

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED SPECIAL BUDGET MEETING

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 1983

17th Board of Representatives  
Stamford, Connecticut

A SPECIAL MEETING of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, was held on Wednesday, May 11, 1983, having been adjourned from the previous evening, Tuesday, May 10, 1983, pursuant to a "CALL" issued by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, 2nd Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut 06904.

The meeting was Called to Order at 9:00 P.M. by President Jeanne-Lois Santy. The CALL was for 7:00 P.M., and both political parties met in caucus preceding the Call to Order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG was led by President Jeanne-Lois Santy.

ROLL CALL:

CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE: My Fellow Representatives, it is very important for the recorder that you turn your mike on and be so kind as to answer. I appreciate it. Thank you.

There were 38 present, and 2 absent. Absent were Rep. Barbara McInerney, excused due to a family problem, and Rep. Gerald Rybnick, excused due to illness.

The President declared a QUORUM.

TEST OF THE MACHINE:

PRESIDENT SANTY:

We will now proceed to a machine test vote. Please use your YES button on the machine and make sure your light is on. Has everyone voted YES? Will everyone please vote NO? Mr. Blum, would you vote NO, please? Will everyone please use the ABSTAIN button? Has everyone voted ABSTAIN? The machine is in good working order as of this minute.

PRESIDENT SANTY read the CALL of the MEETING (same as appears on Page 1 of the Tuesday, May 10, 1983 Minutes).

PRESIDENT SANTY: I will now call upon Mr. John Hogan, Co-Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, to continue with the Fiscal Committee Report.

Note: The May 10th and May 11, 1983 tapes were in the Law Department for several weeks before being transcribed. WSTC copied May 10th. The tapes were returned; and May 10, 1983 are back there as of now (11/14). The tape recorder malfunctioned at times both nights and the spool got stuck and did not move occasionally, with either the cassette itself causing the problem, or both the tape and the machine.



FISCAL COMMITTEE BUDGET REPORT - Co-Chairman John Hogan

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives met on Saturday, the 10th, in Executive Session, and discussed the Operating Budget for the Board of Education, as transmitted to us by the Board of Finance. Present at the meeting were Co-Chairperson Marie Hawe, Mrs. Betty Conti, Mr. Joseph Franchina, Mrs. Goldstein, Mr. Jerry Livingston, and Mr. John Roos, as well as myself. Mr. Burt Flounders had been excused due to an earlier commitment. Mr. Donahue did not participate in the deliberations because of a possible conflict-of-interest.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, may I interject here that Mr. Donahue has left the floor and he will not partake in the debate, and will not vote on this budget. The record will so state.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OPERATING BUDGET:

MR. HOGAN: The Committee met and this was part of an on-going all-day session. After we finished the Operating Budgets for the City, we took up the BOARD OF EDUCATION BUDGET. The Chair called for a Motion on the Operating Budget for the Board of Education. This is found on Page 124 of your blue book, the large blue book....

MR. LIVINGSTON: Lois, I'd like to give a Minority Report. There were only two people who voted against it. (The other remarks are inaudible.)

MR. HOGAN (continuing): Page 124, as you can see, under the Mayor's Request is listed as \$56,722,334. This was reduced by the Board of Finance and transmitted to us...this was reduced in the amount of \$1,000,000, so that the last line should read, and if it doesn't, you can pencil it into your books as \$55,700,000 even.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, would you give that total again? The page number, so everyone can follow it, please.

MR. HOGAN: It is in our large blue budget book that the Clerk held up, and it is on Page 124, the original request was for \$56,722,334. It was reduced by the Board of Finance and transmitted to us with a figure of \$55,700,000 even. This, in effect, made a cut of \$1,022,334.

The Fiscal Committee Co-Chairperson called for a Motion for action on the Board of Education Budget as transmitted to the Board of Representatives. A Motion was made in the amount to reduce the figure of \$55,700,000 by \$3.8 Million. I will repeat it again, the Chair, <sup>called</sup> for action on the Board of Education request for \$55,700,000. A Motion was made and Seconded that the request be reduced in the amount of \$3.8 Million.

The Chair then proceeded to ask if there were any remarks. There were remarks made by one member of the Committee directed to the cut, after which the Chair again asked if there were any remarks; there being no further remarks, the Chair then called for a vote. The vote was as follows: there were 3 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention. The Chair then declared that the Motion had failed, and a further discussion ensued.



FISCAL COMMITTEE BUDGET REPORT (continued):

MR. HOGAN (continuing): After a discussion on the methods and the monies involved, the Chair called for a vote on the \$3.8 Million again. The results of this vote were 3 in favor of the cut, and 4 opposed. The Chair then declared the vote to be lost.

There were a number of other figures advanced; there were nine or ten figures advanced, ranging all the way from \$300,000 up to the \$3.8 Million. All of these failed to achieve the necessary majority. The Motion was made finally, in the amount of \$1,000,000 reduction. This Carried. I'm sorry, the Chair then asked for a discussion, and then called for the vote. This Carried by a vote of 4 in favor and 3 opposed. The Chair declared it a vote and so ordered in the amount that the Fiscal Committee is recommending to be deleted, or reduced; I'm sorry, the amount that we were reducing the \$55,700,000 is by \$1 Million, for a total of \$54,700,000, and I so Move you, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a Motion on the floor, the Fiscal Committee's recommendation that the Board of Education Budget be cut \$1,000,000 from what was received from the Board of Finance, bringing that total to \$54,700,000. Is there a Second? Several Seconds. The first to speak, I have four speakers, the first to speak is Mr. Livingston.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. Being a member of the Fiscal Committee, the ordeal we went through Saturday was, to put it mildly, somewhat of a challenge; but, however, I strongly feel that the \$1 Million cut that is being offered by the Fiscal Committee would do extreme damage to our educational system as we know it today.

We went through our entire budget last night, and I believe that if we were to average it out, I believe that we took less than 1% on all of the other departments combined.

Madam President, since I have the floor, and I, too, believe that our educational system should tighten its belt just as we have asked our other departments to tighten their belts, but at the same time, we have asked our other departments to tighten their belts to the tune of less than 2%. Therefore, I feel that I would be in order that if I offer a cut that would reflect slightly more than 1%, to the tune of \$700,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is that a Motion?

MR. LIVINGSTON: That is a Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? Seconded. Do you have anything further to speak to on that Motion, Mr. Livingston? No. Mr. Livingston has an amendment to the Motion for a reduction in the Board of Education budget to \$700,000. Next to speak is Mr. Franchina.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. FRANCHINA: I would like to amend Mr. Livingston's Motion. Before I amend it, I would like to say that I feel we owe it to the already over-taxed people to check-and-balance this budget as best we can, being sure at all times that we are prudent and do nothing to jeopardize our public school system.

The Mayor, if you recall, had asked all departments to come in with as close to a zero increase as possible; and on Fiscal, we did receive a tight budget from all departments, with the exception of the Board of Education; and they proposed an almost 10% increase.

Many schools have closed over the last several years, since 1973 to the projected 1983 enrollment, we have lost over 7,500 pupils. What happened to the savings realized from these facts? In just two years alone, this budget has soared to an increase of approximately \$11 Million, and by reducing the proposed budget to the near level of the current school year budget, with a recommendation that more emphasis be placed in using the taxpayers' money more efficiently.

We can have programs designed to meet the needs of all of students and not a select few. We must make sure that all of our students are prepared to be productive citizens upon graduating.

We want a better school system, but we must let the Board of Education know that more is not better. One of the finalist candidates for the superintendency in Stamford, a Dr. Peter A. Barile, Jr., stated "financial pressures are nation-wide. You have to demonstrate to a community that you are showing a willingness to tighten the belt when necessary."

Dr. Barile also stated, "I have been able to accomplish a lot of improvement in Instruction without having to spend an awful lot of money," and if he can do it, so can we. We are sure the Board of Education can accomplish what is needed to serve the community in a two-fold way.

One, to educate its children; and two, to be a watchdog over the community's fiscal well-being. Based on this, I move to amend Mr. Livingston's Motion by deleting the amount of \$3.8 Million from the proposed Board of Education budget, leaving a balance of \$51,900,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a Second to that Motion? Several Seconds. We have an amendment on the floor, \$3.8 Million from the original Board of Finance cut to \$55,700,000. Is that your figure, Mr. Franchina? Give me the total after your amendment cut.

MR. FRANCHINA: After the amendment cut? \$51,900,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have two amendments on the floor to the Main Motion. According to Robert's Rules, that is all that are entertained at this time. You can speak to either one of those amendments. You have a Motion, a primary amendment, and a secondary amendment. We will be addressing those.

MR. LIVINGSTON: On my Point of Information, Madam President, don't you think Mr. Franchina's amendment slightly alters the Main Motion?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, all the amendments do a little, but I am going to entertain those amendments.....

MR. LIVINGSTON: But that is a little bit more than a little, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: But I am going to say it is a proper amendment before the Board. Next to speak is Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President, I actually just had a question for Mr. Hogan on the proceedings that the Fiscal Committee had at their meeting on Saturday. However, in his fine professional manner, as usual, Mr. Hogan was able to answer my question in his presentation, and I thank him for taking the time to explain what happened on Saturday.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam President, I would like to speak in support of the amendment to reduce the budget to \$51,900,000, which is basically the same as last year. I believe that this is necessary. I believe that this is fair because I believe that the budget requested this year ranges from \$4,400 per pupil to \$4,772 per pupil per year. I'll repeat that: \$4,772 per pupil per year. This is a document which I have on my desk. My own calculations were \$4,400, and it is in that bracket.

I would just have to compare this with the whole process of education in the United States. There has been a survey made throughout the United States, and it is found that many of the people, 37%, are actually desiring to go to schools outside the city schools. Now this means there is competition for the city schools. I favor the city schools. I think we have to do a better job on the city schools, but when 37% are favoring outside education, then I think we have to look at what we've got; and here are some of the figures that they have found to exist.

I would like to read a few articles. Realizing that the newspapers are not correct completely, they do indicate a trend, and there is a large trend, but I think the trend is large enough to indicate that the \$4,000 plus dollars per student is much higher than it should be.

For instance, going from the top, which is the Phillips Academy in Andover, the tuition there for boarding and everything is \$8,900 per year. However, the Christian schools, according to the American Association of Christian Schools, averages \$850. Now that is quite a bit; realizing that the tops include board, room, and everything else, and profit; and real estate costs, in other words, capital costs; and realizing, of course, that some of the Christian schools may be supported by the Christian organizations. However, there are more documents here.

The Los Angeles Baptist High School with 775 students, has a tuition of \$1,700, and has a very tough academic reputation. I remind you again that is \$1,700 a year versus our \$4,400.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. BONNER (continuing): I would <sup>then</sup> read a little further in another article: "The average cost per student for non-sectarian, this is non-church schools, but private schools, is about \$5,000 per year. Now this includes profit and the capital costs also, and our figure is not much lower than that for only education. The Catholic schools vary from \$600 to \$1,000 a year, so you see, and I'll keep the report as brief as that, because I think this is the trend that we're seeing, that we find schools that are competing with our city schools, are competing at a much lower cost, and doing a good job. Therefore, Madam President, I would support the amendment made for the total of \$51,900,000; and also I would like to state that The Stamford Taxpayers Association also approves and recommends an equivalent amount, and they represent a good portion of the people in this City. Thank you very much, Madam President.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to support the Stamford Taxpayers Association recommendation to us, also. Therefore, I am supporting Mr. Franchina's Motion to set this budget at \$51,900,000.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman, I'm really curious as to where Mr....I say this rhetorically, as to where and how Mr. Franchina pulled the figure of \$3.8 Million to cut. I really think that such a cut would truly be the death knell to our system, and we have a very fine system.

We have a fine system because we have supported the system through excellent teachers and through funding good educational budgets, and that means paying for education. You get what you pay for.

We will not have computer programs; we will not have programs for the gifted and programs to help the slower children if we don't fund it. We will not have fine programs for our average children if we don't fund them.

I have heard several members say on the floor and in caucus, and while speaking informally, that they are upset that the Board of Education's budget has gone up about 10%. The Board of Education has included the teachers' salary increases in their budget.

The teachers' salaries make up about 80% of the Board of Education budget. Had we voted on the budget last night, a City budget, that included other municipal employees, our budget would have gone up not the 2% or 3% that we spoke about, but 14%, so that when we compare City budgets and Board of Education budgets, let's be fair and let's compare like with like. I hope this \$3.8 Million cut does not pass, and I hope that Mr. Livingston's recommended Motion goes on to succeed on the floor. Thank you.

MR. BLAIS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I am here tonight discussing the Board of Education budget, and thinking that we have a fine professional staff that submitted the best budget in the City to the Board of Representatives, and a very fine professional staff in the Board of Education, and if they say that they need \$56 Million, I have no reason to disbelieve that. These people have no sinister motives. Their sinister motives are to help your children, your neighbor's children, and the children down the street, no sinister motive. They are not asking for One Dollar more than they think they need. I firmly believe that.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. BLAIS (continuing): But there is something else that always strikes me. The Mayor, who ultimately recommends the budget to us, first of all, he chose for his other City departments, not to include salary hike, to give the appearance that these line item budgets that he has direct control over, are coming in at a no increase; yet the Education Budget was presented to us with the labor increases in the budget; thus, giving the image of having a much higher percentage increase than the rest of the Operating Budget. In fact, the way this whole budget has went, I think that if the Mayor were up there instead of Mrs. Santy, we couldn't have it better.

He didn't have the guts to cut the Education Budget in an election year, and he is making us do his dirty work. The Mayor chopped everything else. He didn't cut Education! He used a meat cleaver on everything else. But he didn't cut the Education budget, no! Because he's got lackeys in the Board of Representatives to do that for him.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blais. I would ask the Representatives to please keep their remarks to the pending amendments and motions. I would ask that all of you please do that. Next to speak is Mr. Jachimczyk.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: Thank you, Madam President. I do not believe that it is fiscally prudent to support the drastic cuts proposed in the amendment by Mr. Franchina. We have a legitimate right to be concerned about the amount of money being spent on education. We also are entrusted with the duty of insuring a better future for our community and our children. To indiscriminately and irresponsibly slash the Board of Education budget, which is what we would be doing because we have no guarantee that if we did cut the budget by \$3.8 Million that the right cuts would take place.

We have no guarantee that some of the administrative fat on Hillandale Avenue would be taken out, because they are the people who make the decisions about what gets cut. The students and the teachers, the real people who make up our educational system, would have no say in the matter of belt-tightening. In our community, our students would suffer, and I would hope that we would not cut the budget at all, except the budget as proposed to us by the Board of Education. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. At the beginning of Mr. Franchina's little talk to support his motion, he mentioned that the Board of Education was coming in with a 10% increase in their budget from last year to this year. Through you, Madam President, to Mr. Franchina, I have a question. Out of that apparent 10% increase, Mr. Franchina, what percentage is mandated salaries as a result of contractual obligation?

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

MR. FRANCHINA: Absolutely. Two per cent (2%). It was an approximate ten per cent (10%). I didn't say exactly ten per cent.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Well, to be specific, the Board of Education is now coming in with a budget of 7.3% more than last year. From \$51.9 Million to \$55.7 Million, that is 7.3%. Of that per cent, 5% are salary increases, exactly \$2.6 Million. The remaining per cent is approximately 1.6% other mandated increases that go along with these salary increases, specifically, your medical premiums, security payments of \$450,000.

Then Transportation of \$150,000, and equipment and materials are \$330,000, which adds up to \$930,000, or 1.6% of the 7.3% that the Board of Education is asking for. I don't see any fat in that. The salaries are there, and along with the salaries comes the support of costs. Certainly not a 10% promiscuous increase.

Let's go on. What are we going to do to the school system if we approve a \$3.8 Million reduction? First, let's take a look at the teachers. Any body who is involved with the Behavioral Sciences in industry will tell you, what is the most important thing to a worker? Not how much money they are making, but job security. Do our teachers have job security? Every year their jobs are up in the air it seems when it comes before us for budget. They don't know whether they'll be here next year, or will they get RIFED, I think that is the expression.

It's a terrible thing for somebody with responsibility not to know in September if they'll be teaching here. What does it mean to that person? They want job security. They are going to go to a school system that offers it, and they don't have to go too far.

