

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1983

17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, APRIL 4, 1983, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:32 p.m. by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are very honored this evening to have the Right Reverend Monsignor Alphonse Fiedorczyk of the Holy Name of Jesus Roman Catholic Church open our meeting with a prayer.

INVOCATION: Monsignor Alphonse J. A. Fiedorczyk, The Holy Name of Jesus Roman Catholic Church, 4 Pulaski Street.

"Our Nation was born with a prayer 'In God We Trust.' Let me now say a prayer in the name of all of us here; all of you here present, Members of the Board of Representatives.

"Our heavenly Father, today as we exercise the acts of government, we again, turn to Thee and repeat, 'In God We Trust.' Enlighten our minds so that we may have a clear understanding of the principles of democracy and a full knowledge of the laws of our City. Strengthen our wills so that they will not be prompted and motivated by pride and selfishness. These citizens of our fair City call us the 'City Fathers' because by their own free choice, they have put their faith and welfare into our hands. By their vote, they have said that they trust us. They have said that we are the representatives of the Community and the interest and good of our Community will be our primary concern as long as we carry the honorable title, 'a Member of the Board of Representatives.'"

"Our heavenly Father, help us to be guided in all of our deliberations by your Supreme Law which is above all human law for it is the source of justice, and freedom and human rights and charity, and is the basis of all valid human laws. God Bless you. Amen."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Monsignor Fiedorczyk.

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

ROLL CALL: Clerk ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 37 members present and 3 absent; Grace Guroian, Burtis Flounders, and Philip Stork.

PRESIDENT SANTY declared a Quorum.

TEST VOTE ON MACHINE: President Santy conducted a test vote on the machine, in turn voting yes, no, and abstain, in order to check the operation of the machine. The machine was in good working order.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late ELWAY BELL - by Rep. James Dudley.

For the late PAUL MITCHELL - by Rep. Annie M. Summerville.

For the late AUDREY BECK - by Rep. Annie M. Summerville.

For the late GIBBS LYONS - by Rep. Barbara DeGaetani.

For the late VIRGINIA T. DAVIS - by Reps. Robert DeLuca, Marie Hawe, and John Roos.

For the late ROBERT F. PHILIPP - by Rep. Audrey Maihock.

For the late JOSEPHINE IPPOLITO - by Rep. Mary Jane Signore.

For the late GERTRUDE HATTERMAN - by Rep. David Blum.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have one birthday among our members in April: Barbara DeGaetani's birthday we will be celebrating this evening. Happy Birthday, Barbara. Later on we will have cake.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

PRESIDENT SANTY: Committee report, Mrs. McInerney.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, I make a Motion to waive the reading of the Steering Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to waive the reading of the Steering Committee report. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? The Steering Committee minutes have been waived.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I would like to ask for a 15-minute recess, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made for a 15-minute recess and Seconded. All in favor of a 15-minute recess, please say aye. Opposed? We'll recess until ten after nine.

AK

RECESS: 8:50 - 9:20 P.M.

HM

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met on MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1983, in the Democratic Caucus Room, and the meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M., in response to a CALL issued for 7:30 P.M. A Quorum was declared. Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy was out-of-the-State and Republican Leader BARBARA MCINERNEY chaired the meeting.



STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Barbara McInerney, Acting Chairwoman	Lathon Wider, Sr.
John J. Boccuzzi	Elizabeth Gershman
Annie M. Summerville	John J. Hogan, Jr.
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca	James Dudley
Mary Jane Signore	Mary Lou Rinaldi
Marie Hawe	Jeremiah Livingston
Burtis Flounders	John Zelinski
Audrey Maihock	Michael Widerlight
Sandra Goldstein	Peter Blais
Gerald Rybnick	Cadie Vos, Mayor's Exec. Aide

(1) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the eight items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. The rules were suspended to add a ninth item relating to funding for the Stamford Coliseum. Rep. Summerville noted for the record as voting No on both the Suspension of Rules and on putting the item on the agenda.

(2) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered held for next month was the final adoption of Rep. DeLuca's ordinance on replacing Ord. 319 with a new one. Ordered held until the Board of Finance acted on the sale of City-owned property on Cold Spring Road to Mr. Frank Pelli. Ordered held for April Steering for May meeting and transferred to Public Works Committee was the matter concerning the death of a laborer at the Incinerator.

(3) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of availability of telephones in the Downtown Area; also a Committee report to be made.

(4) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item, being Rep. McInerney's concerning inequities within the Commission on Aging policies to provide equal treatment/services to all of Stamford's citizens over age 62. Ordered held in committee was the matter concerning the Fair Rent Commission, its staff, and their policies and procedures.

(5) APPOINTMENTS

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

(6) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered removed from the agenda was the matter of the Streetscape Program on Atlantic Street. A Motion to suspend the rules by Rep. Flounders and put on the agenda was a matter concerning a new safety and training officer was defeated. It had been presented by DPW Comm. Spaulding at the Republican pre-steering meeting in the Mayor's Office shortly before the Steering Committee meeting was scheduled, and no copies were available for the Steering Committee members.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(7) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; also an additional item from the American Red Cross. Ordered removed from the agenda was the matter of Safe Rides of Stamford for sober teenagers as well as for intoxicated teenagers, withdrawn by Adam J. McManus.

(8) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the ordinance concerning satellite transmission facilities. Ordered removed from the agenda was Rep. Gershman's request concerning management/tenant dispute at Coleman Towers. Both items were on Tentative Steering Agenda.

(9) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered held were the proposed ordinances concerning pornographic material not to be available to minors and others; also amending Chapter 10, Section 10 and Ord. 246 for a proposal to fine those who violate provisions of Chapter 10.

(10) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being the sale of City-owned property.

(11) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of unlimited Sick Leave for certain City employees, also liberal Vacation Leave. Ordered removed from the agenda was Rep. DeLuca's request for personnel data to be studied by this Committee.

(12) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one resolution honoring Mr. Milton Schiebel which appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

(13) NEW BUSINESS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the investigation of the Public Works Department under Section 204.2 (two resolutions); the record to indicate 11 voted Yes and One voted No (Maihock), and two Abstentions (Signore and McInerney).

(14) ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, on MOTION duly made, Seconded, and Carried, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

BMCI:HMM

BARBARA MCINERNEY, Acting Chairwoman  
Steering Committee  
17th Board of Representatives



AK

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John J. Hogan, Jr. and Marie Hawe

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, March 30th. Present were Committee members Co-Chairperson John Hogan, Betty Conti, Joe Franchina, Burt Flounders, Jerry Livingston, John Roos, Gerry Rybnick and myself. Other Representatives present at various times throughout the evening were Betty Gershman, John Boccuzzi, John Zelinski, and Ann Summerville.

I would like to Move the following items on the Consent Agenda. Item #2.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #2 on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #3.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #3 on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: And item #8.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #8 on Consent.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Excuse me, Madam President. I would like #8 off Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #8 is off Consent.

- (1) \$ 1,000.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - CODE 230.2940 CONFERENCES AND TRAINING -  
Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes and  
Corporation Counsel Fraser 2/18/83. Board of Finance approved  
March 3, 1983.

MRS. HAWE: \$500.00 of this amount is to partially defray the costs of Assistant Corporation Counsel Alice Perry's attendance at property assessment and taxation seminar. The other \$500.00 is to cover additional seminars and training conferences for other staff members from now through June.

There are many areas that have recently gained prominence in municipal law, and it is advantageous for the City's attorneys to be well-versed in these as well as to be able to attend seminars held in more traditional areas where continued updating is important for the City's lawyers. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and 1 opposed and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion. Several Seconds. Any discussion? No discussion.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I'd just like to remind the members of the Board that conferences and training were one of the things that we deleted from the present operating budget at last year's meetings, and I think that now, here we go putting something back in that we had taken out. The amount is small; it's true, but by the same token, we took it out of all the departments, and I think we have left it out of all the departments and we should probably leave it out here, too.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. FRANCHINA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We'll Move the question.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Please use your machine. We are voting on #1 under Fiscal; \$1,000.00 Law Department, conferences and training. We are voting on #1 under Fiscal. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? Two-thirds is required. There are 37 members present. We need 25 affirmative votes. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED 25 affirmative, 9 no, 1 abstention, and 2 not-voting.

- (2) \$ 13,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - CODE 450.3443 HYDRANT MAINTENANCE - Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 2/28 and Fire Chief Vitti 2/9/83. State D.O.T. shall reimburse City for \$14,403 for their projects using water. Board of Finance approved March 3, 1983.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (3) \$ 13,294.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Additional appropriation to reimburse four 655 Codes, the sums below having been received by the City of Stamford in the form of fees, per Mayor Clapes' request of 2/28/83 and Recreation Supt. Giordano's request 1/2/83. Board of Finance approved March 3, 1983.
- |                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| \$10,081.        | Code 655.4130 Men's Industrial Basketball. |
| 931.             | Code 655.4184 Men's Open Volleyball.       |
| 1,620.           | Code 655.4185 Winter Soccer.               |
| 662.             | Code 655.4189 Men's Street Hockey.         |
| <u>\$13,294.</u> |  |

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (4) \$ 14,800.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - CODE 610.2310 FACILITY MAINTENANCE - SCALZI PARK BASKETBALL COURT LIGHTS - Additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 2/28/83 and Parks Supt. Cook 2/7/83, for lighted court used every night. Board of Finance approved March 3, 1983.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: This money is to complete the upgrading of the Scalzi basketball court by relamping the lights at the court. The existing incandescent lights are 20 years old and do not provide sufficient light for the night league which plays at this court. They will be replaced with metal halide lamps. These funds would pay for the design of the system for 12 new fixtures and for the installation. This is the only lighted basketball court in the City. The lights should be in by mid-June. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 2 opposed and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? Seconded. Secondary Committee, Parks and Rec, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: We concur.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion? No discussion. We will move right to a machine vote on approval of \$14,800 Parks Department, facility maintenance, Scalzi Park basketball court lights. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? We are voting on #4 under Fiscal. The Motion has PASSED 26 affirmative, 5 negative, 1 abstaining and 5 not-voting.

- (5) \$850,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - CULTURAL CENTER -  
Amend the Capital Budget by adding to the project known as #735.0701 Cultural Center, the sum of \$850,000; and appropriating for said project the sum of \$850,000 to be received from the State of Connecticut (this is in addition to the \$500,000 already appropriated to this project by the City.) Board of Finance approved March 3, 1983.

Above also referred to COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. HAWES: Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 2 opposed to hold this.

MRS. HAWES: Item #6 and #7 are related; could I speak about both and make separate Motions? I think you would have to understand the whole picture.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Certainly, fine.

- (6) \$275,249.44 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGETS (F/YRS. 1973-81)  
(transfer) Closing out and transferring certain capital projects - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, and TRANSFERRING the Close-Outs to Acct. #330-167 "Drainage South of the Parkway", per Mayor's letters 12/3/82 and 11/12/82; (which consists of 52 capital projects, including \$170,000 from #310.305 GLEN, RUTZ, DERWIN, DeLEO DRIVE IMPROVEMENTS) - see data attached to Mayor's letters. Board of Finance approved 12/20/82. Held in Committee 1/10/83 through 2/22/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

- (7) \$409,750.56 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGETS (Fiscal Years: )  
Adding to Project #330.167 DRAINAGE SYSTEM SOUTH OF THE PARKWAY - for the purpose of implementing storm drain projects of Intervale Road/Newfield Drive, and at Glen Avenue/Rutz Street/Derwin Street, per Mayor's letters 12/3/82 and 11/12/82. Board of Finance approved 12/20/82. Held in Committee 1/10/83 through 2/22/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: Item #6 and item #7 are funds to complete two drainage projects. One, the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvements and the other one is the Intervale Road/Newfield Drive.

Item #6 transfers \$275,249.44 into an account called, "Drainage South of the Parkway" and item #7 adds an additional \$409,750.56 to the same project. The Fiscal Committee unanimously feels that the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive project should be undertaken as soon as possible. That project is going to cost \$400,000.00.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) What we voted on a vote 7 to 0 was to give the Public Works Department \$425,000.00 to go ahead with the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvements, and to hold in Committee part of item #7, which would be \$260,000.00. We also voted unanimously that we want to hold this amount in Committee until such time as a plan is come-up with to improve the Intervale Road/Newfield Drive situation that will meet with the area residents' satisfaction. So, therefore, in order to come-up with the \$425,000.00 for the Glen, Rutz project, we recommend approving the transfer of #6, and \$149,000.00 of the additional appropriation on #7.

