

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1983

17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 1983, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:45 p.m. by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am delighted this evening, to ask my Pastor, Rev. Bob Shoesmith of the Stamford Baptist Church, to open our meeting with prayer.

INVOCATION: The Rev. Robert P. Shoesmith, Pastor
Stamford Baptist Church
602 High Ridge Road, Stamford, Connecticut 06905

"Let's bow our heads together. Almighty God, as we bow we thank you that you have chosen us to service you, to serve your people, to serve this Community. We ask Lord that your spirit would be here in our midst, help us to understand each other, help us to reach out to help meet the needs of this Community. We are reminded, Lord, that in sharing, we must give of ourselves. That's what a Community is all about, and so we ask for Your power and Your spirit in Jesus' name. Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Jeanne-Lois Santy led the assemblage in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

RESIGNATION OF BOARD MEMBER BURTIS FLOUNDERS -13th District (R):
PRESIDENT SANTY: I have something to share with all of you now.

"Dear Lois,

It is with regret and a measure of sadness that I announce my resignation from the 17th Board of Representatives effective immediately.

During the past year, it has become increasingly evident that my personal business commitments are allowing less and less time for official Board business. Consequently, my resignations seems appropriate. To you, personally, and through you to the entire Board, I send my thanks and special appreciation for the friendship and support shown me during my five years as a Representative from the 13th. Please convey my sincere good wishes to all.

Cordially,

/s/ Burt Flounders"

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I am sorry to hear of Mr. Flounders decision to resign from this Board. Over the years, working with Burt, I have always found him to be a very sensitive, caring and concerned citizen. He was concerned about the people who live within this Community; all segments of this Community. He always made a commitment to be here, and he made a commitment to act on the best benefits to the entire Community especially those people who could not help themselves. He was always a very articulate spokesman on issues. He was a fighter for things he believed in. He will be missed by the Republican caucus. He will be missed by the Board of Representatives, and he will be missed by the citizens of Stamford, but I would like to wish Mr. Flounders, much good luck.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MRS. HAWES: Thank you. I worked with Burt on the Fiscal Committee for the five years that he has been on the Board. Burt brought intelligence, a reasonable outlook and a special integrity to all his activities on this Board. He is one of the finest public servants that this City has seen and I'm going to miss him a lot. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawes.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I've served with Burt Flounders for almost four years on this Board. I found Burt to be a bright, conscientious and caring human being. The City will miss him; his district will miss him; this Board will miss him. I'll miss discussing many items with him as I have in the past and I will also miss looking down at the end of this aisle and not seeing Burt's face. I wish him much good luck.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: All the good things that Mrs. Signore said about Burt, I feel the same way. I am one of the persons who is really going to miss him. He was a true friend, a true councillor, and to look over there and not see him, it's going to be very heart-sickening for me. I'm going to miss him. Those of you who are going to see him, make sure you tell him that I will miss him. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam President. I served under Burt on his Public Works Committee. I'm going to miss him very much. It was one of the first meetings I had on a Committee role, and I found Burt efficient. He was very interested in the programs of the City, and anxious to provide the best that he could for this City. He was responsible and practical and fair, and he presented all of his items very well. I found it very helpful to work under him. I shall miss him very much, and I wish to express my appreciation for my association with him. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I'd just like to say that I agree with what has been said about Burt. Burt and I didn't always agree, but when you argued with Burt, it was always an intelligent argument and that's what I enjoyed most of all about him, and because when it was all over, you were still friends, both sides got their points across, and I think he respected the opposition and the opposition respected him. I'd like to wish him luck in his endeavors where he is going, and I know I'll miss him and all the Representatives on this side of the aisle will miss him also.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. This is one evening that I wish the beginning of our Board of Representatives' meeting were broadcast. I think Burt would really enjoy hearing all this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I told him I was going to send him a copy of these Minutes.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The honest-to-goodness truth is that Barbara said that the Republican side of the aisle will miss him. Well, there are many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle will miss him very much. He is a very dedicated, intelligent person; although, I'm a little upset that he's coping out on the last two months of his term, but the thing that most delighted me about Burt, is that he was a issue-oriented person, and it's always a pleasure serving with someone who is going to think and going to attack a problem in relation to the issues. He was a colleagues, he is a friend, and I certainly will miss him very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I certainly also wish Mr. Flounders the best in his life away from us. Burt always had a very decisive opinion on issues, and he hotly defended his opinions on occasion. Someone such as Burt, with such an active questioning vital interest is very important on the Board of Reps.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I had the good pleasure of working with Burt for the past five years, also, and one of the things I will always remember about Burt is his absolute honesty and his absolute dedication to the job at hand. If anyone is a shining example of what citizen participation government is all about, Burt Flounders most certainly suited that role, and I'm going to miss a very dear friend.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Livingston.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. May I, too, to Burtis C. Flounders' swan song? He, Burt, has been what so many tried to find time to be. Burt, I, personally, thank you for permitting me to serve in the 13th District. It has been a rewarding experience, and thank you and your family for the time you needed to serve our district. Those on the side lines do not realize the number of hours needed to do the excellent job you have done for our City. Years and time will continue to echo aloud "thank you." At this time, Madam President, may I place in nomination...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe, one moment. We have to entertain the motion to accept his resignation.