I'll tell you a little story. Just recently I was indeed fortunate to attend a regional music concert in Ridgefield, Connecticut, <sup>in</sup> which my daughter participated. Here, one of the teachers leading one of the choruses singing, a teacher that was teaching in our school system last year, that said hey, I'd better get out while the getting is good. We lost this teacher because this teacher had no job security, feared for his job. What a shame! Are we going to do that again? Madam President, I'd like some order over there. Are we going to do that again, year after year? And we are killing our school system. We are driving our good teachers out. Our young teachers who are coming out, coming out of college are teachers with two, three and four years of experience; the teachers who have learned the newest methods of teaching. We are not going to have them. Madam President, members of the Board, a \$3.8 Million cut to this budget would devastate the school system. It is a financially irresponsible number, one that is simply picked out of the air with no support, and I urge my Board members not to even think about that number. Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I sit here, this is my sixth year that I have had the pleasure, I consider it a pleasure and an honor, to spend many hours reviewing budgets, and I enjoy listening to the comments of my colleagues as to why we should or should not support different budgets, I had a long presentation to make this evening, but after listening to some of the earlier comments, excuse me while I just deviate from my own presentation.

My good friend, Mike Wiederlight, talks about a devastating \$3.8 Million cut; talks about job security, RIF security, and that the teachers have had it.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. DeLUCA (continuing): Evidently my good friend does not read the papers, otherwise he would see that autoworkers, steelworkers, all workers, and people in the service industries are being laid off every day. Last week, a force in my division, 28 people were notified that they did not have a job. Some people had worked two years, fifteen years, and the end has yet to come. More lay-offs are projected. Another person, should I say a colleague, or what, has been sitting on this Board for years, at least I thought he was sitting here for the last couple of years with me, yet somehow he makes the statement that the Mayor did not have the guts to cut the Board of Education budget, this person doesn't know that the Mayor doesn't have the right to even look at that budget, that's why I begin to wonder where has this person been sitting for the last couple of years!

We have heard comments that the Board of Education budget includes salaries, and the Mayor's budget did not include salaries. Let us not forget that the Mayor included \$6 Million in Contingency Funds to cover salaries, which the Board of Finance, in their wisdom, found necessary to cut from the budget so we would not have the opportunity to look at, but you can rest assured that \$6 Million will be put back into the computation as they figure out the Mill Rate, and the taxes to be paid by our already-burdened taxpayers.

We have heard comments that the Board of Education motives are not being sinister in making up their budget, that they are being sincere. No one has accused them of being under-handed. It is just that some people who are familiar with budgets, just have a gut feeling from experience, like myself. Every budget has got fat in it, I don't care whose budget it is. Even when I prepare my own budget for my boss, there is fat in there because I know darned well he is going to cut it, and he knows that his boss is going to cut it, and it is going right up to the Chairman of the Board and the Board of Directors, and they are going to cut it.

And since we are more or less the Board of Directors here, we are trying to obtain the results that will benefit everyone. So, please, when you make comments about job security, let's be realistic; and when you make comments about the Mayor, let's be realistic and know what we are talking about before we ramble on.

As far as the Board of Education budget is concerned, too much of everything we are voting for are percentage of funds, from the Coliseum Authority for the Arts who have made passionate, emotional pleas that members will vote 100%, are being lobbied by the elitist lobbyists of Stamford; and it can be attested to the fact that the Board of Education lobbyists are the best. This is their special interest, and I have no complaints about phone calls that I receive. I have no complaints about the harassments, oh yes, I do, about the two-page ad in the paper, complaining that some money should be saved for the Arts, don't do it on my time; soliciting school staffers, and medical staff, during school hours, during school hours, and using time paid for by taxpayers getting money to pay for the ad. Even if they do it after hours, not on my taxpaying money, please.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. DeLUCA (continuing): Talk about the lobbyists, if you were at the public hearing, most of the Fiscal Committee were there, I found it a little confusing at times. I heard people say because our education is deteriorating, people will not come to Stamford, or are leaving Stamford. Yet I have heard other people saying because of our terrific Board of Education system, that our real estate values are fantastically high. I have to believe that because the values went up and the taxes with them, the Education system is fantastic, and it is not deteriorating, and people are not moving out because we have a bad education system.

Let me just quote some facts here that are on the fact sheet put out by the Stamford Public Schools, the Superintendent Jerome Jones. He stated that over the last six years, we have had three presidential scholars, eight (inaudible) in his program, and he goes on to say that Stamford has been consistently in the top five public school systems in the State. Our schools, comprehensive high schools, with an unified curriculum of over 200 courses, all three high schools have two-year accreditations; and he goes on with other fact sheets that Stamford enjoys a Triple A rating because of our education system.

I agree. I am sure if you ask the Mayor, he'll tell you we got a Triple A rating because of his fiscal conservatism and the way he handles the City government, if anybody should reap the benefits of a Triple A rating. We can go on. Always these scholars have been attainers. Over the past six years, if you can recall, we have been making devastating cuts, and I don't see where it has affected our school system. Let's take Westhill High School. in 1981/82, before the devastating cut, we had 17 classes with 30 or more students. We had a devastating \$3.8 Million cut last year. Westhill High School even though <sup>with</sup> they took on some people from Rippowam High, they still only had 17 classes over 30 students.

We keep hearing talk about class-load of 30 that do not get a proper education. I guess I will bore you with the same comment I made last year, or the year before, during my schools years I was with 30 to 35 students and I think most of our classmates did well for themselves. Some went on to college and sat in those classes with sometimes 100 to 150 students in an auditorium, and a lot of these people came out with super grades.

You talk about school ratios and declining enrollment and your staff gets cut. Yup. I don't like to see anybody get cut, yet by the same token, the senior citizens, the young people out there that are crying how can I afford to live in Stamford. Cuts should be made. Look at the Board of Education, if the Research and Development Staff was doing the job, cuts could have been made during the last several years so that cuts shouldn't have to be made at once. (Tape changed here with some loss of dialogue).....by the Board of Education. Using 1978/79 regular student load, which was 7,688 students and 367 regular teachers, this was on the elementary level, we had a ratio of 20.9 to 1.

Using the same ratio of 20.9 to 1, and apply that to projection of 6,000 students for the next school year. This will present you with a ratio of 287 of 20.9 to 1, with a staff of 287, but yet they are projecting a staff of 312.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. DeLUCA (continuing): Here is the same logic applied to the middle schools, and we could come up with a projected staff of roughly 300 people and could do away with 65 people, and have a lower ratio of 15.7, using the same projection basis. I don't want to keep boring you with details about stats in that vein.

Another interesting stat would be to look at 1977/78 of 17,000 students and 170.5 teacher aides. In each year, 1978/79, the student enrollment goes down, but teacher aides climb to the point where for 1983/84, we will have 12,900 students and we are going to have 246 teacher aides. I don't know, is this proper fiscal management? When everything goes down in business, you start losing, you start cutting, but here it seems that when the enrollment goes down, we increase staff.

I remember, going back about 17 years ago, when I attended a business luncheon at which the State Treasurer of the State of Connecticut was present, and he wanted the people attending to know that if the State Treasury had a surplus, they should lobby for recreation areas, new hospitals, but yet when we end up with a deficit, who ends up paying?

The Board of Education finds it necessary, in times of fiscal crisis, with people being out of work, we find it necessary to come out with \$1,250,000 worth of new programs. Is <sup>this</sup> the time to come out with new programs? One of the new programs happens to be for computers for \$600,000.

I would like to tell you a little story about computers. (A Stuart Bugsby is mentioned here but it is unclear.) What about a computer program that is going to cost us \$600,000, cost the City? I called up one of our vice-presidents of what we call our Brokerage Profit Center, which is a division or department that deals with all of our brokerage houses, i.e., Merrill Lynch, Dean Witter. These people are returning quite a bit of our equipment for more sophisticated equipment. We went to one of our vice-presidents and said, gee, why is this stuff coming back, and we probably are going to dump it because it will not be used by any other customers; why don't you donate it to the Stamford school system? The reply was "No problem", if you can find out if your school system can use the equipment, have them talk to our training expert, a man by the name of Mr. Walters. After a few phone calls, I was able to get ahold of Dr. Saladi, who is supposed to be the expert for the Stamford school system Computer Program. Dean Walters conversed with Dr. Saladi, and the feeling was that the chances are that the school system could use it, and that Dr. Saladi would get back to either one of us.

I told our Vice-President, please, don't scrap anything until we find out. Here it is three minutes before ten on May 11, 1983, and I have never received a call from Dr. Saladi. I told the V.P. to get the equipment and scrap it. In one breath, he tells me they can use it, and this dates back to Feb. 15, 1983. I think that if you really are running an efficient operation, you think of the taxpayers, and if someone is willing to make an offer to you, you do not hesitate to follow through.

Where can cuts be made? How can we come up with the \$4 Million? Let's start by looking at the new programs, to begin with. Last year we seemed to have a game that keeps being played. We close Belltown School. We re-open it.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. DeLUCA (continuing): We close Burdick School. We re-open it. Last year, they were going to close Rippowam School, and now they are going to use it for a Cluster Program, for roughly 150 students, gifted students. The way I look at <sup>it</sup> is and most of the people I talked to also looked at it the same way, that this is a program for a select few, and if your child is gifted, it should not be paid for at the taxpayers' or the public's expense. We have schools out there that you can send these children to.

Why should we pay for 150 students, whereas Rippowam High School, and many of my constituents and other people throughout the City look upon Rippowam High School as the ideal spot for a municipal complex.

Do you realize the money that the City can save if we all went up to Rippowam High School? The members in the gallery would not have to worry about parking; if they want to get a beach permit, they wouldn't have to go up to Cove Island; somebody who wanted to go to the Planning Board would have no problem parking his car; and they would not have to go over to Hoyt Street for a health permit; and it would really be a beautiful workable complex. We can do away with the Computer Program, and there are many other programs you can do away with, without devastating our school system. I guess I have talked long enough. Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. Just to make a few comments in terms of some of the remarks that were made concerning the statements about the financing of individual pupil expenditures. To compare private schools and public schools is always a dangerous thing to do. For one thing, private schools have the luxury of accepting only one type of student. This massively cuts down on the offerings needed, and also the expense.

Although most private schools have some sort of situation by which a lot of the leftover expenses are picked up; for example, to compare the public school system financing with the Phillips Academy, the Phillips Academy has an endowment worthy of Harvard. No way does the individual person that goes there pay anywhere near what his educational expenses are. It is picked up by the endowment there.

Also it must be remembered that the private schools do not have the mandated programs that are needed here in the public schools. The public schools have to, as I say, offer a very wide variety of programs and courses, but you, not only because of the varying student abilities that are going there, you are talking about a comprehensive high school, but even more than that, you now have mandated programs in terms of physically-handicapped, emotionally-handicapped, and so on.

In talking about staffing now, it is just not, when you start talking about staffing a school system, especially a public school system, it is just not a question of how many students you have compared to the number of teachers; you've got a problem here in that you've got students of varying abilities; you've got students of varying needs; and you've got students who need all sorts of remedial courses; you've got students that in fact who are gifted; that is, if you are going to run a comprehensive high school, you have to have a variety of all things, and it goes far beyond in terms of staffing the number of students that you have there.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. WHITE (continuing): For example, many of these mandated programs, mandated by the State for example, or by the Federal Government, you really have a pupil-teacher ratio say of 10 students to one teacher, but this has got to be provided for, and more than that, you've got questions of all sorts of electives, all sorts of offerings, all sorts of homogenous groupings, and so on. It is a far more complex problem than simply a simple matter of numbers of student-teacher ratios. It is a lot more complex than that.

If you are talking about Rippowam High School and the Cluster Program, it will start off with 150 students, but eventually it is going to expand to a four-year high school, so we will have a lot more than 150 students there; and it will not just be only for the gifted. It is offered to students on a variety of levels. There is a gifted program, there is a general program, there is a commercial program, and so on. That's the way it is envisioned. Thank you.

MRS. HAWES: Thank you, Madam President. I was going to comment on a few of the things that have been said, and I will add a little bit, although much has been clarified by Mr. White and Mr. Wiederlight.

I would like to expand a little on what Mr. Wiederlight said about the increases in the budget this year. The increase, as asked for by the Board of Education was \$4.8 Million, and we have to remember that the Board of Education has already reduced that by over \$1 Million, \$1,022,000; and as Mr. Wiederlight stated, and that \$2.6 Million of this just is the negotiated pay increase, so we are not talking about that much of an increase in the budget when you take that into consideration, that includes the contract, the teachers' contract, that we overwhelmingly approved, and also other fixed costs, social security, medical premiums, and things like that.

A smaller percentage of the increase is the new programs, the Cluster Program, the Computer Program, and the Fine Languages in the middle schools, returning that program that was cut out several years ago. I think that we have to remember especially that part about the way that \$2.6 Million for the negotiated salary increases and that this came through Binding Arbitration; also that accounts for a large per cent of this increase; and that is something that we have to keep in mind; and we just can't deny that.

Mr. White spoke about the per pupil cost, and I would like to agree with what he said. When we talk about the cost per pupil, even when we compare the cost in different communities in Connecticut, it can be very deceptive, not only comparing between public schools with private schools. We cannot compare Stamford with other communities. Stamford is very unique. We have a combination of a suburban community and an urban community. We have a larger proportion of handicapped children, and these children require by State mandate, they require Special Education which is very, very expensive. When we add that figure into the cost per pupil, it makes that figure go very, very high.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MRS. HAWE (continuing): We also have to remember, if we are looking at the cost per pupil over the last ten years, that the increased salaries, the increased utility costs, all the general impact of inflation drives this figure up. We have to keep that in mind.

Somebody spoke about lay-offs, and laying off teachers. I don't think that we can, or should, or even would want to compare factories and the auto industry and the steel industry with a school system which is catering to our most precious commodity, which is our children.

Mr. DeLuca, I believe, referred to a chart that we received in our packet from the Board of Education in which they projected the decreases in enrollment in the various schools next year. I would just like to speak a little about that on this page, the Davenport Ridge School, for instance, the actual enrollment for this year is 603 students. Projected for next year is 543 students, and that is a decrease of 60. One might, at first glance, think perhaps that you can eliminate two or three teachers because there will be 60 less kids in that school. But when you think about it a little bit, that is not what happens, because not all 60 of those children are going to come out of the First Grade, or out of the Second Grade, or even 20 of them are not going to come out of the Second Grade or the Third Grade. Probably a few will come out of each grade; some will come out of Special Programs; and there might be a chance that no teacher <sup>at all</sup> can be reduced if only one or two come out of each class, so we just can't take the number that is projected in a declined enrollment and divide that number by children in the class and say that we can cut this many teachers.

I don't say that this school system is not without its problems. I think it has problems. I hope they are being worked on. I also don't believe that, as many on this Board do, that money can buy a good education. I don't believe that, but I do firmly believe that a cut this size that we are talking about now, would do serious damage to Stamford public schools, and I really can't believe that anyone would want to do that, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment. Thank you.

MR. FLOUNDERS: Thank you, Madam President. It's hard to add to what Rep. Hawe and some others have said in support of the lower budget cut, and the rejection of the \$3.8 Million cut. The \$3.8 Million cut, just out-of-hand by this Board, is, in my opinion, unconscionable. I couldn't possibly be a part of it. I implore my colleagues on the Board to reject out-of-hand.

We have heard so many references tonight to, somehow the special insight, the feelings that we have that the Board of Education can absorb these huge cuts. I haven't heard many limits to the amount of cut that the Board of Education presumably can afford to absorb.

Mr. Franchina said that he was sure that the Board of Education could take a \$3.8 Million cut. Mr. Bonner felt that he was sure because Phillips-Exeter Academy at Andover, a heavily-endowed school, as Mr. White so correctly pointed out, had a lower cost per pupil, than we do, a City like us where we have to take care of some \$3.0 Million worth of Special Education pupils, Special Education student costs something like \$16,000 apiece to educate, which I daresay drives up our average per pupil cost. Even the in-district



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. FLOUNDERS (continuing) Special Education students cost us something over \$9,000 per year, almost \$10,000 per year, to educate. These are problems that Phillips-Exeter Academy does not have. These are the problems that Darien does not have. I guess we are supposed to have infinite wisdom, but I just think it is the height of arrogance to assume because we believe, because we perceive that something exists, that it exists. That is so short-sighted. I believe it is also the height of cynicism to believe because I put some fat in my departmental budget for my company, that the Board of Education puts fat equivalent to 8% of its budget. That is a pretty big assumption. In short, to recommend cuts like a \$3.8 Million cut, 7% or 8% of the request is playing Russian Roulette with the kids and with their education. Maybe they're right, maybe these insights, these mystical insights we have, we know in our hearts that is right. We know that the Board of Education is dealing in fat. Oh, we know it. How do we know it? Don't worry how we know it. We just know it.