I'll make a Motion for #6. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed to approve the \$275,249.44 amendment to the Capital Projects budget which involves transferring to account #330-167 "Drainage South of the Parkway" from various other accounts and I Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that? Seconded. Public Works Committee, Mr. Perillo.

MR. PERILLO: Public Works concurs.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Perillo. Any discussion?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you. Can somebody tell me how they are going to hold the secondary money?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're not discussing that item now, Mrs. Saxe. We are approving the total amount in #6. Any other discussion? We are now going to use the machine for \$275,249.44 amendment to the Capital Projects' project specifically for the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvement. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED 35 affirmative, no negatives, 1 abstaining and 1 not-voting.

MRS. HAWE: On item #7, Fiscal Committee voted 7 in favor and none opposed to approve the amendment to the Capital Projects budget by adding \$149,750.56 into the project known as #330.167 Drainage System South of the Parkway.

When we approve this amount, we will also hold \$260,000.00 in Committee until such time, as I said before, as the plan for the correction of the Intervale/Newfield Drive problem is come-up with that satisfies the neighbors in the area. I also want to stress and I want this to be included in the Minutes, that it is the intention of the Committee and of this Board that this money be used for the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvements, and I make a Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several Seconds. Mrs. Hawe, would you give me that total again of the money that we are approving under #7?

MRS. HAWE: We are approving \$149,750.56. The rest will be held in Committee which is \$260,000.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. Any discussion?

MR. DONAHUE: Just a question. Could a statement to that effect of what we intend this money to be used for be added to the Action Report which will be in the hands of department heads early next week, rather than waiting for the Board's Minutes?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Donahue, that's an excellent idea. If this passes, I will direct such a letter.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI: At the Public Works Committee meeting when we discussed these items, 6 & 7, we told Commissioner Spaulding what we intended to do. He didn't like it but he said if that was the wish of the Board, that is what he would have to do. He readily understands from our Meeting where we want that money to go, and what project it is to be used for. There is no doubt in his mind as far as the Public Works Committee is concerned as to what that money is for. We could also do it with a little note on our report to him from the Board. I can assure you that he knows right now what that money is for.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi. That account number, Mrs. Hawe, for the Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvements, is that #310,305? Is that the one we are transferring into?

MRS. HAWE: No, the money from both 6 and 7 is going into #330,167 Drainage South of the Parkway.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Any other discussion? We'll proceed right to a vote. We are now voting \$149,750.56 transfer amendment to Capital Projects South of the Parkway specifically for Glen, Rutz, Derwin, DeLeo Drive improvements and a letter to that effect will go on the Action Report. Please use your machine. We are approving now \$149,750.56 from the \$409,750.56. We're holding \$260,000 in that account. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED 36 affirmative, 0 negative, 1 abstaining and 1 not-voting.

What we did was hold \$260,000.00 in Committee.

- (8) \$ 17,000.00 - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS Codes 114, 280, 610, 650 - VEHICLE MAINTENANCE ACCOUNTS - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes 1/4/83 as FLEET MANAGEMENT not ready. Board of Finance approved 1/13/83:

Aging Commission	#114-2510	\$ 1,000.00
Traffic Department	#280-2510	1,000.00
Parks Dept.	#610-2510	12,000.00
Recreation Dept.	#650-2510	3,000.00
		<u>\$17,000.00</u>

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: If you recall at budget time last year, the Board of Finance took all the money out of the vehicle maintenance accounts in order to precipitate the start of a Fleet Management study from which, hopefully, suggestions would come that savings could be made in the management of our rolling stock. The initial report on the Fleet Management study is expected on the 26th of April. The smaller accounts have run out of money. We asked and we were told that this would be the last appropriation into the Vehicle Maintenance Accounts between now and the end of the year. As I said, the Fleet Management study is due out on the 26th of April. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds. Education, Welfare and Government, Barbara DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: We concur.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani. Any discussion?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. The Co-Chairperson of Fiscal answered my question. My question was going to be when we would see the Fleet Management report since I believe, it is close to a year already that it has been forthcoming, and we have been appropriating from time to time various additional appropriations for the maintenance of these vehicles. Is that a definite date, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: That's what we were told by the Budget Director. The firm that is doing the study, the date that they are going to give their initial report is the 26th of April.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: What does initial report mean? The report?

MRS. HAWE: I think it means the preliminary; it's not the finalized report, but we'll get an idea of what their recommendations are going to be.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Will this report be made to the Board of Representatives?

MRS. HAWE: We can certainly ask for it. If you would like, I'll request that all Board members receive a copy. We might have gotten anyway; I don't know, but if you would like, I'll request that we all get a copy just to make sure.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I certainly would like a copy. I was one that questioned the Fleet Management report in the first place as oppose to the way that we were doing things, and it's just about a year since we've appropriated the money for this, and I certainly think it is forthcoming at this time.

MRS. HAWE: O.K., I'll request that we all get a copy, Mr. Wiederlight.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Mr. Wiederlight was on the same wave-length that I was on. It seems to me that we are waiting awfully long for this report. I think we started out with 3 months, 6 months, now we are in April; it's going to be in April. I'm glad to hear that for the next two months we are not going to need any more money for vehicle maintenance. I hope by the time budget time comes, we have some idea where we are going with this particular line instead of coming back every month or every couple of months, the different departments appropriating money.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Through you, Madam Chairman, to Mrs. Hawe, the original concept was that the City's fleet would be maintained by Public Works and then the study idea came about for fleet management. To your knowledge has the Public Works Department undertaken any other department's vehicle maintenance in the interim?

MRS. HAWE: No, I don't believe so. I think what happened was the Board of Finance felt that perhaps the Public Works Department should take on the vehicle maintenance, but commissioned a study so that a firm who is conversant with this kind of thing, could give their opinion as to what should be done to the best advantage of the City, and everyone is just waiting for the study; but to my understanding, I do not believe the Public Works Department has taken on any of the other departments' maintenance as far as I know.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. BLAIS: So they made no endeavor to use the facilities as existing in the City to do some of this maintenance, to your knowledge?

MRS. HAWE: To my knowledge, I believe everyone is waiting for this report, but that's just to my knowledge. I really don't speak with a 100% authority on that.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Through you, Madam President to Mrs. Hawe, is there any money left in any of these accounts now?

MRS. HAWE: No, in fact, some of them have gone into deficit.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I'd like to Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question which is \$17,000 for the Vehicle Maintenance accounts #8 under Fiscal, please say aye. Opposed? We'll move the question. Please use your machine. We are voting on the approval of \$17,000 various accounts, Vehicle Maintenance. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED 34 affirmative, 1 negative, 0 abstaining and 2 not-voting.

- (9) REQUEST FROM MAYOR LOUIS A. CLAPES dated 3/15/83; FROM PATRICK G. MARRA, DIRECTOR, COLISEUM AUTHORITY (FINANCE COMMISSIONER) letter dated 3/15/83; AND FROM RANDALL BRION, DEV. DIR. OF STAMFORD CENTER FOR THE ARTS 2/25/83 that the Board of Representatives approve the commital of 90% of funds received from the State through 9/30/83 to fund their operating budget and working capital loan; and Mr. Brion's further request "to regularize a monthly (or quarterly) funding of their (SCA) budget without further action by the Board of Representatives except for a fiscal year-end report."

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee has recommended on a vote 3 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions that we fund 75% of the money to be received from the State; 75% to go for the Stamford Center for the Arts, 15% to be kept for the Coliseum Authority to make recommendations as to what other cultural organizations in the City that could be dispersed too, and 10% to be kept for the administrative costs of the Coliseum Authority. So, the vote of Fiscal was 75% for the Stamford Center for the Arts, 15% for other organizations, and 10% for administrative costs. Fiscal voted 3 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions to that and I so Move.

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

MR. DeLUCA: At this time, I would like to make a Motion to amend item #9 to read, "Whereby we would vote for 90% for the Center for the Arts and 10% for administration costs."

FISCAL COMMITTEE; (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment. Mr. DeLuca, you are making an amendment?

MR. DeLUCA: To increase this to 90% for the Stamford Center for the Arts.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 90% for the Stamford Center for the Arts.

MR. DeLUCA: And 10% for administration costs.

PRESIDENT SANTY: And 10% for administrative costs. Is there a Second to that Motion? Seconded. We are now speaking to Mr. DeLuca's amendment which is to increase the percentage, 90% Stamford Center for the Arts, and 10% administrative costs.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, is there a ruling or a letter from Corporation Counsel Ben Fraser in reference to the amount that we should be voting on as far as the percentage?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, there is a letter that came to our desks this evening which Mr. Hogan has in his hand right now.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is there some way of getting that on the Floor to realize what Corporation Counsel said?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Hogan, as our Parliamentarian, it's a long letter. Would you like to read maybe the last paragraph?

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. This is a letter which evidently Mrs. Hawe, Co-Chairperson of Fiscal, asked for a ruling from Mr. Fraser as to the expenditure of the Coliseum Authority funding, and after he goes into great detail and cites a number of statutes and rulings; in other words, "The Fiscal Committee is not empowered to present to the full Board a different allocation proposal than that originally received from the Director and Advisory Panel though the Committee indeed has every right in power to recommend," and he underlines "recommend." "The Committee indeed has every right and power to recommend to the full Board what its final action should be in their opinion; nor, is the full Board in anyway limited to simply accept or reject the original proposal, but as with any other appropriation resolution, may vote to approve at any allocation percentage equal to or less than that originally proposed."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question, Mr. Boccuzzi? We have many speakers. We are now speaking to Mr. DeLuca's amendment. We all know his amendment. The Fiscal Committee report came out with 75% for the Stamford Center for the Arts, 15% for the Coliseum Authority and 10% for administrative costs. Mr. DeLuca made an amendment 90% for the Stamford Center for the Arts and 10% for administrative costs. I am asking our Administrative Assistant to pass-out some of this ruling, but obviously what Mr. Hogan read, we are in the proper vein right now. We're doing the right thing.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you very much. I must speak against Mr. DeLuca's amendment and uphold the Fiscal Committee's 75%. This is a rather complicated matter, and I want to be very sure that the Board does differentiate between the State money and the Coliseum Authority money. The Coliseum Authority money, let me remind you, is the money that is coming from the hotel taxes rebated to the City. There is no set amount for one thing. The more people that stay in the hotels, the more hotel rooms we have, the more money over the years we will have to disperse. Therefore, I feel that 90% is a very high amount to tie ourselves into. But more than that, the Coliseum Authority was created to fund other organizations in town. I have heard things said in caucus; people have said in caucus, it was created primarily for the Stamford Center for the Arts.

May I have the attention of the Board?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Gershman, it is very difficult. There is a lot of undertone here. Please give Mrs. Gershman your attention. There are many, many speakers. Then we are going right back to Mr. DeLuca. Mr. DeLuca, I don't think you finished speaking to your amendment. Mrs. Gershman, continue.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. The resolution as we passed it on the Board did not tie all of the funds to go to the Stamford Center for the Arts. We did say that we would like to give it a start to get it started, and that was the intent. However, I question the amount of money that is needed to get it started. The intent of the Coliseum Authority is to promote tourism. There are other organizations in town which do and will promote tourism. What comes to mind, of course, is the old Pink Tent, the new Stamford Festival for the Arts, but there are other things too, such as Museum Day at the Stamford Museum.

My friends, we fund these other organizations through tax dollars.

Next May, in a little bit more than a month, we are going to have before us a budget which will have line items for many of these organizations. I do not think that it is fair to take tax dollars from our constituents to pay for these things when we have more or less free money from the Coliseum Authority to help fund them. If you have read your budgets, you will see that many of these organizations have been cut in their funding from their requests for this year, and cut from what they were given last year. Where are they going to make-up this money? Is it fair that we give all of the Coliseum Authority to one entity and say to the rest of the organizations, "Well, sorry, you're going to have to scrounge for yourselves and go find money someplace else."

We have a commitment to the quality of life in Stamford and that does not mean only one entity; it means many, and I feel that we must try to fund these. When the money is there from someplace other than taxes, for God's sakes let's use it.

The contract which you have not seen because it is still in negotiations; the contract with the Stamford Center for the Arts, between Stamford Center for the Arts and the City, does not require returning any money given to it by the City in case it does not come to fruition. In case it does not happen, they do not have to return any money to the City. We're making a commitment through that contract which is still in negotiation for 15 to 20 years, and your vote, the next vote you take on this 90% or 75% is going to set a precedent for 15 to 20 years. I do want you to think very carefully about that.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MRS. GERSHMAN: (continuing) Stamford is going to grow. There's going to be many more hotel here; they have already been planned. There is going to be a lot more money involved than we are talking about tonight, and I think it should be spread around.