MRS. MCINERNEY: So moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of accepting Burt Flounders' resignation with regret, please say aye. Opposed? His resignation is accepted. Now Mrs. Saxe, I will open the Floor for the filling of that vacancy.

ELECTION OF THOMAS F. BURKE TO FILL VACANCY IN 13th DISTRICT:

MRS. SAXE: Thank you. I move to place the name of Thomas F. Burke in nomination for the seat of Burtis C. Flounders. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several seconds. Mrs. Saxe, would you like to give us some background on Mr. Burke?

MRS. SAXE: Yes, may I introduce Mr. Burke?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, we have to elect him first, Mrs. Saxe; just some background.

MRS. SAXE: Mr. Burke resides on Loughran Avenue with his family. His girls are graduates of the Stamford schools. The family is a member of the St. Leo Parish and loves Stamford and have so for 20 years. Mr. Burke, Tom, brings to this Board a business expertise in the health, welfare and personnel fields. I am sure he will grow to be a polished jewel among our ranks as he has in business. His profession career started with the Army Medical Administration Corps. From that point, he was in industrial relations with the Hewitt-Robbins, Inc. and he was a Director of Personnel for Roosevelt Hospital in New York City.

During the past decade, Tom is with the Mary Manning Walsh Homes for the diocese of New York. He is the Assistant Administrator. May I include my welcome on board to him from all of us.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MR. STORK: I move that nominations be closed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Seconded. All in favor of closing nominations, please say aye. Fine. Will the Clerk please cast one ballot for the acceptance of Mr. Thomas F. Burke to fill the vacancy of the 13th District?

MRS. MCINERNEY: So move, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Seconded to that. All in favor, please say aye. Mr. Burke, will you come forward and be sworn in, please?

You, Thomas F. Burke, having been chosen a member of the Board of Representatives from the 13th District, do solemnly swear that you will faithfully discharge the duties of this office according to the law so help you God.

MR. BURKE: I do.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Congratulations. At the end of the meeting, there will be some changes in Committee assignments that I will announce and Mr. Burke's new assignments.

ROLL CALL: CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 34 members present and 6 absent. Absent were Reps. DeLuca (vacation), A. Conti (ill), Tarzia (family matters), Hogan (father ill), Dixon and Blais.

PRESIDENT SANTY declared a quorum.

MACHINE TEST VOTE: President Santy conducted a test on the voting machine, asking members to vote, in turn, yes, no, and abstain. The machine was declared to be in good working order.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the 269 passengers that were lost on Korean Flight 7 was shot down by a Russian fighter jet - by Rep. Philip Stork.

For the late MRS. JOSEPH S. CRIPPEN, 95 years old; a Smith House resident - by Rep. Audrey Maihock and Rep. Barbara McInerney.