It's not hard to comment on what that is. That is stupidity. That is ignorance. You know, if we think that this Board of Education is so clever, so conniving, so thoroughly deceptive in their planning, we shouldn't be attacking them just at budget time. If we're really sincere, if we really felt that we had that kind of people on the Board of Education, a new administration that were out there to screw us as a City by stealing from the taxpayers, you know we ought to have a special committee all year long whose only responsibility is to look into the Board of Education all year long and indeed force the Board of Education to start Zero Base Budgeting, and tell the Board of Education that is the only way we are going to do business with them.

Because, otherwise, if this cynicism, if this button, button, who's got the button, of who's lying, and who's telling the truth, if this continues, some year, whether it be this year, or next year, or the year after that, if this continues, somebody's guess is going to be wrong, and we are going to cut the life, the heart, as Sandy Goldstein put it out, of this budget, and there is one group of people hurt, and that is the kids. The kids will be hurt.

I would like to say a kind word for the Board of Education, and that is, and I said it in caucus, and I'll say it out here....

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, please give Mr. Flounders your attention.

MR. FLOUNDERS (continuing): I would appreciate the courtesy that I give you, Rep. Guroian, when you speak, on all that you speak. I have three daughters, who have almost now, sad to say, who are through the school system. Each of them has gotten a magnificent education. I don't think that I could have bought, even if I had been able to afford it, a better education for them anywhere, in private school, or in any school system that I am familiar with.

I think we have done an over-all good job in this City in educating our kids. I want to see that continue. I don't want to, for all the wrong reasons, to do anything that would jeopardize the Board and the job they are doing. Sure they're not perfect, but what the heck, \$700,000 is one thing, but \$3.8 Million is something else. There is a \$3,100,000 difference, which someone should consider, I think, pretty carefully. Please, please, do not vote for a \$3.8 Million cut. It is irresponsible. We should not do it.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. GAIPA: I'm in kind of a box here. I want to make an amendment and I can't, so I guess I'll have to pass, because I want to talk to my amendment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, Mr. Gaipa. Mrs. Conti next.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I don't think I was on the list.

MRS. GUROIAN: I was on the list.

MRS. CONTI: I think Mrs. Guroian is on, not me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your name is on the list. Mrs. Guroian, you are next, after Mrs. Conti.

MRS. GUROIAN: Madam Chairman, just so I won't be ruled out-of-order, I only wish to ask a question. I wish to make a remark about the budgetary procedure as regards the Board of Education, and I would like to know at which time you will allow me to make that remark.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You have the floor, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: But I don't want to be ruled out-of-order, and I don't want to start it and then be ruled out-of-order, so tell me when I can make it and not be ruled out-of-order.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All right, we have two amendments on the floor, and a motion.

MRS. GUROIAN: I am not going to speak to them.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are not speaking to either; all right, we'll put you on....

MRS. GUROIAN: I am going to speak about, I want to make some remarks about the budgetary procedure as regards the Board of Education. I just want to know to know when I can make those remarks

PRESIDENT SANTY: After we vote on the amendments. I'll put you on the list. You will not be ruled out-of-order.

MRS. GUROIAN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mrs. Maihock is next.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like to see the Stamford school system have the reputation that it is in the community with dedicated, well-paid teachers. If any one knows such teachers, then our students can achieve their highest potential. In the world of today, Our country is in a very competitive situation. Its future will depend significantly on how well our coming generations will be prepared to meet this keen competition. The goal for achieving such standards will be a challenge to the students, their parents, and the school system. The school system is entrusted to employ the highest priorities and it holds an awesome responsibility. There are areas in our school systems that desperately need immediate attention, such as redistricting, which has had a very serious negative impact in our district, and certainly has not been beneficial to the education of some of the children. I don't know, judging from the two amendments on the floor, what the proper amount would be to insure the type of education that I have described, but I do hope that our deliberations tonight will achieve that. Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. DIXON: The Board of Education is one of, if not the most important Board of this City. The members are elected by the people; and many, if not all, are taxpayers, so why do we, each year, have to label them as unconcerned with the financial welfare of our City?

I've gone through this 15 times in the past 15 years. What is being said here tonight, is the very same that was said in each of those 15 years concerning the school budget; so I will say, in essence, what I have always said regarding the school budget, which is, if we are concerned about the future of our City, then we must equally be concerned with the quality of education our children are getting for they are the future. The proposed cut that was made, I find it to be very much unrealistic, and I cannot, under any circumstances, support it. Thank you, Madam President.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I know we all have figures running out of our ears. Anyone that comes up with a lot of figures they get from the papers and all other places, but I'm going to speak to what I think is the most important thing. We do have a wonderful City. Stamford is a good City. And I am proud of it. I am proud of our educational system. I think it is one of the best in the country, and I have reason to know about it. I don't have a child in Stamford public schools. They are all out. But, I am a taxpayer, and someone alluded to the Taxpayers Association speaking for the taxpayers. I have news for you. No one has spoken for me and no one can. I am going to speak for myself.

And I will let you know that I am willing to see that my tax dollars go to educate our children, because our children are the most important product we have in the City of Stamford, although we do have quite a number of computer products, our children will be the ones that use them next.

I find it really, I don't know the word for it, when you talk about cutting the budget by \$3.8 Million, I think that this is really a disaster to even think this way in the City of Stamford. Because the people that we educate today will take care of this City; and I just sit here and pray every day that some of them will learn better to do than some of the ways that we are doing now. I would hope that we would support Mr. Livingston's Motion. I would like to see the budget stay intact, but since they do want to make a small cut, I will support Mr. Livingston's Motion, but I cannot support any \$3.8 Million; I think that is out-of-the-question. Thank you.

MR. BLUM: I don't have a lot of figures. I don't know what has happened in this school system that I went through. The other day, I saw an article about what happened 50 years ago, in 1933. A superintendent came to this City from Enfield, Connecticut, by the name of Leon Staples, and he got a big figure of \$6,000 in 1933, and I was in that school system. But from 1933 to today is fifty years, and I am sure we have all seen what has happened in 50 years. I don't know at that time what the school budget was, but I know what some of the teachers were making at the time, and I don't see much of an improvement from 1933 to 1983, and I don't like it.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. BLUM (continuing): A teacher in the years that I went to school started out for \$2,000 a year and they now start out of the great total of \$10,500. That's a great improvement. I don't know how we can say and compare this with even the workers out of the steel factories. I assure you some of the employees in the steel factories make more than a teacher, but that is not what I came here to talk about. I came here to talk about education tonight, to vote against \$3.8 Million cut in Education because I want to see public education go on further; so that my children and other children and grandparents' children will have a better public school education, and only through a quality education will they have better.

Years ago, when children didn't have that opportunity, as my parents did, to have a public school education, many came here to this Land to get public, free education. Let us hope that we continue to give them this type of free education; for to deny them that right to get a good quality education, only will send this Land down to where it was many years ago and I don't want to see that either, so I ask my colleagues today to think, today not yesterday, think today because inflation, we've all suffered from inflation. I would like those public school teachers to get more, for they are entitled to more, for they educate the children to become lawyers, doctors, and to become professionals. Why aren't they entitled to better? I ask you to vote the \$3.8 Million cut down. Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to state I do not support Mr. Livingston's Motion. I do not support Mr. Franchina's Motion. I'm not here on the Board of Representatives to support motions and cuts, just for the sake of cuts.

I do have the opportunity tonight to speak in favor of the Board of Education budget. Last night, I didn't even have the opportunity to speak in favor of the Board of Representatives budget, which was cut, and I know that there was no fat in that budget. I hear people talk about fat in budgets. I don't believe in the principle of cutting because you have to cut. I, too, was there when the deliberations went on in Fiscal. I witnessed why there was an \$1.0 Million cut. It is my opinion, and only my own opinion; that there were members of Fiscal that were strongly opposed to a million dollar cut; and if my memory serves me right, I recall a statement made, which lingered with me, that afternoon after I went home: "Well, we gotta cut because we'll be here all night, so let's agree on something that all of us can at least say we can get something to present to the Board." I respect those Members' opinions, because that was a long deliberation, but I do think it is about time that we decide we are going to take a stance on what we believe in.

I have problems with the Cluster Program, and I have expressed that to the members of the Board of Education. I hope that they will go back and re-think, but I can't take a chance on saying "cut the Board of Education budget \$700,000 because we cut the Operating Budget of the Mayor".

We charge a committee to do a job, and we were charged last night by a majority vote to accept their decision; well, tonight, when I go home, I want to be able to rest a little better than I did last night. And to make a long story short, and I could go on and on, I will not support one cut, one ounce of money from the Board of Education until it is proven to me that it should be cut; and let me state it again for the record, I will not support a \$700,000



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MS. SUMMERVILLE (continuing): cut because we want to get out of here before tomorrow morning. Let's go on like Weicker. Let's filibuster all night. It's the cause that you believe in. For those who believe in a \$3.8 million cut, you have the same rights. I'm not trying to take that away from you. Tonight, however, I am saying to you, the Representative of the Sixth District will not go along with the caucus. Tonight, I will not go along with the majority to get out of here early. I am not going to vote for a cut for the Board of Education. I think that the budget should be left intact. I still also believe that the Board of Finance should not have cut. I don't have that right. But tonight I have a right, and I have a vote, and I will not vote for one cut. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville. Are there any other first-time speakers, before I go on to second-time speakers. Mr. Wiederlight?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Once again I have the dubious task of clearing up some of the supposed facts that have been bandied around here. Firstly, the Cluster Program, as was stated by my colleague, is not for the Gifted. One needs simply look at the brochure that was given to all of the Board of Representatives members about the Cluster Program. Indeed, one cannot say that Typing, Computer Literacy, Introduction to Business, Biology, and Chemistry are for the Gifted.

I do not compare a teacher to an oilworker, or an automobile worker, or a machinist. These people do not educate my children, and my children are my most prized possessions in the world.

Let's talk of these lobbyists, now, these evil lobbyists, who get out there and make telephone calls to us, their elected officials. Who are these lobbyists, this organized group, that lurks in the background behind all of us: mothers, fathers, relatives, working women, wives to husbands, chauffeurs to our children. I salute your efforts. Keep exercising your constitutional rights. It is your prerogative and privilege, and our forefathers fought long and hard for this. Thank you, Madam President.

MR. ZELINSKI: I would like to Move the Question. Seconded by Mrs. Perillo.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before you Move the Question, Mr. Zelinski, we have two speakers left. No, not first-time speakers. Mrs. Signore is first time, and Mr. Franchina also.

MR. ZELINSKI: Sorry, I thought everyone had spoken that wanted to. I withdraw that Motion to Move the Question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Second withdraw the Second? Fine. Thank you.

MRS. SIGNORE: I Move the Question. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the Question, please say AYE. Opposed? Passed Unanimously.

The Motion before us, Ladies and Gentlemen, is Mr. Franchina's secondary amendment to amend the Board of Education Budget to reduce it by \$3.8 Million, bringing the total to \$51,900,000. One moment before you vote, Mr. Stork, do you have a question? We're in the process of a vote.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MR. STORK: I'd like to Move for Roll Call vote. Seconded by several members.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of a Roll Call vote, please say AYE. Opposed? Sufficient for a Roll Call vote. Tellers Wiederlight and Stork, please come forward and pick up your tally sheets. Any other members who would like to tally, please come forward. We will now proceed to a Roll Call vote. I would ask all of the Representatives to please be as quiet as possible. It is very difficult for the Tellers to hear. I would ask the gallery to continue to be as polite as they have been. Mrs. Goldstein?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, what vote will be necessary?

PRESIDENT SANTY: A simple majority. We are voting, to clarify it, on Mr. Franchina's amendment, which is to reduce the Board of Education budget, an additional \$3.8 Million, bringing that total of the Board of Education budget to \$51,900,000. We will proceed with the Roll Call vote.

CLERK OF THE BOARD SUMMERVILLE took the Roll Call vote (see attached Roll Call voting sheet at end of these Minutes).

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Tellers, when they finish the Tally, to come forward, please. The Motion is DEFEATED: 27 Negative; 9 Affirmative, 1 Abstention, 1 Non-Vote; and 2 Absent.

We have another amendment on the floor. There are no further speakers.

MRS. GUROIAN: Do I speak now, or do I wait until....

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you speaking to the amendment, Mrs. Guroian?

MRS. GUROIAN: No, I asked <sup>you</sup> when I should speak, and you said after the vote on the amendments. Now, when am I supposed to speak, now or later?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, I have your name down. We are addressing the amendment now. If you are speaking to the procedure of the Board of Education budget....

MRS. GUROIAN: When will I be allowed to speak? I can't get an answer that I understand.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You are going to be allowed to speak when we finish with the vote on these amendments.

MRS. GUROIAN: All these amendments?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We only have one more. And the Main Motion. So just one more amendment. And then I will allow you to speak. When we finish the action on this primary amendment, then I'll ask you to speak.

MR. DIXON: Point of Information, Madam President. The \$700,000 cut proposed by Mr. Livingston, is that from the recommendation of Fiscal Committee?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

PRESIDENT SANTY: I was going to give that in the Motion. No, it's from the Board of Finance. Mr. Livingston's amendment, which is on the floor now, and no speakers are left, on which we will act now, is for a \$700,000 cut, bringing the total line item for Board of Education to \$55.0 Million. Am I correct, Mr. Livingston? Right. That is the Motion on the floor now.

MR. WIDER: Move the Question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are no speakers left. We are going to move right to a machine vote. Mr. Livingston? There is a Motion for a Roll Call vote. Seconded. Please raise your hands if you wish a Roll Call vote. There are plenty for Roll Call. Will the Tellers please come forward.

The Motion on the floor that we are voting on now is Mr. Livingston's amendment, the primary amendment to the Main Motion, which is a reduction of \$700,000 bringing the total for the Board of Education, line item total, to \$55.0 Million. We will proceed with a Roll Call vote and all we need is a simple majority, as is the procedure in all the budget sessions.

CLERK OF THE BOARD SUMMERVILLE took the Roll Call vote (see attached Roll Call voting sheet at end of these Minutes).

MRS. GERSHMAN: I'd like to change my vote to a YES, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'll have to ask the gallery to please refrain from any emotion, or I will have to clear the gallery.

The vote has not been announced. Any one can change their vote prior to the announcement. I would ask that the Tellers come forward and give their totals.

Mr. Tarzia has changed his vote to a YES. The vote has not been announced yet. Mr. Franchina is changing his vote to a YES. We are still waiting for the totals from the Tellers.

The MOTION has PASSED: 20 Yes, 17 No, Zero Abstentions, and 2 Absent; and one not voting (Mr. Donald Donahue), not participating in this vote.

Mrs. Guroian, you now have the floor, but wait until I tell the Representatives so that they can take their seats and listen to Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: Again, I would like to lodge a complaint as to how the Board of Education budget is prepared. I do not believe it should be included in the Mayor's Operating Budget and I shall read to you from Section 615 in the Charter: "Action on Board of Education Budget. Not later than the 15th day of March, the Board of Education shall submit its budget for the next fiscal year to the Board of Finance. The Board of Finance shall take final action on the Budget on or before...et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Perhaps part of the reason why Mr. Blais was so confused about the Mayor cutting the Board of Education Budget, is that it is included in the Mayor's Operating Budget.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget):

MRS. GUROIAN (continuing): The Mayor's Operating Budget is in a different Section of the Charter, and it is Section 612, The Mayor's Budget.

WHY they continue putting the Board of Education Budget in the Mayor's Operating Budget, I have yet to understand; and I have spoken on this before; and every year, if I'm still here, I shall speak on it again. It is very confusing. They should remove it out of the Mayor's Operating Budget and present their own budget, just as it says in the Charter. Why they don't do it, I don't know. That is all I wanted to say.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your remarks are well-taken, Mrs. Guroian. As I remember, you made the same statements in 1981, 1982, and for the record, they are on record again.