One of the things that has been asked is, "How is this money going to be used?" Primarily, it is going to be used to pay-off a loan at the State National Bank that the Stamford Center for the Arts has taken out to help it go so that they can borrow more money. This disturbs me. I think it should be used in a more direct fashion for the Arts.

Mr. Marra said that the Coliseum Authority has not had the time to digest all of the requests put before it. They have not had time to understand all of the nuances of the Coliseum Authority and the capital funds from the State and so forth. We have had almost a year to do it, and we are still trying to understand it. Perhaps the Coliseum Authority acted too quickly. Perhaps they should not have made this recommendation quite so quickly. Why did they make it? I think because they were pressured into making it, and I know that the pressure has been put on each and everyone of you for the last few days to vote this 90%. I can only ask you to please consider all sides of the question. Consider your constituents' tax dollars, consider other organizations.

The Board has not seen the budget that this money is going to be spent for. They have not seen the budget to discuss what the Stamford Center for the Arts has proposed. We really are being asked to give money without having any control over how it could go. We don't know if it's enough, too much, not enough; what it's going to go for. This disturbs me greatly.

Last year, the Stamford Center for the Arts asked for \$40,000. It was cut by this Board. This year, they are asking more than \$400,000, and we don't really know what they are going to spend it for. I really feel that the 75% is quite a lot of money. I think it is \$370,000; something like that, that they should be able to certainly keep going, get started, begin to show us what they can do with this money, and we can give some of the other organizations around town the other 15%. It doesn't mean that in time to come, we can't change those ratios. I do want you to consider this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman. Mr. DeLuca, you did not have a chance to speak to your Motion. Before you go into that, Mrs. Guroian is now present. We have 38 members present.

MR. DeLUCA: It's amazing what short memories people have. I don't know if it's a memory of convenience lapse or just really that they cannot remember as far back as two months ago. If memory serves me correctly, approximately two months ago, I think it was sometime around February, the Leadership of this Board, including Chairperson Bettie Gershman, representing the Coliseum Liaison Committee, met with Commissioner Pat Marra to discuss the future contracts of the Coliseum, the Center for the Arts, and the funding. At this meeting, it was pointed-out that 90% would be used the first year, 85% the second year, and 75%. Whereby, it would come at a point where chances are a drop-off point would be 75 or 65%. We are not being committed for 20 years. Rep. Gershman was at this meeting and no objection was raised as far as the length of time and the drop-off point starting at 90%, 85, 75. Now we are being told, it's 20 years. As I said, I don't know if it's a convenience lapse of memory or what it is.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) We go around to say that we did not get a budget. I have a budget but evidently it is home with my other files on the Coliseum; with all my other notes. Here it is, we spend many months appointing a Coliseum Advisory Panel. We have 9 people on this panel which this Board voted unanimously with the exception of one person because she was not present at the interviews, abstained; but, we appointed 9 people, intelligent people with wide variations of background. This Advisory Panel in their wisdom recommended 90% approval. Now to sit here and say that this Advisory Panel did not have time to digest everything, and that they really did not know what they were talking about when they recommended 90% funding for the Center for the Arts, is terribly unconscionable for us to even think along those lines, and if I was a member of that Advisory Panel, and somebody came up to me after much deliberation and soul-searching on my part and I recommended 90%, to be told that, "Hey, you don't know what you're really talking about. We can't go along with your 90%." Oh, yes, there certainly are many other organizations. We talk about promoting tourism. Are we to say that sooner or later, everytime we have a baseball tournament in Stamford, these people are coming in. The main intent was to make the Stamford Center for the Arts self-sustaining, and that was the idea of these funds. And, if this is what the Advisory Panel recommended to us, I think it would be morally wrong for us to go against them. I would urge this Board this evening to wholeheartedly support the recommendation of the Advisory Panel, and I would urge you to vote for my amendment bringing these funds up to 90%. To do otherwise would be an injustice. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. We are now addressing Mr. DeLuca's amendment.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I, too, like the previous speakers am going to make an honest effort to be as brief as possible. This whole matter concerning the Coliseum Authority, it disturbs me. I am disturbed. I am disturbed anytime anyone, any group regardless of social status or what have you, appears before the Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives, and presents a proposal to monopolize 100% funding over a development and to read the intent that came out of Hartford, Ordinance No. 480 Supplemental, "D" Purpose: "The purpose for which the Authority is hereby created is to promote tourism in Stamford through the growth and appreciation of cultural and performing arts, as well as other acceptable forms of recreation and entertainment as defined in Section 7-130a (d), and as approved by the Board of Representatives, through a Coliseum building or buildings where such activities, projects, exhibitions and supporting functions may be suitably displayed and performed together with such other activities, projects and public facilities as are authorized under Section 7-130a (d) of the said Connecticut General Statutes, as amended, or as may by ordinance be subsequently designated."

I am outraged when an elitist-type lobbyist group appears before the Board of Representatives Fiscal Committee, and states outright that the soul purpose of these fundings is to support an organization which they see deemed to be supported regardless of the consequences to any other organization.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: (continuing) Our Committee was outraged by members of that Board of Directors that the fundings justifiably should go to one organization, namely, the one they are presenting and other groups somehow or other should scrounge-around for funding.

On top of that, to have an individual that's part of this elite lobbyist group to state to our Committee that when all members ask legitimate questions concerning responsibility, funding sources, future plans to be accused of sniping. This Board has an obligation, we have an obligation to greater Stamford, and we must keep in mind when Community Development came into this City, we wouldn't have dared thought of allowing one single organization to soak-up all the funds, and no one else is even allowed a chance to speak on it.

When a man such as Charlie Ukkerd comes before a Committee of the Board of Representatives and states that he was told by the Mayor to take the request for his group to the Coliseum Authority, and when that man takes his request to that Authority, and for that Authority to tell him that they are going to meet in two weeks to entertain his objectives and for that group to hold the meeting one week in advance, it tells me something is wrong; because then when the man goes to the meeting, there is nobody to meet with. The decision has already been made.

For the Mayor and the Administration to suggest to Mr. Ukkerd that he should go to the Coliseum Authority, and then even after the Coliseum Authority made its position clear, for them to further refer him to the Coliseum Authority, it tells me loud and clear that even the intent of the Administration was not for all of these fundings to go to one, single source. Then for a high official of our Finance Department to tell me in front of the Co-Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, that when the members of that Committee amended this particular item to 75%, that we did the wisest thing. I'm asking this Board to look very carefully at what we are doing. To take every penny and to sew-it-up into one particular organization, and I honestly feel that our Coliseum Authority Advisory Panel had to be somewhat intimidated. I believe the Administration has been somewhat intimidated by an elite-type lobbyist group to have all these things to happen, and to have a Panel that we, this Board set-up to administer funds, we had no intentions of making middle-men out of them; get money from Hartford; give it to them; they give it to one group, but to have all of these things to happen, it tells me that there had to be a degree of intimidation somewhere. For the corporate community to think or to even entertain the motion that overwhelming support for this particular group takes them off-of-the-hook to projects presented by greater Stamford, I think it's naive. What are we listening to? We know that the little guy on the street, they've said it and they say it to all of us time and time again, one of the reasons why our taxpayers are overburdened with taxes is because the corporate giants are getting free rides. To a degree, to an extent, I have to somewhat agree with it but I do know, naturally, we did things to attract the corporate giants here. Their efforts in this City should be commended, but it's not enough, it's not enough. The corporate giants of this City should be involving themselves in our educational programs.

There is no doubt in my mind to allow the Coliseum Authority Advisory Panel to be able to disperse a little 15% of those fundings, and let's not forget for the first time to my knowledge, after almost 12 years sitting on this Board, we have an Authority, an Advisory Panel that's dispersing funds with no consideration to public hearings. All traditions of this City are being thrown down the drain and if we dare sit here and allow it to happen, then it will be our voters who pay the consequences.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON: (continuing) The Coliseum Advisory Panel has to learn; they have to know that their responsibility lies to all of Stamford, not a certain group.

Madam President, I'm probably taking up too much time already. I'm going to yield the Floor, but before I do that, I feel that I would be in order to offer another amendment on top of Mr. DeLuca's amendment which will reduce it to 50%. I hope and trust I have a strong Second. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston, would you repeat your Motion, please?

MR. LIVINGSTON: To amend the item as presented by the Fiscal Committee to 50%.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 50% for the Stamford Center for the Arts? That completes your Motion? There's a Second to that Motion. We are now speaking to Mr. Livingston's Motion. We have 20 speakers. When I call your name, you have to speak now to Mr. Livingston's amendment which is to reduce the amount to 50% for the Stamford Center for the Arts.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I'll try to be brief in my remarks. I would like to remind this Board that the General Statutes of Connecticut 7-130 which is enabling legislation, was in effect and has been in effect for many years; probably five at the least within the State of Connecticut, and I would note that prior to last year, the City of Stamford had not even aggressively considered having this initiated, and when it was initiated, it was brought to the Legislative and Rules Committee by the Administration solely for the purpose of trying to off-set any type of funding which would be necessary for the Cultural Arts Center to become established and a part of the Stamford Community, and in effect, bring life to what is a dead downtown. I would say that also under the enabling legislation, the law gives full and complete power to the Authority to act in furtherance of its purpose without reference to or the requirement of the consent or approval of any Board, Body or Commission. However, unfortunately, as it appears now since I was the maker of many amendments to the ordinance that passed this Board, I felt in my wisdom at that time, that this Board should have more control over the type of contracts that the City was involving itself with, and that we should also have more control over the people who were appointed to that Authority.

I'm wondering after months of confusion whether I, in effect, made a mistake. I feel that there has been pressure put-on some Representatives, but I have found that with my calls within the past two or three days, none of them have been from any elitist group. If anything, they have been from people who were still misinformed as to the choice of a site of the Arts Center, and certainly, bantered about figures such as 20 years and 30 years; figures in a contract that as I understood earlier in remarks made, was in negotiation. How those people knew of this negotiated figure I certainly don't know because I do not have a copy of that contract; to my knowledge, perhaps only the Coliseum Liaison Committee members do. Who had privy to that and made that available to members of the public at large, I cannot speak for. However, one thing I can speak to is taxes, and certainly when we agreed to fund that Authority, we tried to do it with the presence of mind that it would be most tolerable to the taxpayers in the City.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MRS. McINERNEY: (continuing) In the Leadership meeting as discussed by Mr. DeLuca, it was indicated that it was our intent to certainly have the burden become less and not to become the albatross as everybody would like to have it be.

I'm distressed to see that we now have art groups fighting amongst themselves, scrapping over money here and there and everywhere. It's a problem. It's going to become a further problem. I would speak against Mr. Livingston's resolution to reduce it to 50%, and I would now like to make an amendment to amend his Motion to have the entire amount restored to the 90% as was originally requested by the Coliseum Authority.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney, I would rule that that Motion is out-of-order. We are now addressing Mr. Livingston's Motion.

MRS. McINERNEY: Could I challenge that ruling?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No. Mrs. McInerney, we have a Motion. We have an amendment for 90%. Now we have an amendment to an amendment. We're going to go back to Mr. DeLuca.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I would just continue that the 50% would be not a tolerable figure. I think, if anything, it would help those people whose true intent is to undermine the entire purpose of an intent of having an Arts Center. Certainly, the future will find the time to share it, and perhaps the City should have an umbrella to handle all of these groups, but as it turns out now, we can either watch the Arts Center fail and all of the other groups fight because I understand there are 20 groups who would like this money; many of them from outside of the Stamford Community, and certainly, to reduce this to 50% would be ridiculous.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. There are 20 speakers. The Motion was 75%. Mr. DeLuca's amendment was 90%. We are now addressing Mr. Livingston's amendment which is 50% to the Stamford Center for the Arts. As I call you name, you know that's what we are addressing now.