For the late HAROLD HOFFMAN, a Community leader - by Rep. Barbara McInerney.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'd like to say Happy Birthday to our only September birthday who is Lathon Wider. He celebrated his birthday on September 9th. Happy Birthday, Lathon. We'll all enjoy our cake later. Lathon, we expect you to cut that cake. That is going to be your chore this evening. You can ask anyone on the Floor to help you.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE REPORT - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion. Seconded. All in favor please say aye. Opposed? We'll now waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report.

ak

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met on Monday, August 29, 1983, in the Democratic Caucus Room, in response to a CALL for 7:00 P.M. (There was a Special Meeting of the Board to be held immediately after the Steering Committee Meeting). The meeting was called to order at 7:05 P.M., when a Quorum of the Committee was present.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman
Annie M. Summerville
John Boccuzzi
Barbara McInerney
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca
Anthony Conti
Philip Stork
Gerald Rybnick
Mary Lou Rinaldi

Mary Jane Signore
Marie Hawe
Paul Dziezyc
Donald Donahue
Audrey Maihock
Sandra Goldstein
John Roos
James Dudley
Burtis Flounders (7:30)
Len Gambino, Radio

(1) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was ordered Held in Committee, being the publication of a proposed ordinance concerning retail markets.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(2) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three of the four items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was removed from the agenda by Chairman Donahue, being the sale of City-owned property on Cold Spring Road to Frank Pelli.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

~~ORDERED ON THE AGENDA~~ was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, a proposed ordinance concerning licensing of tree sprayers.

(4) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON AGENDA were the first two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; also one other item transferred from Fiscal, (#18), being Rep. Dziezyc's request for report on status and progress of collection agency, whose 6-month funding from 2/9/83 has expired, on Traffic tickets. Ordered Held in Committee was the proposed ordinance concerning parking facilities for Stamford officials, employees, etc. at the Municipal Office Bldg. and adjoining streets.

(5) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA 20 of the 21 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered moved to Transportation was the item #18, as mentioned above under Transportation.

(6) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 5 of the 6 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was removed from the Agenda, being the Stamford Bocce League request for more parking spaces, which was being handled.

(7) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Held in Committee was Mr. Richard Meno for Hearing Officer for Parking Appeals.

(8) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of a report.

(9) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

There were no items for Public Works.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

There were no items for this committee.

(11) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of a report.

(12) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda; plus another item of a SCDP request for approval of salary schedule of increases pursuant to Ord. 510. Ordered Held in Committee was Nurse Rita Hogan's matter concerning pensions.

(13) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

The one item on the Tentative Steering Agenda was ordered removed.

(14) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven of the eight items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was held in Committee (#8), being a proposed ordinance amending the prostitution loitering ordinance #500.

(15) HOUSE COMMITTEE MATTERS - There were no items.

(16) COLISEUM LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of a Report.

(17) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED removed from the Tentative Steering Agenda were the two items appearing thereon.

(18) PETITIONS - None.

(19) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of changing the date of the next meeting to October 11, 1983.

(20) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - None.

(21) NEW BUSINESS - None.

(22) OLD BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion made, Seconded, and approved, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 7:40 P.M.

The members then answered the CALL of a SPECIAL MEETING for 8:00 P.M., for the full Board to decide upon a date when the proposed revised Charter changes are to be put before the Electors for approval or disapproval.

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman

Steering Committee

JLS:HMM

ak

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

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. We did not have a quorum so all the items are being held.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - NEW PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING POSSIBLE HAZARDS IN SATELLITE TRANSMISSION FACILITIES - submitted 4/19/82 by Reps. Guroian, Betty Conti, and Dennis White. Held in Committee from May 3, 1982 through July 11, 1983. Approved for publication 7/12/82. Held 8/15.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (2) REQUEST FOR DISCOURSE ON ORD. #206 REGARDING THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS - from Communications Director Hawley Oefinger 4/25/83 - ALSO ORD. 504.
~~Have turned into the General Fund substantial sums collected from~~
delinquent accounts. Held 7/11/83. Held 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (3) THE MATTER OF PEOPLE WHO RIDE ON MOTORCYCLES BEING COMPELLED TO WEAR PROTECTIVE HELMETS - submitted by Rep. Gershman 7/21/83. Law Department is researching this and will prepare ordinance for publication if their findings so dictate. Held 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dziezyc.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE: Item #1, an ordinance resubmitted for final adoption concerning the purchase of portions of North State Street and Hill Street from the City of Stamford by Elm Street Corporation which is General Reinsurance Company for \$599,360 by a quit claim deed. This ordinance is commonly referred to by the members of the Planning and Zoning Committee as "Hill Street Blues."