Mr. Hogan, will you continue with the Fiscal Committee Report.

MR. ZELINSKI: I don't know if this would be in order at this time, based on Rep. Guroian's excellent remarks, would it be proper for you, our President, to send a letter to the President of the Board of Education expressing that this concern regarding the comments made by Rep. Guroian regarding the Charter and the way the Board of Education submits their budget; if so, I would make a Motion to Move that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You don't have to Move that. I can send a letter, Mr. Zelinski, and I will.

Mr. Hogan, continue with your Fiscal Report. Will you tell us what book you are on, and Ms. Summerville can hold it up and we can all begin working.

MR. HOGAN: We are still on the blue book on the Board of Education, Madam Chairman.

MR. FRANCHINA: I'd like to make a Motion for a RECESS at this time. Seconded by several.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan did not begin his report again. I will accept that Motion for a Recess. All in favor of a Recess, please say AYE. All opposed? We will have to use the machine. The Motion is on the floor for a Recess. I would make it to 11:15 P.M., 25 minutes. Has everyone voted? The Motion to Recess is DEFEATED: 14 Affirmative, 21 Negative, and 3 Non-Voting. Mr. Hogan will now continue with his Report.

Pg. 125 MR. HOGAN: In the blue book, still under Board of Education, on Page 125. Non-Public School Transportation, the total transmitted to this Board by the Board of Finance is \$726,717. It is the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee, Madam Chairman, that this amount be approved in total.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are working under a running motion now. Mr. Hogan has made the Motion on Page 125, Board of Education, Non-Public School Transportation, \$726,717. Several Seconds. Any discussion? None.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing on Board of Education Budget Items):

Pg. MR. HOGAN: Under Page 126, Food Service Program, the amount transmitted to  
126 this Board is \$125,601. The Fiscal Committee so Moves you, Madam Chairman.  
Several Seconds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any discussion? Continue, Mr. Hogan.

Pg. MR. HOGAN: We have a Section Total now, Page 127. Madam Chairman, the  
127 new Section Total on page 127 is \$55,852,318. Once again, \$55,852,318.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan, the staff concurs. That is the final figure, and it was a running Motion and there was no discussion. Moved and Seconded. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? Two No votes, Mrs. Conti and Mr. Bonner. And the rest I would assume is unanimous, but no, there are some members in the caucus room. We will have to use the machine. We will go to the final total.

MRS. HAWE: Madam President, you know, I think we should get a final total on Page 130 which is the Board of Education and everything else.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All right, we will continue, but I will ask the Representatives to take their seats, because we are coming up to the totals. Continue, Mr. Hogan, we will go to the final total.

Pg. MR. HOGAN: That's it. The total on Page 130, the Debt Service has been  
130 removed, so the total would be a Grand Budget Total on Page 130, and it will take a few minutes to work it out.

MRS. HAWE: Last night, we voted on the Debt Service with that Motion, that was included in it. That Motion last night, everything except the Board of Education; so that included the Debt Service, but I think we should get a final total of the whole Operating before we go on to Capital.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Oh, definitely, that is what we are waiting for, is the final total. We have a Motion for the Board of Education. What are you giving me now, Mrs. Hawe, as a Motion?

MRS. HAWE: I Move that we approve \$55,852,318.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now voting on the total Board of Education budget. We will use the machine for a vote, and you all have that total of \$55,852,318. Please use the machine. Has everyone voted? I'll give you a moment. I would ask the Representatives to please take their seats. We are voting on the total Board of Education Budget, the Grand Total of \$55,852,318. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED: 22 Affirmative, 13 Negative, and 3 Not-Voting. And 2 Absent. Mr. Hogan has the floor.

MR. HOGAN: The new total for the Operating Budget is \$140,464,820. That is \$140,464,820. On Page 130. The total cuts in the Operating Budget were \$750,604. Repeat \$750,604. That completes the Report of the Operating Budgets, Madam President.

MR. BLUM: I make a Motion that we accept \$140,464,820.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (Continuing; start of Capital Projects Budget):

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, you really don't have to at this point. We will do it with the final resolution. We have approved the budget to this point. The final resolution will include this, at the end.

MR. DUDLEY: I Move for a 15-minute Recess. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of a Recess, please say AYE. Opposed? CARRIED.

CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1983/84:

MR. HOGAN: We will now go on with the Mayor's Proposed Capital Projects Budget for 1983/1984.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, some members think they received two books in the mail. Which one are we using? I only received one. What's the date on it? The book we are using is dated March 18, 1983.

MR. WIDER: They're both the same.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ladies and Gentlemen, we have quite a bit of work ahead of us. We are on the Mayor's Capital Projects Budget, date of March 18, 1983 on the first page.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of Information. The book we are going to use is the one with the computer print-out in it; it is the one that has the letter from the Mayor dated March 18, 1983. It looks a little more expensive, as a matter of fact.

Pg. 5 MR. HOGAN: We will start on Page 5 and go through each page, Madam Chairman. On Page 5, there is no action necessary.

Pg. 6 On Page 6, there is no action.

I will read the first is Registrars of Voters, no action.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, I think you had better make a running motion for the whole Capital Projects Budget.

MR. HOGAN: So Moved you, Madam Chairman.

Pg. 7 PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, we have a running motion on the floor. We are on Page 7.

MR. HOGAN: We are on Page 7, the Planning Board. The Finance Board has submitted to us two projects from the Planning Board. The first project is the Downtown Revitalization Design; it is the cost phase of the new project for Downtown Revitalization, and it is transmitted to us by the Board of Finance in the amount of \$106,897.

MR. DZIEZYC: Madam President, I'd like to....

MR. HOGAN: They're having trouble with the book...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti is first to speak, then you, Mr. Dziezyc, but Mr. Hogan, are you finished?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing; CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. HOGAN: No, I'm waiting. They're having trouble with the books.

MRS. HAWE: Can I say something?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Certainly, as Co-Chairperson, you certainly may.

MRS. HAWE: There are two different books that were given out at different times, and so the page numbers are really going to confuse you because, like in one book the Planning Board is on Page 7, and in another, it is not, so I think it is easier if you follow along just by the code numbers. The Planning Board is Code 104, and whatever page that is on in your book, find that and....

PRESIDENT SANTY: But, Mrs. Hawe, didn't we receive a copy of both books?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, but maybe someone brought only one.

PRESIDENT SANTY: If there is someone who does not have the book that we are working from, please raise your hand. You all should have the accurate workbook. I think they all have it. Mr. Conti does not have it? There are a couple extra ones and we'll see if they are the right ones. I think you all should have your own book. It is a lot easier to handle it by pages, if we all work from the same book. Ms. Summerville has found some. Raise your hand, if you do not have the right book. Mr. Conti needs one. Does everyone have the right book? We will get right back to working. Mr. Hogan, have you finished?

MR. HOGAN: This is a continuation of a project that is in progress at the present time. It will complete a study of the south side of Main St., from Tresser Blvd. east on Main St., then around the Old Town Hall, then coming down Atlantic St. to Bell St., in that area. As I said, it is a design cost phase, and it's been transferred to us in the amount of \$106,897. We have no changes on the Fiscal Committee on this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti is the first to speak to that. You are giving us a total on Page 7 that the Fiscal Committee recommendation is \$155,397, Mr. Hogan, right?

MR. HOGAN: No, just the top item, Madam Chairman, the one item.

Several voices saying "the whole thing".

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let's go through the whole page, Mr. Hogan, and then we will give the page total.

MR. HOGAN: The second item on Page 7 is the Railroad Station Area, a study of the railroad station area down around Beehler St., Tresser Blvd. by the Armory, and down past under the railroad bridge, in the general vicinity of the railroad station. This is in the amount of \$48,500, for a total page total of \$155,397.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing: CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan. For the record, Mr. Donahue is back on the floor, and we have 38 members present. There is a Motion on the floor for \$155,397 for Planning Board. Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to Move to delete the entire \$155,397 from this page. On the first item (Pres. Santy said there are several Seconds), that we are talking about, this is the Design for the Downtown Pedestrian Improvement, in the areathat Mr. Hogan has delineated for you, the side-walks are in excellent condition compared to the sidewalks throughout the rest of the City. And I think it is quite unfair that we let our other sidewalks go completely without maintenance, to tear up perfectly service-able sidewalks, to put in something more decorative.

On the second item, I would remind this Board that this \$48,500 came to this Board twice in the form of an additional appropriation. This is to study the blocks surrounding the new railroad station complex. Only about 25% of the property in the three blocks they are talking about is City property; therefore, what you are going to do is that you are going to do the very thing that you don't want to do.

As soon as you start to study to consider a possible re-zoning, you will have every private owner rushing in to develop to the maximum intensity, and you will therefore be surrounded by the most intense development. It is foolish to study property that is not City-owned, because there is no way you can control the development. Thank you.

MR. DeLUCA: I'm just going to speak and make the comments as Mrs. Conti, especially on the second item, the \$48,500. We defeated this on two previous occasions, when we needed two-thirds of a vote for passage, and it is just a back-door way of getting the funds in. I don't think it is all right to do a study that will more or less benefit the private developer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: But the Motion on the floor, Mr. DeLuca, is the entire amount.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, that's right.

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, Madam President, I believe that both items should stay in the Planning Board budget. Item #1 for the \$106,897 is the second part of a program that we have already funded for Phase One. This is the second part of the program which will include the Streetscape from Broad Street north to Latham Park. We have been asked by the downtown merchants to help revitalize what we call the traditional. We have agreed to do that in the past, and this is the second part of that plan. The first phase has been partially done; work is starting on that again; and completion is expected in the near future, and this will guarantee that that project is on-going from this point in time, all the way up through Bedford Street.

On the railroad study, we have a great deal to gain by keeping this in here. First of all, the talk about private development benefitting from this, or doing something contradictory to what this study proposes, is a little bit premature, because what this study intends to do is to put zoning requirements in place that will protect the area around the railroad station from over-intense development. Also a part of this study will be the future of



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing: CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DONAHUE (continuing):....this very building and the City-owned property to the north of the railroad station. What is put in place here is very important to the City and to the success of the Transportation Center. I would urge that both of these items stay in.

MR. WIDER: This is a project that I worked on, and I asked for this money to be put in the budget because we are looking not only at the Transportation Center that we are putting there, but we are looking at some way to protect it. There have to be, since we are going to have some matching funds coming in. I think it behooves the City to put forth the first foot, and we do need some way to protect that railroad station once we get it there. And I would hope that we would leave this money in there so that we would have something to work with. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. I really object to seeing this \$48,500 item put in this budget. I voted two times, as did this entire Board, to remove it. Obviously, it is coming back again, and I am glad to see that there are other people, other than myself, that read the budget books. I am going to express my objection by voting NO on this appropriation. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the Question. Several Seconds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the Question. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? CARRIED.

The Motion on the floor is to delete the entire \$150,397 from Code 104 Planning Board, being the total of the page, to Zero. Please use your machine for the vote. The Motion on the floor is for the entire amount to be deleted. Has everyone voted? The Motion is LOST: 17 Affirmative; 19 Negative; One Abstaining; One Non-Vote.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I would like to make a Motion to delete the \$48,500. Several Seconds.

MR. DONAHUE: Point of Order. Wouldn't that be equivalent to a Motion to Reconsider, as we have already defeated that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, Mr. Donahue, it is not a Motion to Reconsider. It is another amendment. That wasn't the original motion. We have a Motion on the floor, and Seconded. Any discussion? We will go right to a machine vote. The Motion on the floor is to delete \$48,500 from Planning Board railroad station study. Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED: 17 Affirmative; 18 Negative; 3 Non-Voting.

Pg. MR. HOGAN: Page 8, Madam Chairman, for \$12,500 for Cove Pond Dam Repair,  
8 and I so Move you. Code is 110.0286.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Continue. It is a running motion. Go right on, if there is no discussion.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing: CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

Pg. MR. HOGAN: On Page 9, the fourth line down, Code 112.0101 Emergency  
9. Correction Account, \$50,000. On line 112.0284, \$392,600.....

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Hogan, there is some discussion on this.  
We are on Page 9, Sewer Commission.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, please. On 112.0101 Emergency Correction Account,  
would you please give us some information on that? There is not too much  
there, and you didn't give a description, and there is not much under-  
standing on what this is.

MRS. HAWE: Can I answer Mrs. Maihock?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Certainly.

MRS. HAWE: This is kind of like a revolving sum that is always in the  
budget, and it is to replace inadequate and antiquated sanitary sewer  
lines during the year that need replacing. As you can see, there is a  
previous appropriation; it's money that is put in just about every year  
for when these emergencies come up that have to be worked on.

(Note: At this point, there is a section of the tape for about 20 minutes  
that the spool spun so slowly and finally stopped, that the dialogue cannot  
be understood. We have reconstructed from the Machine Voting Record and  
our notes on the action taken between Pages 9 and 13, at which point, the  
tape is understandable again.)

Pg. There were no changes on Pages 9 or 10 from the figures presented by the  
10 Board of Finance, with the departmental total for the Sewer Commission  
being approved at \$442,600.

Pg. There were no changes made on 12, with LUIS-MAPPING, Code 135.0998 approved  
12 as presented for \$230,000. The Section Total was \$840,497.

A Motion was made and seconded to delete the \$230,000 for Luis-Mapping and  
was defeated: 6 Yes, 25 No, Zero Abstain, and 7 Non-Voting.

(The tape became clear enough to transcribe at a point of discussing Pg. 13,  
the Code 201.0154 Housing Site Acquisition. Mrs. Hawe is already speaking.)

Pg. MRS. HAWE: .....Code 201.0154 Housing Site Acquisition for \$100,000, this  
13 is to assist Non-Profit Agencies, such as New Neighborhoods, to write down  
the land costs. The land cost and the financing costs are what keep  
housing costs so high, and make it impossible for low, and even middle  
income, people to buy houses. So this would enable them to write down  
the land costs so that when these kind of houses are built, like New  
Neighborhoods builds, for instance, they can be sold for at a rate that  
can be afforded. That is the Housing Site Acquisition Fund.

The next item is 201.0155 Housing Construction/Rehabilitation Fund for  
\$100,000. This has two components to it, and the first one relates to the  
financing side of the item above; in other words, the Housing Site Acquisition  
enables the non-profit agency to buy the land cheaply. This one would  
arrange for low-interest loans to help with the construction of such dwellings.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. HAWE: (continuing): And also the other component of this is low-interest loans to homeowners for energy improvement, code improvement; and these loans would go on to the transfer of the title when the property is sold.

And the last one, Code 201.0304 Demolition, as Mrs. Maihock started to mention, this would establish a Demolition Fund and the ordinance that would set this up is in the Legislative and Rules Committee now. This \$75,000 would enable the City to take advantage of a change in the State Statute. The City could always, in the past, order blighted structures to be demolished, but there was always the question of who would pay for the demolition; who would pay for relocation costs, if there were people living in those buildings; and now this would provide a fund available for this. If anyone has a house that is a real eyesore in their neighborhood, they know that this can really be a problem, and this would help solve that problem by helping to get rid of some of these structures that are really beyond repair. We are not talking about things that could be rehabilitated or preserved, but we are talking about real eyesores here, so that is what these things are about.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. Through you to Rep. Hawe, am I correct in reading here on Page 13 that under Code 201.0154 Housing Site Acquisition, that there is \$100,000 unencumbered from last year? I have the figure unencumbered as of March 11, 1983, \$100,000, is that true?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, that's right, because the City is trying to set up a substantial, not substantial, but a fund that can be used for this, and part was requested last year, and more was requested this year.

MR. ZELINSKI: O.K., then as of right now, we have \$100,000 already in that account?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, that we approved last year.

MR. ZELINSKI: I guess the Motion on the floor is to delete everything. O.K., leave it as it is.

ACTING PRESIDENT BOCCUZZI: Mrs. Saxe is next to speak.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi. I would like to ask either Mrs. Hawe or Mr. Wider, do we not, at the present time, have a fund for Demolition?

MRS. HAWE: No, we don't.

MRS. SAXE: I believe we do. Maybe Mr. Wider can answer. There's plenty in there.