MR. FRANCHINA: I Move the question, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. The question is on Mr. Livingston's amendment to reduce the amount to 50%. We need two-thirds. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? The Motion PASSED. We are going to Move the question. The question is voting on Mr. Livingston's amendment. I would ask all the Representatives to take their seats. If you are in favor of Mr. Livingston's Motion to reduce the amount for the Stamford Center for the Arts to 50%, then vote yes. If you are opposed, vote no. Has everyone voted? We are now voting on Mr. Livingston's amendment. Has everyone voted? Mr. Livingston's Motion has been DEFEATED by 9 affirmative, 28 negative, 0 abstaining, and 1 not-voting.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'd like to Move the question on the main Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. The question is on Mr. DeLuca's amendment to restore the amount to 90% to the Stamford Center for the Arts and 10% for the administrative costs. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Not sufficient. We are going to Move the question. Please use your machine. We are now voting on Mr. DeLuca's amendment, 90% Stamford Center for the Arts; 10% administrative costs. #9 under Fiscal Committee. The question has been Moved. We are voting on the Motion by Mr. DeLuca.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Does everyone understand what you are voting on? You're voting for Mr. DeLuca's amendment. His Motion was 90% of the funding for Stamford Center for the Arts; 10% for the administrative costs. Has everyone voted? It's an appropriation resolution and we need 21 votes. The Motion has PASSED 27 affirmative, 9 negative, 1 abstaining, and 1 not-voting.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to Move the following items on Consent Agenda. #2, \$13,000 for the Fire Department Code 450.3443 hydrant maintenance, and item #3, \$13,294 for the Board of Recreation for various self-sustaining accounts; men's industrial basketball, men's open volleyball, winter soccer, and men's street hockey, and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made to Move the Consent Agenda. Several Seconds. All in favor of items 2 and 3 on the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. That concludes the Fiscal Committee report.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein - NO REPORT

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT - Co-Chairmen David Blum and Lathon Wider, Sr.

MR. WIDER: The Public Housing and Community Development Committee met on March 30, 1983, at 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Representatives room which is our room here that we are sitting in right now, to finalize the Community Development Year Nine budget totalling \$1,263,000.

- (1) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF STAMFORD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (SCDP), BUDGET AND FINAL STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND PROJECTED USE OF FUNDS (PRIORITY PLANS) FOR NINTH (9TH) YEAR FUNDING - submitted by Mayor Clapes 3/16/83, and SCDP Director Nancy Mitchell 3/16/83. For SCDP Year 9, beginning 7/1/83, there is expected an entitlement resulting in an estimated budget of \$1,170,000. (Amount changed to \$1,263,000)  
(4 copies of 21-page report at Staff office)

Above also referred to FISCAL COMMITTEE

The meeting <sup>culminated</sup> ~~culminated~~ the budget preparation process that began in November, 1982. The Mayor's office and the Committee held a Public Hearing on February 30, 1983, to discuss the Community Development program and receive Year 9 proposals. This Committee met at least five times, including a budget session lasting until 1 o'clock in the morning to review all the proposals submitted in depth, and finalize and develop a balanced budget that reflects the Housing and Community Development needs of the City of Stamford.

This budget allocated 70% of the allocation for allocated funds for housing and economic development activities. In addition, there are several human resources that are funded to assist the low and moderate income resident in need.

The Community Development fund comes from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. There is no impact on the mill rate. The application must be voted on to meet the application schedule this Committee set in November of 1982, so that funds will be available to the City this July. The year has changed from October 1st to July 1st.



PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. WIDER: (continuing) The Committee meeting held on March 30, 1983, heard public comments and finalized the budget with minor adjustments. The revised budget was mailed out Thursday with the copy of the resolution to every member of the Board.

The Committee voted 3 in favor and 1 abstention to recommend the budget as amended by members of the Public Housing and Community Development Committee presented. Present were Mr. John Roos, Mrs. Ann King Saxe, Ms. Ann Summerville, and Lathon Wider, Sr., Co-Chairman, and I now refer to Mr. Roos to read the resolution.

MR. ROOS: "Resolution authorizing the Mayor to file 9th Year application for the Community Development Program of the City of Stamford, Connecticut.

WHEREAS, the City of Stamford, Connecticut is entitled to receive ONE MILLION TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$1,263,000) from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Ninth Year Community Development Program; and

WEHREAS, these funds are subject to filing of application (Final Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds) and related forms, and completion of all citizen participation requirements;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, THAT the Mayor is hereby authorized to file the NINTH YEAR APPLICATION (Final Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds) and related forms for the Community Development Program, including all understandings and assurances contained therein; and the Mayor is directed and authorized to act in connection with the application (Final Statement of Community Development Objectives and Projected Use of Funds) and related forms and to provide such additional information as may be required.

The above Resolution shall be effective upon enactment." and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Roos. Is there a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President to Rep. Lathon Wider. In your report, Mr. Wider, you stated the budget was \$1,263,000. Our Agenda states an estimated budget of \$1,170,000. Would you please be able to advise what comprises the difference in these amounts?

MR. WIDER: That is a typographical error.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made. Is there a Second? Seconded to Move the question. The question is on the approval of the resolution as read by Mr. Roos. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're right in the middle of a vote, Mr. Blum. We are going to use the machine. Two-thirds is needed.

MR. BLUM: Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Blum.



PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. BLUM: As Co-Chairman, the same as last year's budget, we have to read every item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, Mr. Wider as Co-Chairman read the Committee report. Mr. Roos placed the resolution before us and we're acting upon that now. The Motion on the Floor is to Move the question. We're going to use the machine to Move the question. The question is on Mr. Roos' resolution. Please use your machine if you are in favor of Moving the question. Please vote. We are voting on Moving the question. The machine is ready. If you are in favor of Moving the question. Please vote again. We are voting on Moving the question. The question is on the resolution as proposed by Mr. Roos. Has everyone voted? There are 38 members present. We need 26 votes. The question has been MOVED 29 affirmative, 8 negative, 0 abstaining, 1 not-voting.

We are now going to Move the question. The question is on the approval of the resolution as read by Mr. Roos, and you should all have a copy of that. We are now going to use the machines for our votes. If you approve of the resolution, please use your machine and vote yes; if you disagree, vote no. Has everyone voted? We are now voting on the resolution as proposed by Mr. Roos. We are voting on the resolution as read by Mr. Roos that you all received in the mail. We just need a majority of those present. Has everyone voted? The resolution is adopted by a vote of 27 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. That ends my report.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairperson Annie Summerville and John Roos

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The Urban Renewal Committee did not meet, but we do have an item on our Agenda and as I said to Steering that we would have a brief report. Through you, Madam Chairman, I would defer this report to be given by Committee member James Dudley.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

(1) THE MATTER OF THE AVAILABILITY OF TELEPHONES IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA.  
Held 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY: The issue that was raised is the availability of telephones in the downtown area. The issue was raised due to a lack of the phones in this area for the purpose of aid to motorists and those who may be in distress in the evening hours when many of the merchant stores are closed.

On March 16, 1983, there was a meeting to discuss the installation of these public phones within the Urban Renewal Area. It was agreed at this meeting that representatives from the Southern New England Telephone Company will be corresponding to the Public Works Department with the proposed locations of public phones by the week of the 21st to the 25th of March.

The installation of the phones in Phase 1A of the Streetscape Program will be first. The balance will be coordinated so as not to interfere with the Streetscape Program. While this issue has not been resolved as of today, and we have not received any new notification from the Public Works Department about the 21st or 25th, it is the intention of the Committee to hold this item in Committee until such time as this issue is resolved and we may pursue it further. Thank you.



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #1 under Urban Renewal is held in Committee. Is there any other Committee report, Ms. Summerville?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: That ends our report, Madam Chairman.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock - NO REPORT

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Co-Chairwomen Mary Lou Rinaldi & Barbara DeGaetani

MS. DeGAETANI: Thank you. Due to the Passover Holidays, our meeting which had been scheduled for March 29th was cancelled as Mr. Selin, the Chairman of the Commission on Aging could not attend. Therefore, we are holding item #1.

- (1) REP. McINERNEY'S LETTER 3/10/83 REQUESTING FOLLOWING BE PLACED ON THIS COMMITTEE'S AGENDA: "INEQUITIES WITHIN THE COMMISSION ON AGING POLICIES TO PROVIDE EQUAL TREATMENT/SERVICES TO ALL OF STAMFORD'S CITIZENS OVER AGE 62."

HELD IN COMMITTEE

The Committee did meet briefly tonight. Mrs. McInerney, Mrs. Gershman, Ms. Rinaldi, and myself met to vote on the Fiscal item on which we were the Secondary Committee on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. DeGaetani. That item under E,W, & G. is held.

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

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. The Appointments Committee met Wednesday, March 30, at 7:00 o'clock in the Public Works Conference Room. In attendance were Mr. Boccuzzi, Mr. Conti, Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Dixon, Ms. Summerville, and Mrs. Signore.

I would like to Move the following items on the Consent Agenda. Item #2, John Marsalisi, Board of Ethics.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #2 on Consent, Mr. Marsalisi.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #3, Theodore Santy, Environmental Protection Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #3, Mr. Santy, Environmental Protection Board.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item 4, Janet Vanderwaart, Parks Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Vanderwaart, Parks Commission, Consent Agenda.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #5, Thomas Pia, Board of Recreation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Pia, Board of Recreation, Consent Agenda.



APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #6, Harry Selin, Commission on Aging.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Selin, Commission on Aging, Consent Agenda.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #7, James Rosecrans, Personnel Appeals Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Rosecrans, Personnel Appeals Board, Consent Agenda.

MRS. SIGNORE: Item #8, Raymond Cohen, Board of Tax Review.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Cohen, Board of Tax Review, Consent Agenda.

FAIR RENT COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

(1) <u>MR. WALTER SEELY (R)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
14-B Hamilton Court		
Held 2/9 and 3/7/83.		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: The vote was to hold Mr. Seely in Committee. The vote to hold was 4 to hold, 1 in favor of Mr. Seely, and none opposed.

BOARD OF ETHICS

(2) <u>JOHN A. MARSALISI (R)</u>	To fill a vacancy	June 30, 1984
92 Alton Road		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

(3) <u>THEODORE SANTY (R)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
133 Thornridge Drive		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

PARKS COMMISSION

(4) <u>MS. JANET VANDERWAART (R)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
29 Friar Tuck Lane		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

BOARD OF RECREATION

(5) <u>THOMAS PIA (R)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1985
18 Windell Place		

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)



APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (Continued)COMMISSION ON AGINGTERM EXPIRES

- (6) HARRY SELIN (R) Re-appointment Dec. 1, 1985  
1166 Hope St., Apt. 4

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

- (7) JAMES R. ROSECRANS (R) Re-appointment Dec. 1, 1987  
55 Breezy Hill Road

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

BOARD OF TAX REVIEW

- (8) RAYMOND COHEN (R) Replacing Harry Alter Dec. 1, 1986  
243 Intervale Road East whose term expired.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH ONE ABSTENTION. (Rep. Mildred Perillo)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you want to make a Motion now to Move the Consent Agenda?

MRS. SIGNORE: I would like to make that Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: And there has been a Second to that. All in favor of the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed?

MRS. PERILLO: I would like the record to show that I am abstaining on names 2 through 8. I did not interview the people.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Perillo is ~~abstaining~~ on 2 through 8 as she was not at the Committee meeting. Any others? They all passed unanimously with one abstention.

MRS. SIGNORE: That concludes my report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

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

MR. PERILLO: The Public Works Committee met on March 31. Present were Perillo, Flounders, Boccuzzi, Saxe, Bonner, Blais and Roos.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION PER THEIR RESOLUTION 12-21-82:323, effective 1/1/83. Supt. Jerome B. Jones' letter 12/28/82. See Comm. Spaulding's letter 1/6/83. Held in Committee 1/24 and 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO ACCEPT RYLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION PER THEIR RESOLUTION 12-21:323, effective 1/1/83. Supt. J. B. Jones' letter 12/29/82. See Comm. Spaulding's letter 1/6/83. Held in Committee 1/24 and 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO: It seems the Board of Education is too busy to set-up an appointment with the Commissioner to tour the buildings for acceptance. We will still hold in Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #1 is held and #2 is held?

MR. PERILLO: Right.

Also 18-63 and 18-64

- (3) FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORD. #18-60, 18-61, and 18-62 governing STREET OPENING PERMITS - submitted by DPW Commissioner Bruce Spaulding's letter 2/4/83. Approved for publication, as amended, 3/7/83.

MR. PERILLO: This has been approved by 7 - 0 of the Committee and I so Move. With the amendment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that? There are several Seconds. Any discussion on item #3 under Public Works; final adoption proposed ordinance amending ord. #18-60, 18-61, and 18-62 governing Street Opening Permits that's as we received with the changes, Mr. Perillo?