MR. DONAHUE: The Planning and Zoning Committee met with Mr. Stork, Ms. Rinaldi, Mrs. Signore, Mr. Jachimczyk and Mr. Donahue in attendance.

- (1) RESUBMITTED BY TRAFFIC DIR. JAMES FORD - (THIS BOARD DEFEATED 8/15/83) - FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE RELATING TO PURCHASE OF PORTIONS OF NORTH STATE STREET AND HILL STREET FROM CITY OF STAMFORD BY ELM STREET CORPORATION (GENERAL REINSURANCE COMPANY) FOR \$599,360 VIA QUIT CLAIM DEED. Resolution concerning "A Notice of Intention to Discontinue" these portions of streets approved at 5/2/83 meeting. Public Hearing to be held. Chapter 64 provisions apply. Letter 3/8/83 from Richard Tobin, Atty., Cummings and Lockwood; also 2/4/83 letter from Traffic Director James Ford. Approved for publication 7/13/83.

MR. DONAHUE: We have many serious traffic problems in the downtown area and this is a step, the passage of this ordinance is a step towards relieving some of those problems. North State Street has not been discontinued as a City street. However, in a 1976 and 1977 agreement, which were made between the state and the City of Stamford which realigned exits 7 and 8, and as a secondary fact, restricted access to a state right-of-way as permitted under state law. This access from North State Street on to the Elm Street ramp has been restricted.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) Of course, the City has desired to provide for greater and more efficient exits to the downtown, agreed to the terms of this agreement. This was done before General Reinsurance purchased the property and it was still owned by the Knights of Columbus and residents who lived along Hill Street.

A letter has been sent from the state which denies access to this right-of-way due to traffic safety, primarily, but also as a part of an effort to provide for smoother traffic flow. Copies of that letter dated September 7, 1983, can be found in your packets this evening.

The adoption of this ordinance will allow 40 to 60% of the vehicles exiting from the complex in question, to exit directly on to the frontage roads along the thruway and eventually on to westbound Interstate 95 without having to exit on to East Main Street which would add to an already critical traffic problem. General Re is willing on top of this, to pay the City of Stamford almost \$600,000 for the subject property which has no foreseeable use to the City. The sale and discontinuance is therefore, beneficial to the City as a whole and by a vote of 4 in favor and 1 opposed, we recommend adoption of this ordinance and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Any discussion?

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. First of all, I would like to say, Mr. Donahue, your comment "Hill Street Blues" is somewhat amusing. It is not amusing to the citizens and residents in the area of Hill Street and North State Street.

not
This item was defeated last month. I'm going to belabor the issue. We've gone over this over and over again. The residents of this Town have spoken. The citizens in my district have spoken. They have spoken out and said they are not in favor of this. They were never in favor of North State Street being closed to begin with, and I urge all my colleagues here tonight, to do as they did last month and defeat this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm afraid that when someone said that this was done in 1976/77, this item never came before the Community unfortunately, up until after the Knights of Columbus was bought, and General Reinsurance wanted to build that building.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Wider. As I look over the Floor, I don't think we have 21 people here. May I ask the representatives to please go a couple at a time to go into the Caucus rooms. I know it has been a long two days for everyone concerned, but we have business to transact tonight, and right now we have before us a very important ordinance that was resubmitted. I still don't see 21 people.

MR. ZELINSKI: We do not have 21 present here, Madam President. Could we take an attendance, maybe to see who is here and not here?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I want to save a little time. Now we have 21. I would please ask the representatives and Leadership on both sides of the aisle, if you leave the Floor, just a couple at a time, but don't go in mass. All of a sudden we looked out there, and there was no one sitting here. Thank you, Mr. Wider.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will reiterate that the closing of North State Street was never presented to the Community in any public hearing. I sat in those public hearings when we were doing exits 8 and 9. The public never had a chance to react to this until they found out that had bulldozers across the street and the street was closed.