MR. WIDER: Yes, we do have a fund that was appropriated by The Community Development Program, and that is also a Revolving Fund, and it is in the total of \$75,000, but we are down now to about \$45,000 because the rest of our money is already out in Demolition and is liened against the property. Yes, we do have one. But this is the City's part.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. SAXE: Mr. Wider, may I ask again; about the monies for buy-downs? Could you explain that because have we not, through the Community Development Program, decided to have another fund within the City under the SNPP, Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program, Inc.?

MR. WIDER: For site acquisition, you mean? Is that what you refer to? 201.0154 for \$100,000, is that you mean? We do have SNPP, INC., that is an independent corporation. None of this money goes to them. This money is only, will only go for acquiring property to be turned over to New Neighborhoods, Inc., to develop affordable housing for low and moderate income people.

MRS. SAXE: Lathon, I question that; and I think if you would like to hold that in abeyance, and hold it as unencumbered, it would be a good idea, but the way it is set up now, I don't think it should stay on the books.

ACTING PRES. BOCCUZZI: Are you finished, Mrs. Saxe? Mrs. Perillo next.

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, I would like to know if she could answer this question. It has been asked of me, and I don't seem to get the answer. On this Housing Site Acquisition, when they do build the homes here, is it strictly for Stamford residents, or do out-of-towners have the right to come in and buy them?

MRS. HAWE: I think Lathon could probably answer that better.

MR. WIDER: The first choice goes to the over-income tenants in public housing. They have a priority. The second goes to Stamford residents; and if there are any left, then they would go to anyone who made out the application and qualified. There is a qualification process.

MRS. PERILLO: In other words, an out-of-towner could come in here. Thank you.

MRS. CONTI: The statement made by Mrs. Maihock, I realize that we do have a demolition ordinance before our L&R Committee; however, everything that is in this Capital Budget is going to be done by Bonding; so, therefore, if we do this, it is going to cost us far in excess of the \$75,000. I would suggest that from the Demolition Fund that Mr. Wider referred to which Community Development Program has, that this SCPD fund be used first, and then if there is an additional need for funding, and if there is a large bill for demolition, I would suggest that they come to us <sup>on</sup> an additional appropriation basis rather than have to bond this money and cost the taxpayers more in the long run. Thank you.

ACTING PRES. BOCCUZZI: Is there anyone else to speak? Mrs. Conti, please state your Motion then.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I Move to delete \$275,000 from Page 13, leaving the balance Zero. Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

ACTING PRES. BOCCUZZI: Call for your vote. All in favor of deleting \$275,000 from Page 13, please say AYE. Opposed? We will take a machine vote. Has everyone voted that wants to vote? We are going to have to take a re-vote. Please vote again. Has everyone voted?

The Motion is DEFEATED: 7 Yes, 20 No, 2 Abstentions, and 9 Non-Voting.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, I would like the record to show that I Abstained because this item for Demolition was included, and since I am on the Legislative and Rules Committee, and I am not certain how that could be left out, and I feel that it should have been left in the budget.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to make a Motion to delete \$100,000 from Code 201.0154 Site Housing Acquisition. I really can't rationalize that if we already have \$100,000 in unencumbered funds, why we need an additional \$100,000, and I so Move. Seconded by several.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, I would agree with Mr. Zelinski on that item.

MR. WIDER: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I have to disagree with that Motion. The fact is that we have not used that money because it wasn't enough. What we are going to do, we are going to have a property that we can develop some housing on, and for the lack of funds, we won't be able to tie it up.

The fact is that we need additional money. We had a problem over on North Street where we had to put a lot of money in the bank and pay interest off of it to keep that property, because we did not have the money. And we need this money to tie up a site when it comes, so I would vote against taking this out of the budget. That is why we have it in there, on top of what we already have, so we will have enough money. I would ask you to vote against the resolution from Mr. Zelinski.

MR. DIXON: Well, I think we all understand, but when it comes to Land Acquisition, \$100,000 is just a drop in the bucket; and if they are trying to do what I think they are trying to do, which is to establish a workable fund that would be available for them to get into at any given time when they have a chance to acquire certain sites, then I think this \$100,000 should stay in there. They can spend \$100,000, in fact \$200,000, acquiring one site, so I have no problem with this. I think it should stay in there and intact, just as it is. Thank you.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Mr. President. Through you to Rep. Wider, are there any sites specifically in mind that the money will be used for, at this present time?

MR. WIDER: Yes, we have some sites in mind, but I cannot divulge them because I screw up the minute I do. Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. FLOUNDERS: I just want to support Reps. Dixon and Wider on this \$100,000 for Housing Site Acquisition. We give a lot of lip service to the importance of providing affordable housing in this town, and we complain chronically about how we are not providing housing; how low-cost and moderate income housing is not available.

The New Neighborhoods, Inc. organization is one of the few organizations that is really doing something about it, and really should be supported. They should be applauded for the work that they have done. I think they have done an outstanding job, and sure, it is a drop in the bucket, but at least they keep chipping away at it; and providing \$100,000 for a total budget of \$200,000 for site acquisition is, literally, a drop in the bucket, as Mr. Wider said. We should support this amount, definitely.

MRS. SAXE: Mr. Flounders, the \$100,000 which is in this budget, and the other \$100,000 which is unencumbered, is not necessarily going to be used for New Neighborhoods, Inc. projects. And I would suggest that very, very quietly, and very earnestly, at this point, this Board has to make a decision on how much public housing can be supported by the people who live in the City of Stamford. Thank you.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The problem with this whole housing question that we never faced up to is that it is not Stamford's problem. It is a national problem, and Stamford is not going to solve it by itself. The problem is that it is a national problem and we don't have a national housing policy. We don't have a national housing philosophy; and indeed we haven't really had a coherent one since the days of Franklin Roosevelt.

The problem is that Stamford quite morally tries to solve this problem, and I have a problem with projects like this, precisely what Mrs. Perillo pointed out, that out-of-towners come in to this housing and we don't solve anything that way. It seems to me the best thing a community, and I am not saying I am going to vote this out, but my point is let us stop thinking in the long-term philosophy here, the point being that Stamford cannot solve the housing problem by itself. I mean, you can put public housing from one end, from Shippan to the Bedford-Pound Ridge border, and you still won't solve our housing problem here.

So then you have a situation whereby you are, in some way or other, allowing outsiders, for one reason or another, to come in here and acquire this public housing, one way or the other.

It is all well and good to say that Stamford people have first shot. I question this very much. There are all kinds of definitions as to what constitutes a Stamford resident. Somebody comes in and lives for two weeks with his brother-in-law, and all of a sudden, he is a Stamford resident. There are all kinds of things like this, so I really think that we should, in the long term sense, really start to question and think this thing through. I think the best thing we can do now, in terms of a municipal philosophy here, is to try to take care of our own housing needs for people here in Stamford, even if it means turning our nose up at Federal money, and solving our problems here; and until in fact, we have a Federal



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. WHITE (continuing):....Administration that decides that this is a national problem, and in fact, they set forth a national policy; and in fact, that means the over-turn of various court decisions and so on. All of our problems here in Stamford, whether you talk about public housing or anything, stem from poor land use. The quarrels and squabbles we've had over the Education Budget, that all stems, in part, from two things here in Stamford; it stems from lousy zoning and the land use apparatus that resembles the Katzenjammer Kids, and I'm not kidding. Thank you.

MR. BLUM: Move the Question. Several Seconds.

ACTING PRES. BOCCUZZI: All in favor of Moving the Question, please say AYE. Opposed? CARRIED Unanimously.

We will now go to the Main Motion. Mr. Zelinski, will you repeat your Motion?

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I would like to Move on Section 201.0154, to delete \$100,000, which was requested. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion is to delete \$100,000 from Code 201.0154 has been DEFEATED: 11 Affirmative, 22 Negative, and 5 Non-Votes.

Pages  
14-15-  
16-17.

MR. HOGAN: Nothing on Page 14; nothing on Page 15; nothing on Page 16; nothing on Page 17.

Pg.  
18

On Page 18, Line 280.0240 Seaside/Cove Turn Lane, 10th line from bottom, there is a cut there by the Board of Finance; the whole \$80,000 was cut. On that page, one item is left for \$7,000. The Fiscal Committee has no changes.

MR. DUDLEY: Through you to Mr. Hogan, could you explain exactly the use of that \$7,000 improvement?

MR. HOGAN: The Traffic Department is going to design-study the corner of Blachley Road and Main Street, with the intent of making it <sup>an</sup> easier access to get into the industrial area, Clairol and that area there. This is just the design phase.

MR. DUDLEY: What I am curious to know, Mr. Hogan, is exactly what is being done to the intersection of Main and Blachley; maybe it is being made easier, but exactly what improvement is being made?

MR. HOGAN: In the back-up information we received, it says "that we will improve the vehicle access to the adjacent industrial areas and provide for both existing and future industrial development."

MR. DUDLEY: Is there any member of that committee who can give me an answer, clearer than Mr. Hogan? I am looking for specifics of what is being done; if it is something being done to improve the industry in the area, I would like to know exactly what the improvement is.

MR. HOGAN: Evidently, the access road, Blachley Road, the corner is going to be widened, or worked on, so that the traffic flows easier in and out of Blachley on to Main Street.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DUDLEY: The reason I am questioning it is because I know the intersection well, and I don't know whether there is that much room to widen the road any more than it is right now; and I am concerned about what this \$7,000 is being used for.

PRESIDENT SANTY: While Mr. Flounders and Mrs. Hawe, members of Fiscal are looking it up, Mrs. Maihock is the next speaker. We'll come back to that, Mr. Dudley.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, I'd like to make a comment on this. We have a similar situation where corporations were coming in to the Long Ridge Road area; and the procedure used there was that the corporations contributed to these new traffic improvements. And I just wondered if anyone has investigated whether these corporations, Clairol, and I don't know of other corporations you have in mind, but I am sure that if they were approached, they might be agreeable to contributing also to this particular improvement.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Next to speak, while we are waiting for the answer, is Mr. Zelinski, then we'll get back to Mrs. Hawe.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I have concerns as Rep. Dudley raised, and also as Rep. Maihock has, as far as if this is an improvement for the betterment of the neighborhood for the residents, or primarily to help the one corporation who happens to be there, with the traffic flow. I think all the Representatives have driven around Stamford and a lot of the time, they will see so-called traffic improvements where lights are put up to alleviate the bottle-neck of the people who work in these corporations, most of whom coming from out-of-town; and when, even during working hours, the lights are still working, causing you to stop and wait for the light to change, and causing bottle-necks in some cases. I would like to Move to delete the whole \$7,000. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, do you want to go back and maybe answer Mr. Dudley's question? But we do have a Motion on the floor to delete the whole \$7,000.

MRS. HAWE: The \$7,000 is for consulting engineering services for design improvements for this intersection; and when these designs are completed and it is determined exactly what the improvements will be, the affected property owners will be approached to determine their participation in this project, whether it would either through land transfers or monetary contributions. It is anticipated, however, and this is just a projection because the engineering studies have not been done, that more than half of the funds will come from these other sources; but the City will be, in future fiscal years, it is estimated asked to contribute about \$88,700. But it is not finalized until there is a study done, and they can determine exactly what they are going to do, and exactly the cost of it. But the figures are based on preliminary cost estimates, and what they are going to do is improve local drainage, new curbs there, sidewalk and roadway improvements, relocate existing utilities, and the traffic signals, and other related items. But they are going to approach the affected property owners after the designs are in to determine their contribution.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DUDLEY: I am a little bit concerned about this. First, I'd like, through you to Mrs. Hawe, maybe she can answer, who exactly is going to be doing this study? Do we know, for a fact, who is going to do this study?

MRS. HAWE: No, we don't know at this point.

MR. DUDLEY: I have a lot of doubts about this. I would have to agree with Mr. Zelinski's Motion. The area is not an area that could be widened all that much. To my knowledge, and I drive by there every day, and to my knowledge, the sidewalks on that corner intersection are not in need of repair at this point; and from the reports that I am getting from the Fiscal Committee, I don't see anything concrete that would make me agree that this \$7,000 improvement is necessary. Thank you, Madam President.

MRS. GUROIAN: I wonder at my Fellow Representatives' sense of proportion. When it comes to spending hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars for improvements for the downtown area, which add to millions and millions of dollars in improvements to the downtown area, not a question is raised, not a word is said, but when it comes to a \$7,000 appropriation in a neighborhood, because there is a corporation there whereas most of the corporations are downtown, they raise a question; or they raise a question of whether it is needed or not. The questions are not raised in the downtown area because those numbers are too large and that is a big neighborhood, I guess, I don't know.

I would be very loathe to vote against the \$7,000 appropriation for improvements in a neighborhood when I see the millions going in a small area downtown while the neighborhoods all go to pot. I don't know who the Representatives are in that District, but if one of them would speak up and advise me as to whether they think this appropriation should be made, I will go by the wishes of that Representative.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Next to speak is Mr. Tarzia.

MR. TARZIA: Move the Question. Seconded by several.

MRS. GUROIAN: Could one of the Representatives answer my question, please?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Tarzia, would you withdraw your Motion? Thank you. Mr. Donahue, are you the Representative in that District? And the Secunder of the Motion also withdraw? Yes? Thank you.

MR. DONAHUE: It is actually the border between two districts. I am right across the street and well familiar with the area. There is a corporation in this street. It is Clairol. There is no other development space in there as far as I know of. It is also a highly-developed residential area. I would imagine that the improvements that are suggested here are to better the flow of traffic on both Main Street and into Blachley Road accessway, and there are safety reasons why that should be done.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, then you are in favor of the appropriation. Fine. All right. Thank you. Mr. Tarzia, you are recognized now.

MR. TARZIA: I Move the Question. Several Seconds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to Move the Question. All in favor of Moving the Question, please say AYE... Yes, Ms. Summerville?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of Information, Madam President. Just to make sure, before I vote, I only heard the Co-Chairman, Mr. Hogan, say that the study was being done because of the industry that is in the area. Am I clear in understanding this? I didn't hear it all, because there was an outcry from the neighborhood residents?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, that's right. In the back-up information, that is right, Ms. Summerville.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Motion is on the floor, Mr. Zelinski's Motion to delete \$7,000, line item 280.0268 East Main/Blachley Road Improvement. Please use your machine for a vote. Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED: 21 Negative, 10 Affirmative, 7 Non-Voting.

Pg. MR. HOGAN: On Page 19, I draw your attention to the last item on the page.  
19 This item for \$230,000 was deleted by the Board of Finance. The rest of the page: \$300,000, \$38,000, \$20,000, and \$240,000, the Fiscal Committee made no changes.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to Move to delete the \$300,000, 280.0688 Computer Signal System. Seconded.

This is an item that we have rejected in past years; an item that was to be funded by the Federal Government originally, and they decided not to fund it because they were short of funds. The State was to provide the funds, and they also reneged because of a shortage of funds. I don't believe that the City can appropriate money for something like this right now. We have already rejected this in prior meetings, in fact, and should be rejected again.

MRS. SAXE: I would like to know<sup>about</sup> the other three items which are left on that page. They come to about \$300,000. Are they all a part of the same system?

MR. HOGAN: No, they are independent systems, Mrs. Saxe. They are not all tied in with each other.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask for clarification from the Fiscal Co-Chairmen. I believe that this is just another phase of an on-going program. I am not sure, but I would like to clarify that.

MR. HOGAN: Yes, you are right, Mrs. Conti. When the presentation was made, the question was asked and this \$300,000 is the initial appropriation. The entire appropriation, I have a note here, eventually would be about \$5 Million.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. CONTI: May I continue? I would like to urge my Fellow Colleagues to think strongly about this. If you go for this \$300,000, you are committing yourself to \$5 Million. Please bear that in mind when you vote.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I must support Mrs. Conti, and also Mr. DeLuca's views. I think everything has been said. \$5 Million is a lot of money.

MR. TARZIA: I, too, support Mr. DeLuca. In light of what has been said, I think we had better think twice. Talking about \$5 Million is not really \$300,000, so down the line, when the rest of the appropriation comes through, if we appropriate this this evening, I think we'd have to make a commitment to appropriating the rest, which is \$4.7 Million; therefore, I am going to vote NO. Thank you.

MR. ZELINSKI: I, too, would be supportive of this Motion made by Rep. DeLuca. I think before we appropriate an initial \$300,000 in this case, with a total cost eventually of \$5 Million, I think that before we go into computers, I think we should have the Traffic Department manually fix some of these lights the way they are now, because Stamford is one big mess as far as the bottle-neck with traffic is concerned. Thank you.