MR. BLUM: Madam Chairman, I would like to make an amendment to this particular ordinance. It is now \$ 5.00 a flat fee for a street opening permit. I'd like to make it \$50.00 a flat fee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, would you give us the number and the page and whereabouts you want us to insert that \$ 5.00.

MR. BLUM: The \$ 5.00 is now the law, or the ordinance. This is a final adoption of an ordinance amending 18-60, 18-61, and 18-62 governing street opening permits. They're calling for, I believe, \$50.00, whatever it is plus \$1.00 for every...

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's on top of page #2, section #18-63. That's where you're inserting the change? You're making an amendment that the City Engineer should charge a fee of \$ 5.00?

MR. BLUM: No, of \$50.00.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's \$50 now. What is your amendment?

MR. BLUM: \$50 flat with no additional for any extra footage.

MR. PERILLO: If I may?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. PERILLO: That's \$50.00 a permit for street openings, and then it's a \$1.00 per square foot thereafter. Up to 50 feet, it's \$50.00. After that, it is a \$1.00 per square foot. He wants to amend to eliminate that \$1.00 per square foot after 50 feet.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, as I read it, that's underlined in the ordinance; "An additional fee for trenches or excavations greater than 25 sq. ft. shall be charged at the rate of one dollar per square foot," and your amendment is to delete that whole section?

MR. BLUM: That's correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have a Motion on the Floor to delete in this ordinance that sentence. Is there a Second to that? There is a Second to that. Discussion? I have three speakers here. We're speaking to Mr. Blum's amendment.

MRS. CONTI: I have a general question with or without the amendment. I received a letter from the Stamford Water Company, and I wondered if anybody knows whether the figures quoted in that letter are accurate or not as regards to what it will cost the consumers?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is your question to Mr. Perillo?

MR. PERILLO: We did discuss that in Committee and it was directed upon the Commissioner of Finance to give us an answer, but we haven't got it yet.

MRS. CONTI: May I Move that we send that back to Committee until we find out what we are dealing with here?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, you are making a Motion to send this item back to Committee?

MRS. CONTI: Until such time that we can check out the facts in the Water Company's letter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That Motion is properly before the Floor. There are several Seconds. Now we are discussing sending this back to Committee.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, my question was precisely the one that Mrs. Conti raised and I would certainly suggest that we do send it back to Committee because the Water Company did make statements which indicate that they feel these charges are exorbitant and I feel this should be investigated before we make our decision. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any further discussion?

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I think it should be sent back to Committee for a number of questions that are not answered in this ordinance. It should be sent back to Committee for further study.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. Just a point of information. If it does go back to Committee, I would then suggest to the Committee that they check to make sure that the ordinance number is correct. According to the Code of Ordinances, the section dealing with the fee is 18-63; not 18-60, 61, or 62. So before we vote on anything, make sure we have the right section.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, I have the ordinance in front of me and it does say, "section 18-63" on my ordinance. We all received it. This is the corrected one.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'm sorry, I was just going off the Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, we have the proper ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to sending this back to Committee. Any further speakers?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you. I'm not speaking to send it back to Committee. At the public hearing, the Water Company presented the same letter that they sent us this past week, and if we take those figures and work with them as Mr. Spaulding did with us in Committee, you'll see that the pyramiding is absolutely out of range of anything that is reasonable nor anything that is correct. They are pyramiding numbers which do not cause any validity and nothing more than a sham to make all of us turnaround and do exactly what we're doing, and it isn't right. The ordinance has been before us. The ordinance has been discussed. It has been compromised and we are now in a position where we should not send it back; we should accept it. We all use the streets in the City. We all go by what we have done, and let me tell you, the man that is the head of that Department is more than fair not only to the Water Company but also to the rest of us as citizens who use the streets.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe. There's no further speakers. We can go right to the question. We're going to use the machine for a vote. The Motion we are voting on is return this item to Committee which is the proposed ordinance amending street opening permits. Has everyone voted?

MR. WHITE: In order to return to Committee, is it a yes vote or a no vote?

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want to return it to Committee, it's a yes vote. The Motion was made positive.

MR. WHITE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti's Motion was to return it to Committee. Has everyone voted? The Motion to return to Committee has been DEFEATED 14 affirmative, 21 negative, 0 abstaining, and 3 not-voting. We still have the Motion on the Floor. Anyone that wants to speak; we now have to go back to Mr. Blum's Motion, a deletion on the second page, 18-63 to delete that sentence that is underlined, by the way in the ordinance, an additional for trenches and excavations greater than 25 feet, shall be charged the rate of \$ 1.00 per square foot.



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) We are now speaking to that amendment. Are there any speakers?

MRS. PERILLO: I just wanted to ask Mr. Blum a question, if he wants this deleted, who is going to pick-up the tab for this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, would you like to answer that question?

MR. BLUM: The ordinance as it exists now is a \$ 5.00 flat fee. The new ordinance calls for \$50.00 plus \$ 1.00 for every 25 feet or whatever, every square foot. I am asking that they delete the \$ 1.00 for every 25 feet and make it at a \$50.00 flat fee. If they had a 50-foot or a 100-foot trench, it would be the same \$50.00 fee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. BOCCUZZI: This is going to sound a little strange. I'd like to speak against the amendment for one reason. Normally, a homeowner would probably never pay more than \$50.00 because usually they dig a trench which would be a lateral from their house to a utility whether it would be the water or the sewer. That particular trench would be probably covered in the 50 foot; the original \$50.00. Now, if we stop there, you are not going to help the homeowners at all, you're helping the utilities, and if that's the direction this Board wants to go, that's what you have to consider.

MR. DeLUCA: I have to also agree with Rep. Boccuzzi to speak out against the amendment. Evidently, Rep. Blum is a little mistaken with some of his facts. This \$ 1.00 per square foot has always been on the books since 1920. It is just that it has never been enforced; the \$ 5.00 flat fee was being enforced, and, therefore, what we plan on voting tonight is to increase the \$ 5.00 to \$50.00 plus the \$ 1.00 per square foot which is just carried over from the existing ordinance. The only thing that is changed is the \$ 5.00 to the \$50.00. My comments are not to be misled by the remark of Rep. Blum that this is a revision. This \$ 1.00 per square foot has been there since the 1920's.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. The Public Works Committee worked very hard to have all of these fees become user fees. The person that is going to have to pay for these is the person that is using or mis-using a street and having to fix it up again, and it's not for individuals to pay the freight for a company who is making capital gains on what they're doing. It's a user fee. It's to be looked at as a user fee as all of the other items were that came before Public Works and will come before Public Works. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. McINERNEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to Move the question. We're going to use the machine. It's on the final adoption. 21 votes are required. Proposed ordinance amending ordinance #18-60, 18-61, and 18-63 and 18-64 which is not on the Agenda governing street opening permits.



PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Mr. Blum's amendment we're voting on first.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am sorry. That's right. It's Mr. Blum's amendment. We're voting on Mr. Blum's amendment. Please use the machine. Has everyone voted? The amendment is DEFEATED 2 affirmative, 31 negative, 1 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

We are now to the main Motion which is final adoption of the ordinance that I just read.

MR. DeLUCA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed. We're going to Move the question, and we're going to use the machine to vote. We are voting on final adoption of that ordinance street opening permits. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The ordinance is ADOPTED 31 affirmative, 0 negative, 3 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

- (4) PROPOSED ORDINANCE REPEALING ORD. 8-18, Section (a) - FOR PUBLICATION - REPEALING "SPRING CLEAN-UP" - submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding 2/8/83, received 2/17/83. Held in Committee 3/7/83.

MR. PERILLO: The Committee voted 4 to 3 in favor of repealing Spring Clean-up, and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is for publication, Mr. Perillo?

MR. PERILLO: For publication.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that? Several Seconds. We are voting on publication.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. I would be speaking against this. My constituents are in favor of the spring pick-up. I know it hasn't been held for several years, however, it is an ordinance on the books and it should be adhered to. The public does pay taxes. They do require it. They do want it, and I will not vote to repeal this and I urge my colleagues not to, also. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are just voting on publication at this point, Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. McINERNEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question which is approval of publication. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? One nay. We're going to Move the question, and we are now going to use the machine for a vote on publication of the repealing of the ordinance, Spring Clean-up. Please use your machine. We're voting on publication only. The Motion to publish proposed ordinance repealing Spring Clean-up has been DEFEATED 11 affirmative, 25 negative and 2 not-voting.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: (Continued)

- (5) THE MATTER OF REPAVING DERWEN STREET, RUTZ ROAD, GLEN AVENUE, AND DeLEO DRIVE - submitted by 15th District Rep. Paul Dziezyc. Held 7/12/82. Report made 8/2/82 that DPW will submit their report and request appropriation. Held 9/20/82, 10/4/82, 11/8/82, 12/6/82, 1/10/83, 1/24/83 and 2/22/83.

MR. PERILLO: Item 5 has already been disposed of by the Fiscal Committee. That ends my report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Perillo.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen John Roos and Jeremiah Livingston(1) REPORT

MR. ROOS: The Charter Revision Committee did not meet but I do have a report updating the status of the present Commission's activity.

The Charter Revision Commission will have another Public Hearing at Cloonan School on April 11, at 7:30 p.m. That is Monday night. A 1,000 copies of the proposed changes have been printed and will be distributed to the Board of Reps., you have them on your desks tonight, the Town Committees and be available at our Library.

After the Public Hearing, the Commission will meet at least for two more meetings. The Committee will meet to divide the proposed changes into sections, thereby facilitating the Board's consideration. Tentatively, the Committee will meet on Wednesday, the 13th of this month. On May 15th, the completed Charter revision proposal will be presented to the complete Board.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Charter Revision Commission for their efforts and accomplishments to date. It was a large and demanding assignment requiring much time and thought, and they have met the challenge. I would also like to commend our Committee for the time and interest they spent choosing the Commission candidates that were presented to the Board. They chose well. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Roos.

MR. ZELINSKI: If I could just add to Rep. Roos' report. The evening that the Charter Revision Commission met with members of the Board of Representatives, 20 or so of our members took the time to come to that meeting and make additions and corrections, and voice their opinions and concerns. I'd just like that noted for the record. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

MR. DeLUCA: The Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday, March 28, 1983, in the Republican Caucus Room to discuss the items on tonight's Agenda. Attendees were Committee members Owens, Rybnick, Gaipa, Franchina, myself, Gabe DeLuca. Also attending were Park Commission Chairperson Polly Vanderwaart, Park Supt. Bob Cook, Park Department employees Condon and Woodside, Recreation Commission Chairperson Tom Pia, Recreation Commission member Tony Marrucco, and Recreation Supt. Bruno Giordano.



PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA: Items 5, 6, and 7 are on the Consent Agenda.

- (1) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HOLD 10 km FOOT RACE on Sunday, May 8, 1983 (rain date 5/15/83) for benefit of Connecticut Special Olympics' athletic competition programs for the retarded - from Dan Kinley, Jr., Aarborg Associates, Inc., 269 Round Hill Road, Greenwich, CT 06930. Held in Committee 2/9 and 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

Item 1 is being held at the request of Dan Kinley, Jr. of Aarborg Associates.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #1 is held.

- (4) REQUEST TO HOLD SEVENTH ANNUAL HIKE BIKE FOR THE RETARDED - ON BEHALF OF THE STAMFORD'S AID FOR THE RETARDED, INC. - Saturday, April 23, 1983 from 12 Noon to 3:00 P.M. at Cummings Park; with a rain date of Sunday, April 24, 1983. From Arlene O. DuBiago, Hike Bike Chairman.

MR. DeLUCA: It was voted 5 in favor and none opposed with the following changes: It should read Sunday, April 17, 1983, with a rain date of Saturday, April 23, 1983, and I so Move. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made to hold the Seventh Annual Hike Bike for the Retarded with the changes as read by Mr. DeLuca. We'll vote on that at this point. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. DeLuca, what happened to #2 and 3 on the Agenda?

MR. DeLUCA: I'm coming to that. I just wanted to skip-around to see if you are alert.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're alert, Mr. DeLuca. We're all still awake. Thank you, Gabe. Please try to stay in order.