I'm a little concerned with this because, I think we have a letter from Commissioner Burns stating what the state wants to do, and I can't see for the love of me, where we can give to a corporation the opportunity to use egress way from their place and deny the citizens the right to use a street. The opening of North State Street will not over-crowd East Main Street as had been alluded to by some people. It will only make it available to the citizens who leave from the other side of town and get downtown easier. ~~There's some fallacies involved here that bother me;~~ that this is a hazard for the people who have used North State Street, and it isn't a hazard for the people that are coming out of General Reinsurance. I don't see the difference. It bothers me to see people try to push something like this into corporation hands against the wishes of the citizens. I would certainly want to have the Governor involved in this because I'm pretty sure we have enough petitions to send to the Governor of the State of Connecticut; to let him know that we do not appreciate his Commissioner taking privileges away from the citizens of Stamford. I have a motion to make but I would like to hear from the rest of the people before I make it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. BLUM: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I just read the letter from William A. Lazarek for William Burns, Commissioner of Transportation. I also just heard the report from Rep. Donahue. In his statement he made, that the ramp, the access ramp that will be made to allow the, at least 40 to 60% of the employees, to egress from General Reinsurance so as they can have an easier access to a westbound ramp to Greenwich, and I would assume if it is 60%, then the other 40% will still be coming off on East Main Street and where they might be going, I don't know, but they will be going, I gather, east to Route 9. I said this in our Caucus. The access ramp is to be placed from the second floor on to North State Street and when the lights will be signalized as such that they will enter on to Elm Street and they are suppose to go over to the other side of North State Street and on to the Atlantic Street access to I-95.

Has anyone taken the number of local residents who went that way? I don't feel that will even if we looked at as someone said, this monstrosity, to this date I don't know how many people are going to be hired at General Reinsurance. Let us assume that it will be 500 people and I'm sure it will be more looking at the building; that means if we're taking the 60% figure, then at least 250 to 300 will be coming off on to Elm Street from this second floor ramp. I'm sure between the hours that they are giving them, 4 to 6, and let me tell you there, Mr. Donahue, I've traveled that route from Glenbrook Road to the railroad yards. Well, it will be on the tape and he can read it. I've seen traffic conditions there at 2 and 3 o'clock in the afternoon and I've seen it at 4 o'clock, so as the Traffic Director who gave his statement Monday evening to the Planning and Zoning Board, has finally realized that the traffic situation in downtown Stamford is in a very sad situation even without new buildings coming onboard, and he is stating to the Planning and Zoning Board that we better not have anymore new buildings in the downtown area unless we really need them or we will have a mess here such as New York City, and I've been there, too.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MCINERNEY: Mr. Blum...

MR. BLUM: I'm not finished yet.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Please speak to the question, Mr. Blum.

MR. BLUM: I am. I'm against this because the citizens in the 12th District, and many who work for the railroad use this access way to go to work, and many of the downtown people who lived up in the Forest Street area, and Lafayette Street and so on, also came through this direction to get on to the ramps to go to I-95.

The story of North State Street was built there years ago, when 95, was to have an easy access to get on to I-95. Now, we are going to close off one area of the Glenbrook area, Springdale, who want to get on to I-95 will have to go other ways. I think before we think about closing this ramp off completely and giving General Reinsurance special privileges, we ought to consider whether the state, in a sense, can give special privileges to one corporation and block this access to the citizens of Stamford? Thank you.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Blum.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. I attended the meeting on...

MRS. MCINERNEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Bonner, I made a mistake. Ms. Summerville's name was on the list before yours. Please forgive me. You're next.

MR. BONNER: Very well.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: All of you are aware of my previous testimony against this particular item. I am still against North State Street being closed. I have over 300 petitions here from residents of this City. They come from every area of the City; from Hope Street to Wire Mill Road, from High Ridge Road to East Main Street; from all over the City, and I would like to present these petitions to the Body, but before I present them, I would like to read what the petitioners signed. "Petition to the Board of Representatives: We respectfully request the Board of Representatives to take whatever action is necessary to reopen the North State Street property at exit 8 at Elm Street, as it was until 1981. This portion of roadway was closed in 1981 for reconstruction of ramps to the Connecticut Turnpike. These ramps and necessary changes were completed in November, 1982, by White Oak Construction Company, and the ramps were opened. North State Street at Exit 8 was not reopened.