MR. WIDER: I would just like to turn the coin over on the other side and wonder. We are thinking about \$300,000. I wonder what we think in terms of life saved by this.

MR. BONNER: I believe that these other items would also be tied in with the \$5 Million Program, either be additive, or part of the \$5 Million. Would that be true? If this total program is for the City, wouldn't that include eventually, these other three items?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think Mr. Hogan answered that originally by saying that they were independent items. Right, Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: No, Mr. Bonner, they would not. They would not be tied in.

MRS. SIGNORE: I Move the Question. Seconded by several.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of Moving the Question, please say AYE. Opposed? The Question is Moved.

We will now vote on the deletion of \$300,000 for the Computerized Signal System, page 19, Code 280,0688. Has everyone voted? The Motion has PASSED: 24 Affirmative, 10 Negative, 4 Non-Voting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Mr. Hogan, just to continue on Page 19, Code 280.0829 Downtown Signal System Improvements for \$240,000. That is still in the Budget. What is that going to be used for, primarily, Mr. Hogan, please?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. HOGAN: From our back-up information, we have that it will replace some Fixed-Time Traffic Control Systems that are now in place in 15 different locations in the downtown area to improve traffic operations, to improve traffic flow, and it will be compatible with any future computerization that we may see fit to put in. There is no land to be acquired. It is all City-owned land. The project would begin...the site planning and acquisition has already started, but the contracting and construction would begin in July if approved.

MR. ZELINSKI: Again, Madam President, to Mr. Hogan, do you know what eventually the cost for this particular improvement would be. I presume this is again, just an initial amount, and is there a final figure in there, Rep. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: No, there isn't. \$30,000 for the land to be acquired. There is no final figure, Mr. Zelinski, no.

MR. ZELINSKI: Based on the information, Madam President, I would like to make a Motion that this be deleted. I think there is a lot of traffic congestion, and if we don't do something about this, we are going to end up having a traffic light at every street corner in Stamford. It takes 20 minutes to get from one part of Atlantic Street down to Bedford Street, and you can go up to Bridgeport in that time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Your Motion, Mr. Zelinski? Would you please make your Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI: My Motion is to delete 280.0829 in the amount of \$240,000 for the Downtown Signal System Improvements. Several Seconds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We now have a Motion on the floor. First to speak is Mrs. Perillo.

MRS. PERILLO: Mr. Zelinski asked the question I was going to ask.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Pass.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I pass.

MR. DONAHUE: As far as I know, this is a one-time amount to be spent on this. I don't know if you recall, but in past years, we were told about the old traffic signals and how costly it was to maintain them. This is to replace those signals with solid-state equipment, which is cheaper to maintain and easier to maintain. This should be passed this evening.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Mr. Donahue has answered my question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we will move right to a machine vote. The Motion on the floor is to delete \$240,000, Code 280.0829 Downtown Signal System Improvement. Has everyone voted? The motion is DEFEATED: 12 Affirmative, 22 Negative, and 4 Non-Voting.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. HOGAN: We will now go to Page 20, Madam Chairman....

Pg. MRS. MAIHOCK: Before we leave that page, I wonder if Mr. Hogan can give  
19 us more information on Item 280.0689, CBD Signal Retiming. There is no  
information and I would like to know what that is.

MR. HOGAN: That is the Central Business District, a one-time expenditure  
to replace equipment in the Central Business District.

Pg. Back to Page 20, \$18,000, no change. We have a new Department Total....  
20

MR. PERILLO: Through you to Mr. Hogan<sup>if</sup>, there is \$132,000 unencumbered  
in that account, what is the \$18,000 going to do?

MR. HOGAN: I cannot answer that question, Curley. I'm going to have to....

MR. PERILLO: What is \$18,000 going to do? I can't believe it.

MR. HOGAN: We have a starting date here on their back-up of 7/83.

MR. BLAIS: I have done some research<sup>into</sup> this particular project a while  
ago, and I understood that they did get an appropriation, but they needed  
additional funds to acquire the property to properly complete the street  
improvement. This is the intersection on East Main right by the underpass  
where we already have a sewage situation that aggravates the traffic  
problem.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blais, isn't this before our Board; isn't the same  
problem that is in Committee?

MR. BLAIS: It is related with the sewers.

MR. TARZIA: I have a question on this since Mr. Blais brought up the issue  
here. I wasn't aware that it involved that particular problem. On the  
Appointments Committee recently, interviewing a member of the Sewer Commis-  
sion, it was revealed to us that apparently not much can be done in giving  
relief to that particular problem. Am I correct?

MR. BLAIS: No, we have two different problems there. We have a sewer  
problem that already aggravates an existing bad traffic problem. This  
addresses the traffic problem. Hopefully, the sewer problem will be looked  
at and perhaps addressed later.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I, too, also serve on the Appointments Committee, and I  
think part of the statement was left out. He did say that things could not  
be done right now, but they are in the process, and we were almost assured  
that within a year, we were going to see some results; that they are in the  
study process, and I don't think I heard that there is nothing that can be  
done, but when they do what they have to do, they want to correct the  
entire project, which is going to entail more than just that underpass.  
It is going to go on over to William Street and all of those little side  
streets on the other side of the Myrtle Avenue section there. So that is the  
whole conversation of the appointment person that came before us.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. BLUM: Still didn't answer the question. What is the \$18,000 going to do towards the improvements for \$132,000? What is the \$18,000 for?

MR. BLAIS: Unofficially, what I understand is that they need the additional money to acquire the necessary property. When they first gave us an estimate for the appropriation, it was an estimate.

MRS. HAWE: The initial studies and the surveys have been completed and this is the revised figure. This is the amount that they need. Mr. Blais is correct. The original is just an estimate.

Pg. 21. MR. HOGAN: Page 21, nothing..

Pg. 20 MRS. HAWE: On Page 20, there is a department total of \$323,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Livingston is leaving the meeting. We have 37 members present now. Sorry, you are feeling ill, Jerry. We do appreciate everyone being here this evening, and especially Jerry, who is not feeling well.

Pg. 22 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 22 is 284.0937 Railroad Station Drainage \$750,000.

MR. DeLUCA: Just a quick question, can't these funds come out of the funds we are going to get from the Federal and State Governments for this Railroad Project? Is there any reason why we are going to have to fund it? rather than coming out of this \$20-50 Million that we are going to be getting? I am sure they can find \$750,000 there. I just want to ask that question.

MRS. HAWE: There is quite a detailed and complicated formula set up for the funding of the Railroad Station and this is part of it. It is not that the Federal Government can take this part and why can't they pay for it. It is such a detailed and complicated contract drawn up, and this is part of it, that the City is providing the money for this project. It, really, at this point, can't be changed.

MR. STORK: I ask in your back-up material, does it explain why the Mayor added \$100,000 to the Planning Board's recommendation of \$650,000?

MR. HOGAN: No, I don't have any, Phil, as to why he did that.

MRS. HAWE: No, I don't have that, but as you see, the Department had requested \$750,000 originally. I really don't have the reasoning that the Planning Board felt that \$100,000 could be put off at this time, or cut out. The Mayor apparently, but I don't have his reasoning for it, but this is the original request that the Department had requested.

MR. STORK: I would like to make a Motion to delete from that account the amount of \$100,000, reducing it to \$650,000. Seconded by several.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have a Motion made and Seconded to reduce 284.0937 Railroad Station Drainage by \$100,000, leaving \$650,000. We are addressing that Motion.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. BONNER: I'll Pass. Thank you.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I Second it.

MRS. CONTI: I really don't understand the complicated formula and why the local taxpayers have to bond and pay for this whole thing. I am highly in favor of reducing it in any way we can.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Just a question, when you say that the department requested \$750,000. What department are we talking about? Public Works, or what?

MR. HAWE: We are talking really about the Traffic Department.

MR. DONAHUE: I just have a question, and I am not sure that anybody can answer it at this point. But if the department requested \$750,000, and it was cut by the Planning Board to \$650,000; and then at some date \$100,000 was put back in, will the shortage of that \$100,000 hold up work at the Railroad Station which is now under construction and will it cost us more in the long run to hold this project up?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does anyone have the answer to that question? I just don't think anyone does, Mr. Donahue, but there is a good point.

MR. WIDER: Actually, Madam Chairman, something is happening here that kind of bothers me. We have a Mayor that puts something in the budget, and we find that some of the people that should be supporting his recommendations, are voting to take it out. I hate to vote to take this out, because I understand what the problem is. But the fact is that I can't continue to try to help the Mayor out while the other people are hurting it. Now, there is a reason for this being in here, and it seems that someone doesn't understand the reason and I wonder why.

MRS. HAWE: It appears that as part of the funding agreement, the City did try to get the Federal Government to pick up this cost. However, they would not agree to it. It is in the Traffic and Parking Budget, but it has been requested by PUBLIC WORKS; and the reason the Mayor raised it back up to \$750,000 is that they felt that Public Works Department had a better handle on how much would be needed than the Planning Board did.

MR. DeLUCA: I guess it is getting late and everyone is getting a little silly, and....

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think this is what is happening. It is a quarter after twelve; we started early; this is the second night.

MR. DeLUCA: I have sat here over the years and listened to the opposite side of the aisle accuse our side of the aisle of supporting the Mayor and being in his back pocket; now, when we are trying to get some answers of what the Mayor is doing, we are being accused of not supporting the Mayor....

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, you know.....

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let Mr. DeLuca finish, and then you can answer, if you wish, Mr. Boccuzzi.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DeLUCA (continuing)....I also heard comments on how knowledgeable the Planning Board is, what a fantastic group they are, and some of their recommendations for studies are super, now we hear that the Planning Board is recommending an \$100,000 reduction, we are told that the Planning Board can't do the job that the Public Works could. Some of the comments this evening really amaze me. I have to go with the Planning Board on this one, and support the \$100,000 reduction.

PRESIDENT SANTY said a machine vote will be taken on the Motion of deleting \$100,000 on Page 22 from 284.0937 RR Station Drainage. The Motion to delete has been APPROVED with 18 Yes, 16 No, Zero Abstentions, and 4 Non-Votes.

MRS. HAWE said the total for this Code 284 RR Station is \$650,000. The Section Total is \$1,248,000. on Page 22.

Pg. 23 MRS. HAWE: Public Works Administration on Page 23, Code 301, Fiscal recommended this remain unchanged.

MRS. CONTI: You may recall, some of you, that this was the first phase of the Downtown Revitalization Project which ran into difficulties. The first contractor was discharged, and there is now litigation pending; it either did go, or is in the process of going back out to bid again. I am in favor of scrapping the whole thing, and I would Move to delete the \$920,550 and leave the balance Zero. Seconded by Mrs. Perillo and others.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will now speak to the Motion of deleting \$920,550, Code 301.0071, page 23.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I have a question through you, Madam President, to Mrs. Hawe. We just voted for \$106,897 for sidewalks. Why is not that part of this beautification plan? Streetscape. What is the difference between the two?

MRS. HAWE: Where is the \$106,000; what are you talking about?

MRS. GERSHMAN: It is on Page 7.

MRS. HAWE: That is for the design of it on Page 7. This is the Downtown Revitalization. This is for the second part of Phase I, Phase 1A has already been funded. That was funded last year. And this is for Phase IB. This is to construct Bedford Street up by Latham Park. What you are talking about in the Planning Board budget was for the design funds. This is construction funds, for the second part of what we approved last year.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I'm very sorry but I really don't understand the difference. I understand the difference between design and construction, but I thought that the design plan had already been completed and we were funding the construction in two different phases.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. HAWE: Yes, we are funding the construction in two different phases. This is for Phase 1B. The Design Costs that we funded back on Page 7 was for the design of Phase 2, the next step to come. They design it a year in advance, obviously, and then construct it after that. So this is to construct the part that has already been designed, the northern part, up Bedford Street <sup>up</sup> from the Library, up that way.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: You are quite right when you said "dilute", because if we do delete this, we will dilute the project. The construction, the revitalization of downtown has been proceeding. It is making a difference in the downtown. The City construction money that is coming in, along with money and a downtown association composed of the various businesses is making a great deal of difference; and it is giving us a downtown of which we can be proud. I think it would be a grave mistake to cut this and to stop the work that is being done in the heart of our community.

MR. DONAHUE: Mrs. Goldstein is right, and this is part of a commitment we have already made. The litigation problem, I believe, has been settled, and a contractor is coming back on board to finish this project.

MRS. CONTI: I would just like to say that while the downtown is being beautified, the rest of the City is going down the tubes. We need preventive maintenance all through the City. It is ridiculous to spend the bulk of a capital budget in one area that is not in that much need of it. Take a look at the rest of the City.

MR. FLOUNDERS: I Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please use your machine to vote on the Motion to delete \$920,550. Code 301.0071 Downtown Revitalization Project Mgmt. Ph. I. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? David, we will wait for you to vote. The MOTION has been DEFEATED: 7 Affirmative, 24 Negative, 3 Abstentions, and 4 Non-Voting.

MR. DZIEZYC: I Move that we reduced the \$920,550 by \$500,000, leaving \$420,550. Seconded by several.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are going to use the machine on the Motion to Delete. Mr. Roos, can you assist us here for a moment, please? Mr. Blais, are you going to assist us, too?

MR. BLAIS: No.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are waiting for the print-out. Just so you will not forget while you are waiting that the vote will be on the Motion to delete \$500,000, leaving \$420,550 on Page 23, Code 301.0071. You can move ahead with the voting. Please, Mr. Blum, that is the vote. You can change it now if you want. Do you want to change your vote? Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED: 13 Affirmative, 19 Negative, and Zero Abstentions, and 6 Non-Voting.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DZIEZYC: I Move the delete \$250,000, leaving \$670,550. Seconded.

You know I don't want to spend my money for putting in concrete sidewalks and then going on the next year and ripping them up and putting in cobblestones, or brick, and my constituents don't want to spend this money either. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please use the machine to vote. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED: 14 Affirmative, 22 Negative, one Abstention, and one Non-Voting.

Pg. 24 MR. HOGAN: On Page 24, we have a change on a deletion from the Board of  
& 25 Finance in Code 310.0561 for Guard Rails-Citywide for \$25,000, which they struck out completely, leaving Zero. There are no changes on the rest of the page. On Page 25, we have a new Division Total.

MRS. HAWE: The Board of Finance's total for Dept. 310 is \$921,000. We haven't taken anything out.

MR. DeLUCA: I would Move to delete \$75,000 from 310.0934 Special Redevelopment Area Maintenance Equipment. This is an item that we voted to delete from the budget last year for special equipment to go down and clean up Garage Road, which was to accommodate Saks-Fifth Ave. Department store. We knocked this out of the budget last year and they got it back in again this year. I would like to see this deleted again this year. Deleting \$75,000 leaves Zero. It is a special piece of what they call "unique equipment", in order to be able to squeeze into Garage Road. A normal accepted road should be 50 feet wide with 10 feet on each side and 30 foot wide, but they waived the restrictions in order to give Saks enough room to put up the ramps and columns, and last year it was in the budget and we deleted it, and this year it is back in the budget. I think we should knock it out again.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to know what is the status of Garage Road. Is it an accepted City Street, or a private road, or what is the status of it?

MR. HOGAN: I have no idea, but I imagine that it is a private road.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It is a private road.

MRS. CONTI: Then we have no Charter requirement to maintain a private road. I would agree with Mr. DeLuca's deletion and I hope it passes.

MR. TARZIA: Am I correct to understand that a waiver was given for a road narrower than standard, and therefore, because the equipment that Public Works has for roads cannot go into that area, and we have to buy new equipment? Is that correct? We have to buy special equipment to use on a private road that we should not be servicing anyhow? Who gave the waiver?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DeLUCA: That was the comment made at last year's presentation by Commissioner Spaulding on a Saturday morning when we were all down here when he made his presentation for the Public Works Dept. I did not attend this year's presentation on the same item.

MR. TARZIA: In light of that, either Saks should take care of the problem, or the owners of the Town Center. I don't think it is a City problem since they got a waiver. I intend to vote the deletion. Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will use the machine on Mr. DeLuca's Motion to delete the \$75,000 in 310.0934. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? The MOTION has PASSED with 32 Affirmative, 5 Negative, Zero Abstentions, and 5 Non-Voting.