- (2) IMPROVEMENTS TO TROY FIELD - Recreation Supt. Giordano requests permission to do the improvements. Submitted 2/22/83, Rep. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: Our Committee as I stated, met with the Parks Department and Board of Recreation, and I am happy to say that we came-up with several recommendation which we have established a target date of May 31st whereby Troy Field will become operational as both a softball field and a hardball field. This is going to be done by cleaning up the debris out in the outfield, removing trees. There's a rock out there that has to be either chipped-away or covered over, and both Departments, the Recreation Department and the Parks Department are going to utilize their manpower and resources to make this field available. The total cost is estimated at about \$2,000 to \$3,000, and the best part about this is that we obtain the maximum usage at Troy Field. Right now, it's only being used for softball. Once these changes are incurred, we will have both the softball and hardball field. The Parks Department and everyone agrees that this is the most maximum use of the facilities at a nominal cost to the City.



PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (Continued)

- (3) THE MATTER OF A PORTABLE FENCE FOR SCALZI PARK LITTLE LEAGUE FIELD.  
Submitted 2/22/83, Rep. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: For the benefit of the people who are not familiar with the Little League field at Scalzi Park, it's utilized by the National Little League for 10 to 12 year-olds; boys and girls, and this field after July 4th, becomes dormant; very little use is made of it. Our Committee recommended and the Parks Department has agreed that during the Fall season, preferably September or October, the outfield fence would be torn down and replaced by a portable fence. The reason for doing this is that starting next year after July 4th, this field will be utilized for both softball, also soccer, and touch football during the Winter season. Once again, the projected cost to put a portable fence would be approximately \$5,000. When you consider the fact that people have been saying that we need more fields, buy more land, when you look at a total cost of approximately \$8,000 for Troy Field and Scalzi Little League Field, we are obtaining additional soccer fields, hardball and softball fields at a nominal cost.

- (5) REQUEST TO HOLD A WALKATHON FROM THE UNITED JEWISH FEDERATION OF STAMFORD ON SUNDAY, MAY 1, 1983 from 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M., as per route stated in letter 3/14/83 from Alida Putterman.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (6) REQUEST TO HANG BANNERS FROM JUNE 13TH TO JUNE 26, 1983, at the following LOCATIONS: (1) Summer St. across from Ridgeway Center  
(2) Bedford Street at Lathan Park  
to advertise The Stamford Festival of the Arts to be held at Mill River Park June 23, 24, 25, and 26, 1983 - submitted by Charles A. Ukkerd, President, 3/8/83.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (7) REQUEST TO HANG BANNER ON SUMMER STREET FROM APRIL 16, 1984 THRU MAY 13, 1984 (for next year, 1984) to celebrate POLISH HERITAGE WEEK in May, 1984 - per request from Al Koproski to Rep. Gabe DeLuca 3/7/83.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (8) REQUEST FROM THE AMERICAN RED CROSS MARCH 21, 1983, TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER STREET (NO DATE SPECIFIED) to publicize their 18-hour marathon training in Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (the Race for Life Course, a 2-hour one person CPR course) given May 7, 1983 at 6:00 a.m. at the Marriott Hotel. From Thomas R. Stevens, Chairman.

MR. DeLUCA: Unfortunately, May 7 at both locations is taken as far as hanging a banner. I was on the phone with Mrs. Lolachi of the Red Cross and she realized that there was nothing we can do about it, and, therefore, hopefully she would get her request in time for next year so that we can meet their requirements. Therefore, this is off.



PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to go back to the Consent Agenda; item 5, request to hold a Walkathon from United Jewish Federation of Stamford on Sunday, May 1, 1983 from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Item #6, request to hang banners from June 13th to June 26, 1983, at the following locations: Summer Street across from Ridgeway Center, Bedford Street at Latham Park to advertise the Stamford Festival of the Arts to be held at Mill River Park June 23, 24, 25, and 26. Submitted by Charles A. Ukkerd.

Item #7, request to hang banner on Summer Street from April 16, 1984, through May 13, 1984, to celebrate Polish Heritage Week.

I now Move for approval of the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made. Is there a Second to Move the Consent Agenda? Several Seconds. All in favor of these three items on the Consent Agenda, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA: I now ask your indulgence to Suspend the Rules to put an important item on the Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Can you just tell us what the item is?

MR. DeLUCA: It's a request from the Stamford Special Olympics Committee to hang a banner.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a Motion to Suspend the Rules to consider this item. There's a Second. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? Alright. Mr. DeLuca, do you want to go ahead with your Motion?

- (9) REQUEST FROM MRS. MARY NICHOLS OF THE STAMFORD SPECIAL OLYMPICS COMMITTEE TO ADVERTISE THE STAMFORD SPECIAL OLYMPICS, REQUEST TO HANG A BANNER across Bedford Street from May 10th through May 14th.

MR. DeLUCA: I Move for acceptance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made. Is there a Second to that Motion? Seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. DeLUCA: And that concludes our report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, I would like to make a Motion to Suspend the Rules to take-up an item out-of-order on the Agenda. I would ask that we take-up item #2 under Personnel; For final adoption proposed ordinance supplemental concerning pensions for the Registrars of Voters.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds. We are now going to Move to Suspend the Rules to take an item out-of-order on the Agenda considering the proposed ordinance concerning the pensions for the Registrars of Voters. All in favor of taking this item out-of-order, please say aye. Opposed? We are going to have to use the machine for a vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) We're voting to take an item out-of-order on the Agenda. Use your machine. If you are in favor, vote yes. If you are not, vote no. Has everyone voted? The Motion is to take an item out-of-order on the Agenda, specifically, the Registrars of Voters pension. Has everyone voted? We need two-thirds. The Motion to Suspend the Rules to take an item out-of-order has PASSED 29 affirmative, 4 negative, 0 abstaining and 5 not-voting.

Mr. Dudley, can you give the Committee report for Personnel because Mr. Stork is not here?

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. DUDLEY: The Personnel Committee met on Wednesday, March 30, 1983, at 8 o'clock.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING PENSIONS FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - pursuant to Section 40 of the City Charter, Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney 11/16/82. Held 12/6/82. Approved for publication 1/10/83. Held 2/9/83. Approved for re-publication and public hearing at 3/7/83 meeting.

The Committee voted 3 in favor, 1 against and 1 abstention, and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made. Is there a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds. We are now on on the Personnel Agenda, #2, to approve for final adoption the proposed ordinance supplemental concerning pensions for the Registrars of Voters.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to propose amendments to this ordinance. I would like to propose an amendment on page 2, section 1a.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just a moment, Mrs. Conti. Let everyone have an opportunity to get this. Mrs. Conti, where is your amendment? We have the ordinance.

MRS. CONTI: On page 2, section 1a, after the word "provided", I would put-in, it would read, "as provided for in Section 710 of the Stamford Charter, an additional requirement set-forth in this ordinance." Then I would delete the balance of 1a.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, I hope I have the same ordinance you have. Would you read that section? I have 1a, "Now, therefore, be it ordained?"

MRS. CONTI: Page 2, section 1a, do you want me to read it as it now reads?

PRESIDENT SANTY: And give us your amendment.

MRS. CONTI: It now reads, "That such employees or officers who qualify shall meet and satisfy the minimum conditions of age and years of service as provided in the Classified Employees Retirement Plan together with such other conditions as may in said plan be prescribed."

Now, I would change that to read, "That such employees or officers who qualify shall meet and satisfy the minimum conditions of age and years of service as provided for in Section 710 of the Stamford Charter and provisions of this ordinance." Yes, and provisions of this ordinance. Oh,"and additional requirements set-forth in this ordinance."



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti. Is there a Second to that Motion? There is a Second.

MRS. CONTI: Everybody had copies of these proposed amendments last month.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're now speaking to Mrs. Conti's amendment, and we have it and we have the ordinance in front of us.

MRS. CONTI: May I give some rationale for this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, you may.

MRS. CONTI: The Registrars are not classified employees. They are officers and employees of the City. See Corporation Counsel's opinion August 14, 1975, and Charter Section 734a and Section 110 of the Charter, "To make officers and employees who are separate and expressly defined under the Charter eligible under provisions set-forth for another category of City employees is questionable, and could be legally challenged by the Trustees of the Classified Pension Fund or by taxpayers." The provisions for giving this type of pension are outlined in 710 of the Charter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you finished, Mrs. Conti?

MRS. CONTI: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I would like to bring to your attention the fact that as Mrs. Conti just indicated, all of these amendments which she is apparently proposing this evening, were proposed at our March 7, '83 meeting. This first amendment was lost by a vote of 25 no, 2 yes. The second amendment which she proposed last month was also lost. The alternate amendment to #2 was also lost with 4 people voting no. I don't understand; she certainly has the option here as she well knows that she can vote against the ordinance. We all sat through these same amendments; if it's exactly as she has presented earlier in her statement, and I think it's very unfair if she lost one month, to try to turnaround and try to do the same thing the following month, and I would speak against this and urge everybody else to just vote right against it, and that's it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other speakers to Mrs. Conti's amendment?

MRS. SAXE: I don't think I would like very much to see any amendments go on this, but I also am not speaking for the change in our Charter and our change in the way we do things because I don't think anybody in this particular situation should go against what we have set-up for the last many years. So, I don't speak in favor of hers and I certainly don't speak in favor of doing what you are proposing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on Mrs. Conti's amendment. We are now going to use a machine vote for Mrs. Conti's amendment. We are now voting on Mrs. Conti's amendment relating to the pension for the Registrars of Voters. Has everyone voted? Mrs. Conti's amendment has been DEFEATED by 4 affirmative, 27 negative, 1 abstention, and 6 not-voting. We are now going back to the main Motion.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wiederlight has made a Motion to Move the question. It's been Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Only one no vote. We'll proceed right to the main Motion which is #2 under Personnel; Final adoption proposed ordinance supplemental concerning pensions for the Registrars of Voters. We all should have received that.

MRS. PERILLO: A Roll Call vote, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to a Roll Call vote? Seconded. All in favor of a Roll Call vote, please say aye. Raise your hands. We need eight votes. Sufficient. I will proceed with a Roll Call vote. Our two Teller, Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Franchina, would you come forward for your tally sheets?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Point of information, please. How many votes are needed to pass?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just a majority.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Majority of those present or those on the Board?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going by Mr. Fraser's opinion dated March 3rd, I note the last paragraph, "that since no present appropriation is contemplated under the ordinance, a simple majority vote is all that is necessary for enactment." This has changed from the original opinion that was dated a month previous. We are going with a majority, a simple majority.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: To pass an ordinance, any ordinance requires...

PRESIDENT SANTY: 21.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, Mrs. Goldstein, but Mr. Fraser's opinion was what I just read. We'll go with 21 votes. We are ready for a Roll Call vote, Ms. Summerville. We are also going to be recording it on the machine, and our two Tellers are taking the total. The two Tellers are taking the Roll Call. The Clerk will read the names. We are also recording it on the machine for documentation. APPROVED 30 yes, 5 no, 3 abstentions, and 2 non-votes.

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

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING POSSIBLE HAZARDS IN SATELLITE TRANSMISSION FACILITIES - Submitted 4/19/82 by Reps. Grace Guroian and Betty Conti, W. Dennis White. Held in Committee from 5/3/82 through 2/9/83. Approved for publication 7/12/82. Held 2/22/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE



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

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING A TAX CREDIT FOR REFUSE COLLECTION TO OWNERS OF RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN MULTIPLE UNIT RESIDENTIAL COMPLEXES. Mayor Clapes' letter 11/30/82. Held in Committee 9/8, 10/5, 12/27/82, 2/9/83, and 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FROM NEW NEIGHBORHOODS, INC. 6/10/82, and Mayor Clapes' letter 11/15/82 for GREENWICH AVENUE AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. Held 12/27/82, 2/9/83, 3/7/83. Estimated Fee: + \$6,000.00.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDING ORD. #449 "TAX RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY" - Revision per State Statute. Letter 5/14/82. Also May 4th memo from Rep. DeLuca on Ord. 449 which expired 5/15/82 per Deputy Tax Assessor Edward Faski. Held in Committee through Steering 10/18/82. 7/26/82 letter from Wm. Hennessey, Esq., Law Dept. Also Rep. John Zelinski's submission. Held 12/6, 12/27/82, 1/24 and 3/7/83. Approved for Publication 3/7/83.