"In December, 1982, a large wire fence gate was placed on the North end of this roadway at Clark's Hill Avenue. Sometime later, a blacktop curb was constructed and concealed with approximately 1½ feet of dirt on the section near Exit 8. In recent months, large concrete blocks about 1½ to 2 tons each were placed on the roadway.

"During all this time, this piece of roadway has been used for storage of trailers loaded with steel girders for the construction of the General Reinsurance Building. Recently, a crane was set up from the middle of this roadway, hoisting material to that building and, also, storing material on the roadway.

"As residents, taxpayers and business people, access to this road is a vital necessity for us, and we request that the Board of Representatives ascertain who authorized its closing, and for what purpose."

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: (continuing) and I present these petitions without ending my comments to the Board. The reason I did that, and I think it would be good for all of you to see some of the taxpayers and the residents throughout this City, not only in the District which I come from, in the 6th District; these are people from all over the City who are also working people in this City. They don't have a quarrel with General Reinsurance which it seems that this whole issue came about. It's not with that company at all. It's with the fact that who has the right to close it when the taxpayers of this City say that it is necessary for their transportation in traveling back and forth and getting into the inner City. They are asking you to, please, consider the concerns of theirs. They may not be as important in dollars as the other persons involved in this. They do feel that it is necessary for this street to be open.

I don't think it's comical at all. I think this is a real serious problem which affect lives of people, and I say to those of you who make a joke out of it, saying it's "Hill Street Blues," why not be sensitive to the issue and make it the way we were? Thank you.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MR. BONNER: Thank you. Like all of you, I was quite concerned about the vote that was coming up tonight. I was able to attend the meeting on Monday night, and listen to the reasons for closing this street and they seemed quite logical. I also, tonight, have heard the views and as I did Monday night of those who opposed it. I always have a great deal of respect for those who sign petitions because I think, and especially, those who get petitions up, this takes effort, and I'm sure there's a lot of thought behind it.

In going over the issue, it appears that the building is about 600,000 square feet which is a large building. This would mean that there must be around 2,000 to 2,500 people in that building, perhaps when it's fully occupied. I would estimate that there are something like 1,500 to 2,000 cars that would be parked in the parking areas around the building. I'm not sure if my figures are correct, but that's normally about the capacity of automobiles and people for a building of that size. That, in itself, is a real problem. As far as I understand it, that the building, those who are responsible for placing the building, have met the requirements of the City for zoning and they have met the requirements for parking, and the issue that remains now is what to do with the automobiles that are coming in the morning and leaving in the afternoon, and also coming and arriving during the day. I would suppose that the biggest problem would be during the morning and the evening hours when people are arriving and people are leaving.

It seems that the Traffic Department testified Monday night that they had studied this for a long period of time, and had come to the conclusion that the only way to satisfy traffic for the City as a whole, was to have this 40% of the cars leaving at evening, and going through a second story access which would go directly on to the ramp and then let these people exit on to I-95.

The program as presented by the Traffic Department seemed to be quite logic. The problem was that the building has been authorized, and I suppose the schedule will be completion within a year or so. Is that correct, Mr. Donahue? About a year, perhaps. So this item has to be settled. Practicality would seem to indicate to me that the Department of Traffic had come up with a good solution, but I hear the petitions that are given against this, so the questions comes into my mind is what would be the proposal of disposing of these cars during period of time? Is there an alternative which would be beneficial, especially to those people that are living in these areas that would be a good alternative to accessing directly from the ramp?

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BONNER: (continuing) It would seem to me that there must be a better way. If this road is to be opened, I guess it will impose some very serious traffic problems on the exit to I-95 and, perhaps, cause a lot of accidents in the future. I'm sure this has been considered, but the point in my mind is how these people will be handled? They were authorized to come here; agreements were made between the City and the state, and now we find the problem of closing off a road which is very objectionable to the people. If anyone can answer these questions, I'd certainly be pleased to listen to them as to how the traffic would be handled in an alternate manner, and would the people in that area be satisfied with such a solution? Thank you, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Bonner, I'm going to allow Ms. Summerville to speak at this time because she feels she has some comments from the people in that area.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The people are saying to Mr. Ford to go back and re-evaluate the study. I think that's what they pay our Traffic Director to do; to come up with a sensible and viable solution where all the citizens or the majority of the citizens can come to some agreement. We don't have the answer. I think Mr. Ford is knowledgeable enough and with the expertise of his office, can go back and reassess and come up with an answer like he came up with this. In 1976 or whenever, there was somebody with a plan, and I don't know if General Reinsurance was in the picture at that time. All we ask is to go back and try again and reopen the street because it is closed.