MR. BLUM: A question to Mr. Hogan. On item 310.0954 PWD Fleet Management Study. What is the \$150,000 for? Are we still studying, or is this money to go ahead?

MR. HOGAN: No, Mr. Blum, this is to add to the \$5,500 remaining unencumbered in the account, left from the previous appropriation of \$50,000. Mr. Spaulding is asking for \$150,000 more to finish the study.

MR. BLUM: Does it take that long to study a system by which to repair and give maintenance to equipment, a monthly inspection. I think it is time that this study should be over; and I am for removing the \$150,000 and go on with the program. Really, by now, the study must have found a way to somehow take care of this equipment. The study should abruptly be brought to an end and start the maintenance of the fleet. I Move to remove the entire \$150,000 from 310.0954, leaving Zero. Seconded by several.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Before I vote, I would like to ask a question. They have an unencumbered amount of \$5,500. They started out with \$50,000, so they have spent \$44,500. Has anyone received any information as to what we have gotten studied, or where we stand right now on that study?

MRS. HAWE: About a week ago, the consultants who did the Fleet Management Study, had a preliminary meeting down here in City Hall with the various department heads to present their preliminary findings and to get in-put back and then to go back and come up with some final recommendations.

The \$50,000 that we approved last year was to pay for the study. That will all be spent. The unencumbered funds will be given to the consultants. This \$150,000 is for a software package and actually the entire title...they put it in this account because it pertains to fleet management.

This is for a computerized Fleet Management System, and this software package would help to more efficiently provide fleet service. They would have computerization of vehicles in this system, inventory use scheduling of the vehicles, preventive maintenance information would be able to be computerized, cost accounting; and according to the Planning Board that they anticipate the first year's cost savings from this whole deal will defray the cost of this system, but this is for software system to be used with our computer.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is this computer going to be the City computer, using City people?

MRS. HAWA: Yes.

MR. WIEDERLICH: We asked for an up-date of this Fleet Management Study at our last Board of Representatives Meeting, if my memory serves me correctly; because I think we had an appropriation in front of us, an additional appropriation for this. And we haven't gotten it, although they had a meeting. I think our sentiments were communicated to the proper people, and we haven't gotten an up-date.

It seems that \$50,000 leads to \$150,000. What is \$150,000 going to lead to? \$300,000? I mean this has got to stop. Let's start fixing the vehicles and let's stop appropriating money here.

Last year when we appropriated the \$150,000, it was to the panacea for our fleet. Now it is \$150,000 more. If they got the software, maybe they will want to buy the hardware also for another \$500,000.

I am in favor of deleting this \$150,000 and letting them get back to fixing the vehicles; and if they have to spend the other \$5,500, fine, they got it.

MRS. PERILLO: Move the Question. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are ten more speakers. All in favor of Moving the Question, please say Aye. Opposed? One No vote. The Question is Moved.

We will use the machine to vote on the Motion to delete the \$150,000 from the Fleet Management Study for Public Works, Code 310.0954. APPROVED to delete with 27 Affirmative, 9 Negative, Zero Abstentions, and 2 Non-Voting.

MR. HOGAN: The new total on Page 25 is now \$696,000.

Pg. 26 MR. HOGAN: The Board of Finance reduced this item #311.0142 Public Works New Equipment - Rolling Stock from \$550,000 to \$400,000, deleting \$150,000. The new total on that page is \$400,000.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Do you have a list of the rolling stock they intend to buy, or is there one available?

MRS. HAWA: I don't think there is one available; and in fact that is why... well, if you notice the department requested \$550,000, the Planning Board reduced it to \$400,000 because there wasn't a list available. This is the money that is a continual replacement of the aging rolling stock. It is on a regular basis. The Mayor put the money back in and the Board of Finance took it out again, because there wasn't a list available. At this point there isn't a list available.

MR. WIDER: Is this for the Mayor's car?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. PERILLO: Through you to Mrs. Hawe, Madam President, why are we buying new vehicles when they are left outside. Just with the weather, it corrodes them and what-not. And the Connecticut buses are in the garage down there, so why are we buying new equipment when we can't take care of the old ones that are just left outside?

MRS. HAWE: Well, there is no place for us to store the buses, which are being stored in that lot down there, not in the garage. That is a maintenance facility, not a storage facility. The buses are being stored inside that fence but not inside that building; and there is really no place for us to store our stock indoors, which is a drawback because obviously they are exposed to the weather and they deteriorate.

MRS. PERILLO: But didn't we build a garage there for our trucks?

MRS. HAWE: That is a maintenance garage only.

MRS. PERILLO: Just for maintenance? Thank you.

MR. BLUM: I understand when the new Maintenance Garage was put up, that Mr. Spaulding did say that some of the equipment that had to be stored inside would be put into the garage, so evidently now the garage was made so that we cannot store anything.

MRS. HAWE: Can I answer that? There was money in this capital projects budget for \$50,000 to build an addition to the garage because, you're right, Mr. Blum, Mr. Spaulding wanted to store more vehicles inside it, and therefore improve the ability of the department, improve the maintenance facility and also to be able to store more vehicles there, but the Planning Board cut that money out as they felt that was not the highest priority and they eliminated that from the budget.

MR. HOGAN: The new total for Page 26 is \$400,000 for Division of Equipment Maintenance, Code 311.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I would suggest that we ask Mr. Spaulding for a list of what he is going to buy with that \$400,000. I don't want to see a lot of new cars.

MRS. HAWE: There is a list of recommended replacements that the Public Works Department has submitted, but it is nowhere near \$400,000. It is like \$1,100,000, so out of those we are not sure what they are going to pick, but we have that original list, but it is not the pared down list.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I assume that somewhere on that list is what this money is going to be spent for.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, that's right, but what exactly it is, we don't know.

MR. WIDER: It may be the Mayor's car.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

Pg. 27 MR. HOGAN: Page 27, we have no changes there in the two items listed. The total is \$227,520.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President, to Mr. Hogan, Item 314.0669, Road Salt Silos. That is plural, how many are considered, please?

MR. HOGAN: I understand that there are two silos.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Do you have any idea where these are going to be erected?

MR. HOGAN: No, maybe Mr. Perillo knows.

MR. ROOS: I would Move that we deduct this \$85,000 from 314.0669 for Salt Silos. Seconded.

MR. FLOUNDERS: The back-up, Ordinance 344 mandates the proper storage of salt to prevent leakage of stockpiles thereby preventing environmental pollution and economic loss. The silo at Scofieldtown town site has been very effective in meeting these goals and also in minimizing problems in truck loading during snowstorms. Installation of a silo at the Town Yard would aid in servicing a large segment of the City. Next year we should place one in the Town Yard. This is for one for the Town Yard.

MR. WIDER: Thanks to Mr. Flounders because he has just stated that we have a mandate to clean out salt off the ground because it is polluting water, and there is a great possibility that we may find it going into our City pipes.

MRS. HAWE: I would like to speak to Mr. Roos' Motion. I would like to urge passage of the Motion. The \$85,000 was requested by the Public Works Department. The Planning Board, as you can see in your book, recommended that it be deleted because they did not think that the cost was substantiated, and then the Mayor put it back in. This is to go in the City Yard on Magee Avenue.

MR. DUDLEY: Yes, what is the individual cost of these silos? Do we have a breakdown on that?

MRS. HAWE: I believe this is just for one, so that would be it.

MR. DUDLEY: I thought I heard Mr. Hogan say there were two.

MR. HOGAN: No, there is just one. I'm sorry.

MR. DUDLEY: Why does it say two?

MRS. HAWE: Because whenever they build one, they put the money in this account, so that the one up at Scofieldtown Road is one, and this is two.

MR. DUDLEY: My other question is where is this salt stored now? Assuming there is a need for this, do we have this excess salt now?



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MRS. HAWE: Well, I know they store some of it up at Scofieldtown at the salt silo there. I assume they want another one. I don't know.

MR. HOGAN: They store it at the City Yard downtown outside. They cover the salt with tarps.

MRS. SAXE: During the presentation of the Public Works budget, a gentleman who works for the Public Works Dept. as an independent contractor appeared and made the statement that the best thing that ever happened to the salt situation in the winter time were those silos. They have helped to pay for over ten per cent of their costs in one year. So they are cost-effective, and to delete them is to be foolish, and it is just bad management to do that. Therefore, I would like Mr. Roos to just withdraw his Motion.

MR. TARZIA: I would like to express my concern about deleting the item. As I understand it, the silo will be located at the Town Yard on Haig Ave., oh, all right, Magee Avenue, then I misunderstood the location. Anyhow, I feel that you really need these things. I see the problem on Haig Avenue as I drive through there every day, especially in the winter time. You have mountains of this salt there and they just cover it up, and that is all that they can do. It runs into the street when you get heavy storms, and it is a problem. I think that just from an environmental standpoint, I think we should reconsider and keep the item.

MR. WHITE: I certainly urge that we don't take this item out. It is very much needed. These silos, especially from an environmental standpoint really are necessary. I hope they would build them as low as possible, and perhaps spread it out on the ground in greater circumference or land area on the ground rather than height. But they certainly are very necessary, just from an environmental, as well as an aesthetic viewpoint. And they do pay for themselves.

MR. BONNER: Move the Question, please. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please use the machine. We are voting on the Motion to delete 314.0669 Road Salt Silos for \$85,000, leaving Zero. Motion is DEFEATED With 4 Affirmative, 30 Negative, Zero Abstaining, and 4 Non-Voting.

MRS. HAWE: The total for Page 27 is \$227,520.

Pg. 28, MR. HOGAN: On Page 28, no change. On Page 29, no change. The Division 29 & 30 total on Page 30 is \$180,155. Dept. 320 DPW Div. of Bldgs. and Grounds.

Pg. 31 MR. HOGAN: No changes on Page 31. On Page 32, the Division total is and 32 \$2,959,500. Dept. 330 Bureau of Engineering.

Pgs. 33, MR. HOGAN: There are no current items on Pages 33 Dept. 340 Bureau of 34, 35, Sanitation; nor on Pg. 34 and Pg. 35 are Dept. 341 Sewage Treatment Plant; 36, 37, nor on Pgs. 36 and 37, Dept. 343 Sanitary Incinerator. Pg. 38, Dept. 345 38, 39, Sanitary Pumping Station has no items; nor has Pg. 39 Dept. 346 Div. of & 40. Equip. and Bldg. Maint.; nor the Div. of Collection, Dept. 350, Pg. 40. Page 40 has a Section total which is \$5,383,725.00. End of Public Works.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

Pgs. 41, MR. HOGAN: Pgs. 41 and 42, Dept. 410 Police Department, no current items.  
42 & 43. Pg. 43, Dept. 420 Department of Traffic, nothing.

Pg. 44 MR. HOGAN: On Pg. 44, we have a cut by the Board of Finance, Item 450.0814  
and 45. Vehicle Replacement, they cut \$14,500, leaving \$22,000. The department  
total on Page 45 is \$22,000.

Pg. 44 MR. DeLUCA: On Pg. 44, Line 450.0875 Training Ground Feasibility Study....

MR. HOGAN: I was coming to that, Gabe.

MR. DeLUCA: That is out? You said no more cuts. I was just wondering.

MR. HOGAN: The Committee voted to recommend that the \$240,000 be stricken. Since that has happened, I talked with Chief Vittti, and I think that the opinion of the committee was they were going to have oil pots down there, smoke pots, and et cetera, but this is for a two-story structure which will be connected to the garage. It will be the same kind of finish as the garage is, and it will house on the first floor<sup>a</sup> toolroom for the mechanics, and on the second floor a classroom for the use by all the Big Five Volunteer Fire Departments and the City Fire Departments. He has asked that, if possible, that we restore that \$240,000, Code 450.0875 Training Ground Feasibility Study.

MR. DeLUCA: But your Committee recommended deleting this item?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. DeLUCA: That was what I was going to recommend, make a Motion to delete.

PRESIDENT SANTY: So, Mr. Hogan, the Committee recommendation is to delete \$240,000, Code 450.0875 Training Ground Feasibility Study. The Motion is already there.

MRS. CONTI: I understood Mr. Hogan was making a Motion to reinstate?

MR. HOGAN: No, I was just describing the conversation with Chief Vittti.

PRESIDENT SANTY: But the Fiscal Committee voted to delete the \$240,000 and that is what you are recommending to this Board right now?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, that is right.

MRS. CONTI: And I think it should stay deleted because it is a three-phase project that is going to cost us another bundle.

MR. DeLUCA: I would like to Move the Question.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: There is no Motion on the floor, just the Committee recommendation, which is a continuing Motion.

MR. HOGAN: Yes, it is deleted and the new department total is \$22,000, Pg. 45.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

- Pg. 46 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 46, Dept. 471 Belltown Fire Department, no change, remaining at \$149,500.
- Pg. 47 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 47, Dept. 472 New Hope Fire Department, no change, remains at \$24,600.
- Pg. 48 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 48, we have an addition. The Mayor requested an amendment to his Capital Projects Budget for Dept. 473 Long Ridge Fire Department, Line Item 473.0798 Vehicle Shelter for \$20,000. This is to provide a vehicle shelter for any of the vehicles that are housed at the Long Ridge Fire Dept. The new total for this department is \$30,000. This is a new line item to be added at the end of that page, just before the total.
- Pg. 49 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 49, Dept. 474 Turn-of-River Fire Dept. has no change and the total is \$47,000.
- Pg. 50 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 50, Dept. 480 Stamford Emergency Service, no current items.  
51 & 52 Pg. 51, Dept. 481 Stamford Ambulance Corps, no current items. Pg. 51, Dept. 490 Communications, no current items. Section Total \$273,100.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before you go on, Mr. Hogan, will the gallery please refrain from conversation as it is very difficult especially for those Representatives who are sitting on that end of the floor to pay attention and listen to all the undertone. I know the hour is late, and we are all very weary. It is almost one o'clock in the morning and there are still quite a few pages to cover.

- Pg. 53 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 53, Dept. 510 Welfare Department, no current items.
- Pg. 54 MR. HOGAN: On Pg. 54, Dept. 520, Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, we recommend no changes. A departmental total here is \$170,880.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Madam, President, through you to Mr. Hogan, on Item 520.0328 200-bed Addition to SNF (Skilled Nursing Facility). The amount is \$15,000; well, that can't be the total amount because that would be incredible to have an addition for that amount.

MR. HOGAN: This is only for the preliminary stages.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Well, how preliminary, is this just for the design?

MR. HOGAN: Just the design.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Well, thank you, but it should say design or study.

- Pg. 55 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 55, Dept. Code 530, Smith House Residence, total \$65,000. No change.
- Pg. 56 MR. HOGAN: Pg. 56, Dept. 535 Welfare Dept. Willard School. Nothing here.
- Pg. 57 Dept. 550 Health Dept. No change here. Dept. total \$262,880. Section total, that is.
- Pg. 58, Dept. 610 Parks Department. No changes recommended. Dept. total \$403,000.  
59, 60.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

- Pg. 61 MR. HOGAN: Dept. 620, Parks Dept. - Terry Conners Rink, No items.
- Pg. 62 Pg. 62, Dept. 650 Board of Recreation. Nothing.
- Pg. 63 Pgs. 63 and 64, Dept. 670, Brennan Golf Course. No changes. Department  
& 64. total \$7,000. Section Total \$410,000.
- Pg. 65 Pg. 65 Code 710 Ferguson Library. Dept. total \$175,000.
- Pgs. 66 Pgs. 66 and 67, Dept. 720 Stamford Museum and Nature Center. No changes.  
& 67 Dept. total \$105,752.
- Pg. 67 Pg. 67, Dept. 730, Fort Stamford. No current items.
- Pg. 68 Pg. 68, Dept. 735 Cultural Center.
- Pg. 69 Pg. 69, Dept. 735 Cultural Center, there is an item of \$500,000. Dept. total.  
And a Section Total of 780,752.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I would like to speak to this. I would Move to delete the half a million dollars here for this Cultural Center. There is such a problem over the intent of this Board, and the direction that this entire matter is taking.

It was my understanding last year, when we passed the first half million dollars and we passed the Coliseum Ordinance, that this Board intended that this money be used for a variety of purposes and that it would come to this Board for appropriation on an annual basis.