(start of tape)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please vote using your machine. We're voting on final adoption of proposed ordinance supplemental amending ordinance #449, Tax Relief for the Elderly. If you are in favor, please vote yes. If you are not, vote no. Has everyone voted? Final adoption of #3 under L&R. The Ordinance has been ADOPTED 34 affirmative, 0 negative, 0 abstention, and 2 not-voting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Just for the record, again, the second meeting which L&R had which was the vote on that last item, was this evening at 7:15 in the Main room, and for the record, present were Reps. Zelinski, Bonner, Saxe, McInerney, Dudley, Donahue, Maihock and Owens.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL - request 1/6/83 from Rep. McInerney that "All industries and businesses located within the City of Stamford be required to file a list of hazardous materials and substances used within their operations on a daily basis, or stored within their premises with the local Fire Department. Also submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock. Held 1/24 and 2/22/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #4 is being held by the Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 4 is being held.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL (text to be submitted) Concerning Public Act #82-318 (effective the assessment year commencing October 1, 1982 and thereafter) which is enabling legislation which may grant additional property tax exemption to veterans if qualified under certain income requirements and disability as specified. Memo from Edward Faski, Acting Tax Assessor 1/23/83. Held in Steering 2/22/83. Also memo of submission from Rep. Sandra Goldstein 3/16/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE



LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE; (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #5 is being held by the Committee, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 5 is being held.

- (6) PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO RULES OF ORDER OF THE 17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES - submitted by Rep. Gershman 3/12/83. (Two-thirds vote of those present needed for passage.)

Page 9: MISCELLANEOUS

- "2. No documents, budgets or other material pertinent to an Item on the Agenda of a Board meeting shall be considered if received by the Board members less than 48 hours before said meeting, unless such material is requested by a Committee Chairperson, and the members of that Committee and/or the Board as a whole are alerted to expect to receive such material."

MR. ZELINSKI: The Committee vote was 4 in favor, 3 against, and 1 abstention. The Committee vote was affirmative, and I would so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? There is a Second to that Motion. We are now on #6 under L&R, proposed amendment to Rules of Order as presented on the Agenda.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to mention at this time, that I did vote against this particular change in our Rules of Order, and I would urge my colleagues to do also. First of all from a practical standpoint, to say that we cannot discuss or take into consideration not only items that are left at our Board office, your desk, less than 48 hours, but that would also preclude getting any information from the constituent who might have vital information on a topic coming before us, and also, I think it's even unconstitutional to say that we cannot take into consideration something that was left less than 48 hours, could not be considered. It can't be enforceable, and I think unfortunately, it just would not be workable, and I urge my colleagues to please defeat this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. DONAHUE: Madam President, when each of us runs for the Board of Representatives, we take-on a responsibility, and part of that responsibility is to be accessible to the public that we represent. Very often, information comes into us at the last moment, but very often, that information is critical to one issue or another. It would be irresponsible of us to not allow the public, even the last minute information that they may try to grant us, and ultimately, it should be each of our decisions what we will consider on a vote; what we will not consider on a vote. No rule of the Board should preclude or prohibit anything along those lines. I would further add such a rule change would be unenforceable. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to Move the question. The question is on #6 under L&R, proposed amendment to the Rules of Order of our own Board. Please use your machine. If you are in favor of the change, vote yes. If you are opposed to the change, vote no. 25 votes are required.



LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Has everyone voted? The amendment to our Rules of Order is DEFEATED 5 affirmative, 29 negative, 3 abstaining, and 2 not-voting.

- (7) "ACCESS EASEMENT AND MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT" submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes 2/14/83 - between the City of Stamford and Holiday Inns, Inc., to provide ingress and egress to Holiday Inn site across parkland, in exchange for park improvements not to exceed \$25,000 and park maintenance not to exceed \$2,000 per year, to be provided by Holiday Inns, Inc. Planning Board 2/9/83 approved.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI: The last item, item #7, is being held. The Park Commission hasn't had the opportunity to look-over the agreement, and so we're holding this also. That concludes my report. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. Item #7 is being held.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

- (1) SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY - List received from Planning Board 9/20/82 with recommendations from them. Board of Finance to send their recommendations. Held 11/8/82 through 2/22/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: No report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No report. Is that item being held?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No report.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork is not here. Mr. Dudley, the brand-new Vice-Chairman of that Committee, please give the report.

MR. DUDLEY: As I said earlier, the meeting was held on Wednesday, March 30, at 8 o'clock.

- (1) REQUEST FROM REP. BETTIE GERSHMAN FOR: INVESTIGATION INTO THE FEASIBILITY OF FREEZING THE ENTRANCE OF ALL EMPLOYEES CURRENTLY EMPLOYED IN ANY CAPACITY BY THE CITY INTO THE CITY PENSION FUND AND MEDICAL BENEFITS, UNLESS SUCH EMPLOYEES ARE NEW EMPLOYEES AND QUALIFY FOR ENTRANCE. The freeze would be in effect until guidelines are agreed upon to allow or disallow entrance into plan and benefits. Rep. Gershman's letter of 10/13/82; also Rep. Stork's letter 11/15/82. Held 11/8, 12/6/82, 1/10/83, 2/9/83, 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE SUPPLEMENTAL CONCERNING PENSIONS FOR REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - pursuant to Section 40 of the City Charter. Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney 11/16/82. Held 12/6/82. Approved for publication 1/10/83. Held 2/9/83. Approved for republication and public hearing at 3/7/83 meeting.

TAKEN-UP UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES: SEE PAGE 34. (APPROVED 30 yes, 5 no, 3 abstentions, and 2 non-votes)

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FROM BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT FUND 1/13/83, for Cost-of-Living adjustments to pensions of retirees. Returned to Committee 2/9/83. Held 3/7/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY: Held 5 to 0.

- (4) PROCEDURES USED FOR THE AUTHORIZATION OF GAS ALLOTMENTS - submitted by Rep. John Boccuzzi 12/13/82; also UNAUTHORIZED CITY GASOLINE USAGE AND WHO IS ELIGIBLE FOR GASOLINE RATION CARDS - submitted by City Rep. John Zelinski 12/13/82; which mentions gas issued to Acting Superintendent of Sanitation and two Clerks of the Work. Held in Committee 1/10/83, 1/24 and 2/22/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY: This is held pending a Public Works possibility of an investigation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #1, 3, and 4 are so far being held.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF GROUP LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE TO THE LOWEST THOUSAND OF SALARY FOR THE PAID ELECTED AND APPOINTED CITY OFFICIALS - per letter 3/10/83.

MR. DUDLEY: This was passed 5 in favor and none opposed and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It was passed by what vote, Mr. Dudley?

MR. DUDLEY: 5 to 0.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 5 to 0 and you so Move? Is there a Second to that Motion? Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Rep. Dudley, in his capacity of Acting-Chairman, I do have the resolution in front of me, and one question that concerns me is there is no mention in the resolution, the amount of insurance for each one of the, I guess nine or ten, people that this is going to affect. Would you have any idea what the dollar amount is?

MR. DUDLEY: Mr. Zelinski, being unprepared as I was tonight, and not knowing that I would be giving the report, I don't have that information with me.

MR. ZELINSKI: In that case, Madam President, I would...

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dudley was not aware he would be giving the report tonight. I was under the impression that Mr. Stork would be here later. Is there anyone on Personnel who could give...Mr. Gaipa, you were at the meeting. Can you shed any light on #5?

MR. GAIPA: What is the question?

MR. ZELINSKI: What is the dollar amount for each one of the categories that is affected here as far as the increase?

MR. GAIPA: You mean how much insurance they will have?

MR. ZELINSKI: Each one, yes.

MR. GAIPA: If you look in the annual budget or the annual report, you would find out what the various people are making in salaries, that's their insurance. I don't know. That did not come-up at all in our meeting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: I think that actually a resolution of this kind should incorporate the amount of coverage here and being it doesn't, I would Move that we send this back to Committee until we get that and I so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski has made a Motion to send this back to Committee. It's been Seconded. Several Seconds. We are now speaking to sending this item back to Committee. Any speakers on sending this back to Committee?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I'm highly in favor of sending this back to Committee. I think it's very vague the information that we have. I'm also very surprised. I would like to know how long we have been paying insurance for elected officials. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. We are now speaking to sending this back to Committee.

MR. RYBNICK: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion has been made to Move the question. The question is on returning this back to Personnel Committee. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. No votes, please raise your hands. Not sufficient.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: I don't think that we should send this back to Committee. I was at that meeting, and the way I understood it to be, the cost associated with this, we all got that information, is going to be like \$200 this year and \$800 next year, and I really think it's superfluous as what the total insurance coverage is. I think, right now, they are only covered up to \$10,000, and what this would do is raise it to the lowest thousand. So, if the Mayor is making \$45,200 dollars, he would be covered for \$45,000 which, I think, most businesses and we are supposed to run our City like a business, they insure their people up to the lowest thousandth also. I would be opposed to sending this back because I think it would just be a waste of time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Jachimczyk.



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. ZELINSKI: I partially agree with Rep. Jachimczyk; however, in a corporation, the corporation hires employees. I would like to point-out that these are elected and appointed officials; people that are being paid by the taxpayers as far as their salaries and they are non-employees of the City, and I am also surprised that they are even covered for the insurance, and I really feel that this should be sent back so we can have a dollar amount as far as what they are getting now, and also, what they would be getting in the future if there is a stipulation that they will have an annual increase because then we're not only talking about only \$220 between April and June or \$883 next year, but this is when your term insurance increases as each individual gets older. We could be talking about thousands of dollars in the near future, and I hope this goes back to Committee. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to the Motion to return this to Committee. Being no further speakers, we'll use a machine vote. All in favor of returning this back to Committee, vote yes. If you're opposed, vote no. Has everyone voted? The Motion to return to Committee is DEFEATED by a tie-vote 17 affirmative, 17 negative, 0 abstaining, and 2 not-voting.

We are now going back to the original Motion. Mr. Stork has just arrived. We now have 38 members present. Mr. Stork, we are on item #5 under your Committee; proposed resolution for the adjustment of group life insurance. We just defeated a Motion to send this back to Committee. I'll give you a couple of minutes to get your papers together. Mr. Dudley has done a fine job giving your report. Maybe you have something else to shed on the light of this item #5, under your Committee. The Motion was defeated by a tie-vote 17 - 17, Mr. Wider, to send back to Committee. We are now back to the original Motion.

MR. STORK: The Motion was defeated to return to Committee. What is the original Motion then?

PRESIDENT SANTY: #5 on your Agenda.

MR. STORK: It was held. That's all I can tell you about it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dudley gave the Committee report that it was passed 5 - 0.

MR. STORK: I beg your pardon.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We'll let you catch your breath. Do you want to give your report? Do you have anything further to add to what Mr. Dudley added?

MR. STORK: No, I'm sure he did a fine job.

MR. DUDLEY: The only thing I would like to find out is maybe he can answer some of the questions that came-up already.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski was interested in the dollar amount. Can you give the dollar amounts, Mr. Stork?

MR. GAIPA: While Mr. Stork is perusing his papers, I wonder if I could give a little discusson on the subject of insurance. Mr. Zelinski made a wild statement saying that term insurance is going to be costing the City thousands of dollars more as these people go up in salary. We're talking about a half-dozen people here, and I challenge such a statement.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. GAIPA: (continuing) The principal factor here which gave rise to this resolution is the fact that these people, this handful of people, are the only ones in the entire City whose insurance has not been adjusted since 1972. Everybody else, classified, unclassified, and what have you, is covered by insurance based on their salary except these half-dozen people. It seems like an equitable and just thing to do to bring these people in with everybody else in the City. It's ~~in-material~~ *immaterial* whether they're elected or not. They are working for the City of Stamford. They are covered under the City of Stamford's other plans and benefits in terms of group life insurance, and so put them on the same basis that everybody else is on. That was merely the purpose of the resolution.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Gaipa. Mr. Stork, do you have anything on this item on your Agenda?

MR. STORK: The question was cost?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. STORK: The amount of insurance would be to the lowest thousand of their annual salary.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you. In reference to the increase in cost, let us point-out that with term insurance, if the benefit remains the same, Mr. Gaipa, the premium goes up as the age of the individual increases. Maybe Mr. Zelinski was a little bit over-zealous in saying it would be thousands of dollars, but it is a fact that with term insurance, if the benefit remains the same and the age of the individual increases, the premium goes up. How much it goes up depends upon the death benefit they will receive and their age.

It's customary to give one time life or two times life. It depends upon the corporation. Some corporations pay their factory workers \$5,000 in life insurance benefits and \$10,000 for their weekly salary people. Some pay them one times their annual salary. It depends upon the corporation. There's no standard in any industry.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. STORK: Madam President, I'm told that there is still a question as to the actual cost.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Why don't you give your report on that item.