MR. BONNER: One other question. If the Traffic Department was to go back and review this; say they made a sincere effort to review that, and came up with the same conclusion they have now, do you think that the citizens in the area would be willing to accept that?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The only thing I can say to you is to look at the petition. I can only go back to my constituents in the 6th District. This whole Board would have to go back to their constituents because all of those petitions come from different district. You would have to do the same thing as I would have to do. You would have to ask them. I can speak for the total of petitioners.

MR. DONAHUE: Madam President, I'd like to address the question asked by Mr. Bonner? The Committee has been working on this for like four months

PRESIDENT SANTY: Certainly, Mr. Donahue. Mr. Bonner raised a question and I will let you address that question.

MR. DONAHUE: This comes before us tonight as a result of the Traffic Department's restudying the very problem that is going to be created by the construction of this building. The plan in front of you, is an alternative to a traffic situation which will have all of General Reinsurance's traffic entering on to East Main Street, divided highway, and having to head towards the Darien border along East Main Street from 4 to 6 o'clock every afternoon. That is an already heavily congested area. Their goal would be to reach the thruway at exit 9. 40 to 60% of their traffic would get on exit 9, and, then, head westbound. The original plan, the accepted plan dictates this. The alternative plan is the construction of this access way from the second story of General Reinsurance which will allow the traffic, 40 to 60% of the traffic, to get directly on the thruway alleviating the traffic problems that Mr. Bonner is concerned about. There are two alternatives here; one is the

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) original plan dumping all the traffic on to East Main Street, and the second is the alternative here before you tonight. This alternative permits a solution to some of these traffic problems.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I still have some questions to ask rather than statements to make. We've heard about the rights of the citizens which, of course, we all support, and the corporations who have come in, and in good faith, signed contracts 6, 7, 8 years ago, how many years ago it was, and I've looked at the little model over there. Now, may I ask through you, Madam President, may I ask Mr. Donahue, it seems to me that it's after the fact that the building is built; we can't ask them to tear down the building. We are concerned primarily with a closing of a parts of North State Street and Hill Street. In reality, what could be done if we continue to vote down this sale? What's the alternative to really keeping these streets open? Can they really be kept open or is this just an after the fact vote?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman. Mr. Donahue, I don't want to put you on the spot. Do you want to answer this question?

MR. DONAHUE: Love to. General Reinsurance, when it originally began its plans for this property, went to the state about its access on to the thruway and found that it could not use North State Street. They wanted to use North State Street, they still would love to be able to use North State Street, but the state has denied that use as the state has denied that use to general traffic flow because of reasons cited in the letter of September 7th of traffic safety, and also, traffic efficiency; an efficient traffic flow.

The alternative, and the accepted alternative to our not accepting this plan which was worked on for over a year and a half by General Reinsurance and the Traffic Department of the City of Stamford, is to accept the original plan which is the accepted traffic pattern which I have already talked about. The traffic from this project will enter on to East Main Street and have nowhere to go but east. This will allow at least 40 to 60% of it to get immediately on the frontage roads along the thruway and on to the thruway into the west. There is a plan in place that require that and there are conditions that have been accepted by both parties which will enforce that on a daily basis. There is no alternative beyond this except to dump the traffic on to East Main Street.

MRS. GERSHMAN: In other words, we either load up East Main Street or we discontinue these two streets; those are the two alternatives? Is that correct?

MR. DONAHUE: It's the consensus of the Committee that that is correct after four months of studying this situation.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. Tonight we're discussing a problem. The problem is whether we should give or sell a street to a corporation to possibly facilitate the traffic flow in this Community, but this problem is going to come up again. Right now, the traffic doesn't move in this Community. Just think of this for a second. You have a hotel going up across the street from General Reinsurance. There's a hotel going up on Summer Street which was the old Town and Country Shopping Center. There's a hotel going up where Redman Chevrolet

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: (continuing) is or was, and there's a complex of hotel and office buildings going up on the other side of the I-95 near exit 7. Then, there are a couple of buildings going up right across the street here. What are we going to do about the traffic? The traffic that is going to buzz up Bedford Street, down Summer Street. How is the traffic going to get around the hotel that is going up where Redman Chevrolet is? Are we going to clear that street out? Are we going to get rid of that little park down the center of the street? Are we going to make this street wider? These are things that the 18th Board of Representatives is going to have to face, and the 19th Board of Representatives is going to have to face.