However, there is a four-party contract that must be negotiated and signed, and we have no control; we don't even see that contract, much less approve it. And that contract entirely contradicts what I believe to be the intent of this Board.

And I will read from that contract: The Agreement provides that (1) the Stamford Center for the Arts, Inc., a non-profit organization, shall have the sole responsibility for acquiring, developing and operating SCA. That is one area.

We were told that there would be a 1-2-3 split. \$1 Million from the City, \$2,000,000 from the State, and \$3,000,000 from the private sector. The contract says SCA shall have received bankable pledges for contributions for a minimum of \$1 Million. We were told initially \$3 Million.

Now we have no control over this contract. I want to impress that upon you. We don't even see this. This is negotiated by four parties, and we never get to approve it. I think before we appropriate another dollar, we should straighten out whether this Board wants to maintain some control over this entity or not. I would Move to delete this until such time as we come to some understanding. Seconded by several.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to the Motion to delete \$500,000 from the Cultural Center, page 69. It has been Moved and Seconded.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to address this, but I really don't know how to address it to conform to Mrs. Conti's Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, just speak to the Motion.

MRS. GERSHMAN: If Mrs. Conti's Motion is defeated and we do appropriate the \$500,000, I would like to reaffirm the intent of this Board, which we made at our May 13, 1982 meeting. I have written it out and it has been put on your desks a couple of nights ago, and I have checked this with Mr. Marra and he feels that it is quite applicable to the amount, but it does not go with Mrs. Conti's Motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, it doesn't, so I don't think this is the proper place to attach that as an amendment.

MRS. GERSHMAN: May I reserve the right to speak later?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, I will put you down later. Right now we are speaking to Mrs. Conti's Motion to delete the entire \$500,000.

MR. DeLUCA: During the course of our deliberations this evening on this Capital Budget, we have been hearing about commitments that we have already made in the past for the Downtown Streetscape; and we have made a commitment, we should follow through on it for the second phase; also for various different feasibility studies for street designs, block designs, etc.

A year ago, we made a commitment for the first \$500,000 for this project. This is the final \$500,000 for the second part of that commitment. To delete this item is contrary to what we have been voting for this evening. It is contrary to our original intent dating back to May 13, 1982.

Mrs. Conti talks about the contract which we have no say on. This same Board a year ago, established a Coliseum Advisory Panel, a nine-man committee whose sole purpose was to review contracts, make recommendations, and advise Finance Commissioner Patrick Marra, who is also the Director of the Coliseum Authority.

Our primary function here is to see to it that the ordinance is complied with, and that there are no deviations from it. I feel that we have an obligation to vote this \$500,000. We made a commitment. Some people resent the fact that the Stamford Center for the Arts is the leader in this endeavor. Some people commented that the idea of the Coliseum Authority is to aid other projects, which will be done in the future.

Right now, granted we have authorized 90% of the funds coming in to be spent for the Stamford Center for the Arts, which will gradually be reduced in years to come to approximately 75% or even 65% allocation, 35%, or 10% staying in the General Fund, and 25% for other arts and cultural activities. I would urge this Board this evening to stick with their commitment and vote against deleting this item, and let's stay with the \$500,000.



MRS. GUROLIAN: I am speaking in favor of deletion of this item. I was told yesterday and reaffirmed today that the Palace Theatre was sold and another private cultural group is going to operate it in competition with the Hartman Theatre, providing substantially the same kinds of services.

I really have reservations whether, under those circumstances, we should go ahead with this because we have no commitment to the private organizations. If they flounder, be that as it may. But if the organization running this flounders, you can rest assured that the City is going to pick up the deficit tab. That is one of the considerations I have.

The other one is the fact that I have misgivings about appropriating -- I also read the contract, which Mrs. Conti alludes to, and I don't have any qualms about saying that I surmise from those contracts, and I am not a lawyer I grant you, that the original intent when the Board passed the appropriation for the \$500,000, is not adhered to in the contract, and in many instances, there is question as to whether it isn't in direct conflict to the intent of this Board when they approved the appropriation.

I have no qualms about reneging, since the parties involved have also gone against the intent of the Board as I see it. So that unless the \$850,000 is passed, and there are arguments that can be raised at that time, and I will raise them at that time as to why it should not be passed. And in view of the fact that we now face competition from the private sector providing a facility to service the people of Stamford; and in effect, we are going to have two organizations, one in which we have if nothing else a moral commitment to subsidize, to pick up any deficits that they may encounter. I think we should defer this appropriation until we resolve the \$850,000 at least.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I have reservations about this contract which Mrs. Conti referred to. I did call Mr. Marra today and he assured me that the Board would be able to see this contract, so there doesn't seem to be a problem in his mind with it.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the Question. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Motion has been made and Seconded. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? It is not certain. We have to use the machine for a Division. We need two-thirds vote. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? APPROVED with 26 Affirmative, 8 Negative, Zero Abstention, 4 Non-Voting.

We will move to vote on the Main Motion which is to delete \$500,000 from the Cultural Center account. Please use the machine. Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED with 8 Affirmative, 26 Negative, 2 Abstentions, and 2 Non-Voting. It is almost 1:30 A.M., Board members.

MR. HOGAN: The Section total is \$780,752 on Page 69.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

Pgs. 70, MR. HOGAN: Pages 70, 71, 72, and 73 are Code 810 Board of Education.  
71, 72, And the Fiscal Committee recommended no changes.  
73.

MR. DZIEZYC: I Move that we remove 810.0010 Soccer Field Rehab, \$212,920, leaving Zero. Seconded.

My Motion is to delete it completely. We have been cutting nickels and dimes and that's it. Our taxpayers are going to be very angry with us. 7% increase. So I believe that the Board of Education has enough money in there that they can spend the money that they receive.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, I would support Mr. Dziezyc's Motion, and I would like to be recognized for another Motion after we vote on this.

MRS. HAWES: Yes, thank you. Let me say first of all that there are guidelines set down by the City whereby certain funds can be used for Operating and certain ones that can be used for Capital ones, and Operating ones cannot be used for something like this.

Second of all, I would like to speak against the Motion and in favor of retaining this money. As you might know, or maybe you don't know, but soccer in recent years in Stamford has really been on the upturn. There is a Stamford Youth Soccer League that I think last year 1,400 children played in it. It is sponsored by the Board of Recreation. They use all the soccer fields that are possibly available around the City.

After they graduate from this League and go into high school, there are many more kids playing soccer than used to. It is really a sport that has come into its own. There is very little equipment needed. A lot of kids get to play and run around; and these fields are used constantly in the Spring and in the Fall. They are in very bad shape. I know in particular the one at Stamford High is almost to the point of being dangerous for the kids if they should fall on it. They really do need upgrading so I would urge you keep this in.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I find it difficult to believe that my colleagues voted to delete this completely. All one has to do is see the utilization of these fields on the weekends and during the week, and you will know the use that these fields get. Now what they want to do is they want to fill some of the holes in, for one. The kids run through the fields and they stand a chance of breaking their legs, and then their parents are only going to sue the City, so it's going to cost us more than \$212,000. So, from a practical point of view, we should keep the \$212,000. From a recreational point of view, we should keep the \$212,000.

MR. WHITE: Just to repeat what Mr. Wiederlight says, there is a question of almost, of danger if, in fact, the soccer fields are not kept in proper shape. You can have some serious injuries. The reason so many kids have gone to soccer, with the encouragement of parents, really it is a sport that has exploded. It requires very little equipment, and it also seems almost devoid of catastrophic injuries unlike some of the other sports. I think it is the sort of sport that ought to be encouraged for a number of reasons, plus the fact it enables a lot of children, students, kids



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. WHITE (continuing): who might want to go out for another sport, but they can't get parental permission, so unless they have their youthful enthusiasm, strength and health and so on, they are exercised on a field in this sort of a sport. I really do think it is a very healthy thing to encourage.

MR. WIDER: I have also observed that adults as well as children enjoy playing soccer. We will just about need this \$212,920 to take care of Kosciusko Park down there to fill up some of those holes and make it nice. It is so wonderful to see those people, young people, playing soccer on a Saturday and Sunday. I feel it is really needed.

MR. DeLUCA: On the grounds of being biased as Chairman of the Parks and Recreation Committee, I would like to recommend voting against deleting this item because as some of the comments stated, soccer has been a sport that really exploded. We can use seven more soccer fields in the area, because the waiting list is tremendous, and it does involve children ranging in ages from 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 years old, to adults. There is a big demand for soccer fields and to get this soccer field in order to make it more suitable and less dangerous is a step in the right direction. This is something our Committee has been pushing for right along.

MR. BOCCUZZI: The soccer fields will be built on school property, is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: This is to repair them; they are already there. They are on school property.

MR. BOCCUZZI: They are not going to build any new ones?

MRS. HAWE: No, to renovate and upgrade the existing ones, not to build new ones.

MR. BOCCUZZI: How many soccer fields do we have in the school system now?

MR. WIDER: How many schools do we have?

MRS. HAWE: These are for high schools, Rippowam, Stamford and West Hill High Schools. Soccer renovation for the three high schools.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, I think there are three. Mr. Boccuzzi, does that answer your question?

MR. BOCCUZZI: We must have a lot of holes in the soccer fields. Either that or they're being filled with money.

MR. BLAIS: I don't see how when we have a program here that serves more than ten per cent of our population, it is not their fault if they don't have franchise to kick us off the Board if we don't give them what they want. I think \$200,000 for any 10% of our population that they use and get enjoyment out of, is a small price, especially when it is safety-related.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

MR. DUDLEY: Move the Question. Seconded by several. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We will use the machine to vote on the Main Motion to delete \$212,920 Soccer Field Rehabilitation, Board of Education, 810.0010. Has everyone voted? Has everyone voted? The Motion is DEFEATED with 8 Affirmative, 24 Negative, Zero Abstentions, and 6 Non-Votes.

MRS. CONTI: I Move to delete the next item on this page, \$92,000 for Administration Building, Heating, Ventilation and Air-Conditioning Renovation, Account 810.0012. This is strictly for the comfort of the administrators on Hillandale Avenue, and has nothing to do with the children one way or the other. No child will be harmed if the central office is not air-conditioned. I Move that we delete this. Seconded.

MRS. HAWE: This is money that we deleted last year, and the situation has gone on for another year, and it is one year older and one year worse. The money is to replace a defective unit, heating, ventilation and air-conditioning unit, which at this point is really difficult to repair because of the condition of it and because of the age of it. During 1981-1982, \$12,000 was spent on repairs for it, through the end of October of last year because that is when this information was drawn up. \$10,662 was already spent on repairing this equipment.

In our packet of information, there is included a letter from James R. Williams, who is a Deputy Fire Marshal of the Stamford Fire Department; and I would like to read it. This is, of course, the heating as well as the air-conditioning; and in the winter time people have to use space heaters because the system does not work properly. In the summer, there is a problem because it becomes so unbearably hot that productivity is affected.

Let me read this letter from the Deputy Fire Marshal of the Stamford Fire Department, and it is written to Mr. Reed. This was written several years so this is how long that this has been a problem, dated 1981: "Dear Mr. Reed: On this date, an inspection was conducted by this office of the premises located at 195 Hillandale Avenue and known as the Board of Education. During this inspection, it was noted that throughout many offices electric space heaters were occasionally used. Portable electric space heaters are to be used in an emergency situation only. When not in use, they are to be put in storage. Also, they are not to be used on extension cords. If you are experiencing problems with the main heating system, it should be serviced at once, and to eliminate the use of electric heaters as soon as possible."

As I mentioned, the costs to repair this system are at least \$12,000 or more a year, and it really would seem wise to get the thing replaced to avoid these maintenance costs and to avoid the safety hazards involved.

MR. OWENS: Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

Pg. 70 PRESIDENT SANTY: We will use the machine to vote on deleting \$92,000 line item 810.0012. Has everyone voted? Motion DEFEATED 12 Yes, 21 No, Zero Abstentions, 5 Non-Voting.

Pg. 71 MR. HOGAN: Nothing on these two pages; nothing changes. There is a new  
and 72 Section Total on Page 73.

Pg. 73 MRS. MAIHOCK: On Page 73, Item 810.0929 Tennis Court Reconstruction. I would like to make a Motion to delete the amount of \$100,100, leaving Zero for that line item. I would like to say that sometime ago in the newspaper, they were discussing the tennis courts at the Stamford High School, and one of the persons on the Planning Board made the remark that this was a very low area and the tennis courts didn't stand up too well in that particular location; and I feel that if they are our tennis courts, it is really foolhardy to keep having to spend money to reconstruct them. They should locate them in a proper area so they can have some kind of lifetime span. Seconded.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to speak to keeping this in the budget because I feel that courts and play areas and recreation areas are very important in Stamford for the quality of life that we want to have. I think there are few enough free courts that people can go to. Tennis is a very popular sport and I would hope that we keep it in.

MRS. CONTI: Actually, Mrs. Maihock is correct. Those tennis courts sit on a virtual swamp, that is behind the parking lot across the street from the back of Stamford High School, across from Fenway Street. It is a very, very low-lying area and it has always been swampy there; and it does seem a shame to put that much money into repairing the courts if they are to remain at that location, because they are not going to hold up. Some of the property in that area is even beginning to sink.

MR. DZIEZYC: Move the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, with one No vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Question is Moved. We will now vote, using the machine, on the Motion to delete \$100,100 from 810.0929 Tennis Court Reconstruction Stamford High School. Has everyone voted? Motion is APPROVED: 18 Yes, 15 No, Zero Abstain, 5 Non-Votes. The item is deleted.

MR. HOGAN: On Page 73, we now have a Section Total of \$424,420.

Pg. 74 On Page 74, Housing Authority, no items. Code 970.

Pg. 75 Urban Redevelopment Comm. No items. Code 980.

If you will give us a little time, we will come up with a Grand Budget Total.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I remind the Representatives not to pack up too soon. We have a Resolution to approve. We need 21 affirmative votes. We are waiting for a total, page 75.



FISCAL COMMITTEE (continuing CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET):

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I also remind the Representatives from the House Committee to please clean up your desks before you leave? And I thank Mrs. Perillo for cleaning up the caucus room.

MR. FRANCHINA: I would like to make a Motion to Reconsider the Board of Education Budget. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That is a proper motion. We need a majority vote. It is debatable. Does anyone want to speak to the Motion to Reconsider? No one wishes to speak to the Motion? We will Move to a vote. Everyone voted? DEFEATED: 14 Yes, 21 No, Zero Abstain, 3 Non-Voting.

We need 21 votes to approve the Budget Resolution. We are waiting for the totals. Capital Projects Budget Total is \$9,623,374.

We need a machine vote on this. I will read the Resolution. (Resolution attached to these Minutes.)

The Total Operating Budgets \$140,464,820. The Total Capital Projects Budget \$9,623,374.

The Motion was made to adopt this Resolution. Several Seconds.  
APPROVED: 24 Yes, 11 No, 1 Abstention, 2 Non-Votes.

ADJOURNMENT: Upon Motion duly made and Seconded, and CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY by voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 1:50 A.M.

MR. HOGAN: I would very much like to thank the Staff, Helen and Charlene, and Anne, on behalf of the Fiscal Committee for their splendid cooperation; and I would like to thank all the members for their assistance and cooperation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Those remarks are well-taken and it goes from all of us, John. The meeting is adjourned, and thank you all.

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

APPROVED:

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

JLS:HMM  
Encls.



60

60

05/11/83 21:06:48  
NUMBER PRESENT = 38 PRESENT; 2 Absent (Rybnick-ill; McInerney-excused)

ATTENDANCE CODE:    Y = Present  
                          N = Absent

VOTING CODE:        Y = Yes  
                          N = No  
                          A = Abstain  
                          (Dash) - = Non-Vote  
                          (Star) \* = means ABSENT

STAMFORD BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES 05/11/83 21:07:29  
VOTE # YES 38 NO 0 ABSTAIN 0 NOTVOTING 0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	Y	Y	Y

STAMFORD BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES 05/11/83 21:07:59  
VOTE # YES 0 NO 38 ABSTAIN 0 NOTVOTING 0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	
N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	*	N	N	N	N

STAMFORD BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES 05/11/83 21:08:23  
VOTE # YES 0 NO 0 ABSTAIN 38 NOTVOTING 0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	
A	A	A	A	A	*	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	*	A	A	A	A