MR. STORK: All I would say to the question of what the actual cost of this will be, it would take it through the end of this fiscal year plus the next fiscal year. It would be \$1,103.51.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President, to Mr. Gaipa, I'm going to have it clarified if this life insurance coverage terminates with the termination of these elected and appointed terms?



PERSONNEL COMMITTEE: (Continued)

MR. GAIPA: Yes, when they cease their association with the City of Stamford, their coverage ceases. They do have, I would imagine, a 30-day period to convert if wanted to into a permanent insurance.

MR. DeLUCA: I'd like to Move the question, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. All in favor of Moving the question which is adoption of the proposed resolution #5 under Personnel, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to Move the question. We're going to Move to a machine vote. If you agree with the resolution and you approve final adoption, please vote yes. If you disagree, vote no. Has everyone voted? The resolution has been ADOPTED 26 affirmative, 8 negative, 1 abstention, and 4 not-voting.

MR. DUDLEY: This concludes the report of the Personnel Committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE - Chairman Gerald Rybnick

(1) REPORT - No report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We all have our cards for the new parking machine. No problems? Mr. Gaipa received his card tonight.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Elizabeth Gershman

(1) REPORT - No report.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons John Boccuzzi & Barbara McInerney

(1) THE MATTER OF UNLIMITED SICK LEAVE for non-union administrators; and the matter of necessary adjustments to liberal VACATION LEAVE to be examined and considered - submitted by Robert "Gabe" DeLuca 3/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. McINERNEY: The Committee will be meeting 6:30 this Wednesday with Mr. Barrett in the Republican Caucus Room, and we will have a report next month on this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

PETITIONS - NONE

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING MR. MILTON SCHIEBEL, 26 Main Street, Apt. 9-W, for saving a man's life by rescuing a man from a burning vehicle. Submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville, 6th District Representative 3/15/83.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: So Moved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and several Seconds. All in favor of this resolution, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESFebruary 9, 1983 Special Meeting

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are there any additions or corrections to the February 9th Minutes as received in the mail?

A Motion has been made and Seconded to accept the February 9th Minutes. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? No opposition.

March 7, 1983 Regular Meeting

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have not received March 7th.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - NONEOLD BUSINESS - NONENEW BUSINESS

- (1) INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT UNDER SECTION 204.2 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD - submitted by Reps. Philip R. Stork (R-15) and John J. Hogan, Jr. (D-12). Resolutions submitted also.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, do you want to put that in a Motion?

MR. STORK: We have two resolution<sup>s</sup>, Madam President. I imagine the proper one to begin with would be the one concerning the investigation itself under Section 204.2, and I would so Move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded with a resolution dated March 15th concerning the establishment of a Special Investigating Committee under provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford to investigate the Public Works Department of Stamford, Connecticut; bearing in mind that 27 votes are necessary to form this Investigating Committee. Mr. Stork, as maker of the Motion, would you like to speak?

MR. STORK: Yes, I certainly would. From my point-of-view, Madam President, my interests in this proposed investigation, specifically, concerns two matters. #1 is the matter that was brought to this Board's attention by Mr. Zelinski, and concerns the matter of improper use of fuel within the Public Works Department, and the second matter concerning the death of Mr. Ray Eagen last December.



NEW BUSINESS: (Continued)

MR. STORK: (continuing) Concerning Mr. Eagen, that is a kind of personal commitment that I made to his family. His wife and his daughter both contacted me on New Year's Day and said that they were not convinced that all of the truth concerning their husband and father's death has been made known. They believe, and they have some reasons to believe, and they have convinced me that there may have been some reasons that he should not have been where he was at work.

I asked them a direct question, "Would you like this looked-into by the Board of Representatives?" They both said, emphatically, "yes," and that was my promise to them that I would do what I could to bring the matter before the Board. That's all I have to say at this time, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. We have a long list of speakers.

MR. BONNER: Over the last period of time, there are several items I have heard. One has to do with personnel, treatment of personnel. One has to do with the fuel and another one with the safety.

First of all, on the Personnel, we have a Personnel Department working for the City. I would like it asked this question, "First, have we had a report from the Personnel Department as to the treatment of personnel in the Public Works Department?" May I ask that question of the Chairman?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you asking that question of Mr. Stork?

MR. BONNER: Yes, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: I would say no to that, but that would certainly be a part of this Committee's work.

MR. BONNER: It would seem that we should have that report; also, do we have a report from OSHA on this accident, Mr. Stork?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, can you answer this question?

MR. STORK: No, I don't have an OSHA report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Since Mr. Hogan is also a co-author of this Motion, Mr. Hogan can you address those questions?

MR. HOGAN: Just to answer Mr. Bonner; yes, Mr. Bonner, there is an OSHA report available.

MR. BONNER: Is it conclusive as far as you are concerned?

MR. HOGAN: It's conclusive inasmuch as it addresses only the accident case that happened, and does not address other conditions that allegedly exist in the Public Works Department.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. This also is a matter; I'm not acquainted with this particular question, but do we have a safety department in the City, and has the safety department given a report on this matter?

NEW BUSINESS: (Continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, Mr. Stork?

MR. HOGAN: In answer to your question, Mr. Bonner, to my knowledge, the answer is no.

MR. BONNER: No, that we do not have a safety department, and that we do not...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe could answer that question.

MRS. HAWE: I know concerning the safety department, we don't have a safety department, and I know that the Commissioner of Public Works is proposing that we create a position for a safety officer, but as of now, there is none in the City.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. BONNER: Before I would be able to vote for or recommend a Special Investigating Committee, I would like to hear the report from OSHA and also from the Personnel Department who are paid persons to investigate this kind of a program. These are professional people. I think we as the Board of Reps should know what their reports are before we go off on an investigation committee of our own. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. There are eight (8) more speakers. The Motion has been made. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We'll have to use the machine because it takes a two-thirds vote. If you are in favor of Moving the question, vote yes. If you're against Moving the question, vote no. Has everyone voted? We are now voting on Moving the question. The Motion to Move the questions has been DEFEATED 21 yes, 17 no, 0 abstaining and 1 not-voting. We'll continue with the question.

MR. DeLUCA: If permissible at this time, I would like to make a Motion to have the President set-up a Special Committee to hold an informal inquiry regarding problems in the Public Works Department, and at that time, if any irregularities occur, then a Special Investigation <sup>NG</sup> Committee should be set-up with subpoena powers.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Point of Order. It's out-of-order, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, I have to go along with that. It was a good try, Mr. DeLuca, but your Motion was out-of-order.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: We're paying attention, Gabe. Thank you, Madam President. It's beyond the scope of my imagination why people in this Administration specifically, the Mayor and others, have sought to politicize an investigation of the Public Works Department. Firstly, the request appears to be a bi-partisian request by two very astute colleagues. Secondly, the matters that they have brought forth to our attention are indeed serious matters some of which have not yet been addressed by anybody.



NEW BUSINESS: (Continued)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing) There is a cloud that hangs above the Public Works Department which must be cleared-up. Under normal circumstances, when a cloud is raised upon an individual's integrity, one is generally in favor of an investigation; or an inquiry to clear-up their reputation. It is beyond me why there is such a negative attitude coming from the Administration for this investigation which would, of course, be made up I'm sure of members of both parties; of intelligent objective individuals who would only be looking for the facts and certainly not looking to politicize something such as this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I'll be very brief, Madam Chairman, that this is simply a request to make use of a method made available to this Body by the Charter of the City to Stamford to ascertain the validity of certain allegations made concerning a certain City department.

I will not attempt to go into detail on this item because I am sure that you along with my colleagues are all familiar with the contents of the proposal. One thought I would like to leave with you is that at no time did either Mr. Stork or myself allude to this as being politically motivated. That thought was interjected and came from City officials who evidently feel it necessary to use this as a defense against the proposed investigation.

This proposal, if adopted, will give not only the members of this Board who are seeking answers to questions the opportunity to ask those questions, but it would also give the department involved a platform from which to respond and present their side of the story. I am truly sorry that this has become political in nature for if this proposal is defeated, then I feel that the only ones who still have, and who remain with doubts are the people of Stamford. Thank you very much for your time, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MRS. HAWES: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the question. There are five (5) more speakers. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Nos, please raise your hands. We're going to continue.

MRS. CONTI: I shouldn't be on the list.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: I have nothing to say. I'm just listening.

MR. BLAIS: Madam Chairman, I was going to Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made. Is there a Second to Moving the question?

MRS. GUROIAN: It's too early. Nothing has happened since the last time it was Moved.



NEW BUSINESS: (Continued)

MR. BLUM: Mr. Blum is not moving the question. Mr. Blum wrote a letter to this Board in regards to Mr. Raymond Eagen, asking the reasons why Mr. Raymond Eagen happened to be in that position at the time of the accident. I'm very much in favor of this investigation because truly, the OSHA report on that machinery has not really come out. A question in OSHA is, "What were the past OSHA records on that particular machine." Those are the questions, and why was Mr. Eagen at that machine when he was working on light-duty? I wholeheartedly support this investigation so we can find out the facts as to how Mr. Eagen happened to be at that point at that time? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'm in favor of the investigation, Madam President, for many reasons. First of all, why is there a gag-rule where you cannot talk to any of the department heads or workers without going through the Public Works? Is it true that someone was asked to change the report on the death of Mr. Eagen? Who authorized or who allegedly asked who to change? I'd like to know why the Personnel Department first objected to the method of appointing a person, and then later on, backed-off from his objections that were so strong at first? I'd like to know why two people accused of the same crime are both supposed to be guilty when one gets a slap on the wrist, and the other one gets fired? I would like to know if it's true in the Highway Department if a person cannot drive a truck, he's transferred to the garbage collection. If he doesn't want to go, he loses his job. Is that true?

I would like to know why a department head is disgraced and reduced in his department, and then, later on, given back his job and then retired at a pension at a job he first held. If the person was guilty, why bring him back and give him his full pension? Maybe it was a fact that the person was accused of something that he really didn't do. These are only some of the things that I would like to have looked into. I would like to know if the OSHA report is really a full report? Who up at OSHA authorized the report, and was it a true report? I would like to know why the Commissioner of Public Works and the Mayor ~~is~~<sup>are</sup> scared of an investigation? If you're not scared of something, you go ahead and have it and prove a point, but if you're scared of something, you try to get people to vote against it so nobody looks into the matter.

I'd like to know why a certain person in Public Works was given 1500 gallons of gas and nobody wants to say who gave him permission to get the gas? I think that these are all facts that should be straightened-out; should be investigated. You can't have an inquiry if you have a gag-rule. You can't have an inquiry if a person is brought-up before the Committee, even the Public Works Committee, when they know their job is in jeopardy, or if they are subpoenaed and have to tell the truth, then that's a different story.

I think if you want to vote against the investigation, you are proving one thing; the Administration doesn't want it. They're scared of an investigation, and the only people who will vote against an investigation are those people who are willing to push items under the rug just to save the Administration.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.



NEW BUSINESS: (Continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK: First of all I am going to say, I don't want anything pushed under the rug. I'm all for an inquiry. I do believe the authors of this question before us should certainly have the preliminary information when questioned by Mr. Bonner, indicated that apparently, they do have. I would certainly think they would have this information by responsible City departments before we consider such a drastic step, and such a formal step as an investigation. Can't we ask these questions? Must we clothe it in a formal investigation? No one is trying to hide anything. Everyone wants the inquiry. The point is we don't feel it is ready for a formal investigation until preliminary inquiry indicates there is a real problem; then, I'm sure you wouldn't have any problem with such a request. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MR. DONAHUE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made to Move the question. Is there a Second? Seconded. All in favor of Moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Only one no. We're going to Move the question. The question is on an investigation of the Public Works Department under Section 204.2 of the Charter of the City of Stamford.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, a Roll Call vote. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of a Roll Call vote, please say aye. We'll have a Roll Call vote. I ask for two Tellers to come forward. 27 votes are required per Section 204.0 of the Charter. We'll now proceed with a Roll Call vote. Mr. Wiederlight, are you ready? 27 per the Charter. Mr. Stork is ready. Continue with the Roll.

MS. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: When the Tellers finish their tally, would you please come forward. The Motion has been DEFEATED by a vote of 24 affirmative, 12 negative, 2 abstentions, and 2 absent.

ADJOURNMENT:

MR. DONAHUE: I make a Motion to adjourn. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before we entertain to adjourn, I remind you to please clean your desks before you leave. All in favor of adjourning, please say aye. Opposed? Meeting is adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

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

APPROVED:

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