education. I do, too. But Board members, the taxpayers of this town can no longer afford a Cadillac. You're going to have to do it with a Ford. And I can't afford a Ford. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I've listened to some of these people and I wonder if this is the way you're supposed to talk about the most important products in the city. But anyway, Mr. DeLuca asked a question that I am really concerned with when he asked why the senior citizen was not here. I want to answer that by saying that they don't have to be out here; they have prepared a City and they have grandchildren come out here and represent them and I think they're doing a good job. I am always upset when I talk about children because as a child I know what happened to me. I didn't get the kind of education that I should have, and I'm not all the man that I could be should I have been given the same thing we are talking about, depriving kids of rights today. I needed it, and I didn't get it.

So I become real upset when we talk about cutting our children education. When they talk about cutting administrators, if there's room for cutting administrators, I think we ought to address that before we cut the budget, and not wait till we cut the budget and then cut administrators. Let's cut the administrators out while the school is going and the money is being paid out to them, and then we can save money there. But to cut anything over \$1.6 million to the Board of Education would be a travesty to the City of Stamford. We are insulting the corporations that we have invited to come here; for those who have children. Our school system will begin to fall little by little. After awhile, our property value will begin to deteriorate equally. And I ask this Board to think twice before you cut \$3,000,000 from the Board of Education because you're not cutting someone else's throat, maybe you're cutting your own. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. As Mr. Wider and Mr. Flounders have so eloquently put it, a \$3,000,000 cut ...

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Board members to please give Mr. Wiederlight your attention.

MR. WEIDERLIGHT: The \$3,000,000 is unconscionable. It is a Motion that is not well thought out. No facts were really presented to substantiate \$3,000,000. It is almost as if a number was taken out of the air and say let's start with that and hope for the best.

When I walked in here for the last two nights, I noticed many people demonstrating outside. I noticed people from the public works, I notice some firemen outside, and I noticed some students. And they should all be proud of themselves. Especially our students, because they have got the ultimate lesson in civics these last three nights. I am also proud of my wife who is the president of the Turn of River Middle School Parent-Teacher Organization and whose job it was to alert the citizens, the taxpayers, of her school, whose children go to that school, what the dire consequences might be if we cut \$3,000,000. And to those of you that objected, I will quote you what a great president of the United States once said by the name of Harry Truman: "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen."

Moving from that point, let's talk about some statistics. The real statistics. I've heard some numbers banted around about what it costs to educate our students, and I guess a round number is about \$4,000, 4,100, 4,500. But is that the real cost? Let's analyze the \$4,000 cost a second. The cost for general learning students in this community is \$1,851, not \$4,000. The cost for educating our special education students is \$5,829. The cost for educating our special education students out of the system is \$16,400. And the cost for the support programs is \$1,602. Which all averages out to \$4,096. That is the derivation of \$4,096.

What will be the consequences of this unconscionable cut on our school system and on our city? Let's look at a few of the things that might happen. Number one, we will lose our newest teachers who have learned the newest teaching concept. Number two, we will not be able to hire teachers in the future if and when our population grows and we need them. Who would want to work in Stamford, the system where the school system that doesn't know what they're going to do from year to year. Stamford will not be able to hire good teachers either. And last, certainly not least, our land values will deteriorate markedly. And nobody wants that to happen, do they?

In conclusion, let me quote you from the summation of a letter written by a young lady by the name of Mindy Feller, who is the President of the Junior Class of Rippowam High School. And I'll just read you the last paragraph. "Our concerns are issues that are not being addressed. To assume that you can foresee all the complicating issues facing us in September is absurd. To assume that you will have the answers to our problems in 3 short months is a case of wishful thinking. At any rate, you are playing with our lives. Our worries must be raised now before you make hasty decisions and then regret your actions later. The City's future is at stake." Thank you, Madam President.