Unfortunately, there's no planning for all of this. There is no planning today for tomorrow, and now we're trying to solve yesterday's problems today. This all should have been thought about yesterday. There's is not much we can do about it now. We have to face this problem. Yes, we are on the horns of a dilemma and we've got to make a decision. Whichever way we vote tonight, somebody is going to be hurt mentally; somebody is going to be hurt financially, and we all have to vote, as it said in the past on this Board, our own consciences. But, maybe we ought to think of something broader scope for the future. Why don't we put a moratorium on all development in this Community until somebody can say, "This is the plan; this is how it's going to work for two years from now and four years from now." And, until we can come up with that plan, stop digging; stop building. We haven't thought about the services that all these facilities are going to need; the police, the fire, the ambulance; the sanitation; the sewerage, but yet, we are building those buildings. We're letting them get away with building those buildings, and we're not looking 2, 4, and 6 years down the road. Let's start looking down the road now. Let's start planning for tomorrow, today, and let's let this item on our Agenda be the spark that sets everybody's mind to working on how we can plan for the future today, and if it means a moratorium on building in this Community until we can get our act together, then that's what it has to be. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. This is really very problematic for you. I find it very hard to disregard the wishes of a community in the City, and of people who have sincerely knowing all the facts and having used the roads, their action in signing a petition and their strong feelings. On the other hand, I am truly concerned that what we will be dumping out on to East Main Street will be a true horror. I've listened to the arguments on both sides, and to quote Mr. Wiederlight, "We are in the horns of a dilemma." It's what does one do? Do you disregard the representatives of a particular district who feel very, very strongly, and are representing their constituency, and also, obviously, many others in a very sincere desire to keep the street open, or do you try to prevent a real horrendous problem from occurring on these streets? Gods know what we are going to do. It's really a very, very negative situation.

I have one question to ask of Mr. Donahue. Mr. Wider has said several times that there was no public hearing in relation to this matter serveral years ago when it first came before us. That would be very disturbing to me if that's the case. If people have a chance to speak out on an issue prior to this occurring, that's one thing, but if they don't, then those petitions do take on a much stronger meaning to me. Mr. Donahue, perhaps, you know whether or not there was a public hearing where people had a chance to speak out on the closing of the street?

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

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: At our last meeting, I asked that a transcript of a public hearing be included as part of the record. It was held by the State Department of Transportation at Cloonan Middle School in January of 1976. It was announced in local papers; information concerning that was distributed throughout the City. The outline presented by a representative of the Department of Transportation, clearly talked about the cul-de-sac or the dead-ending of North State Street at this point, with reasons of safety and traffic flow. The public hearing was held that same evening and Mr. Wider was in attendance according to the record. It was a copy of a certified copy presented by the stenographer.

MR. DUDLEY: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY: Just as a point of information, is there a time period or length of time period when the state or whoever was involved, should have acted in closing North State Street being that the meeting was held in 1976, and no action was taken until this year? I'm wondering if there is a time period before another public hearing would have to be held?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The Chair feels that there isn't a time period if they acted properly, but I would ask Mr. Donahue since he's Chairman of the Committee. Can you comment on that, Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: There is no time period but under state law, the state at anytime can restrict access to state highways and state right-of-ways. We all drive along the highway and see those signs that say, "Road legally closed," and really what it tells you is to pass at your own risk. This was the case with North State Street. The road has been closed and is closed now. Reference has been made in the past to the fence that was erected by General Reinsurance. That fence was erected there #1, at the request of the Traffic Department for pedestrian vehicular safety under a street use permit under the construction of General Reinsurance. They were able to use an area which was critical to the construction of their building. The fence was erected and taken down once the work was completed. It was also done so with it in mind that the state had already closed the road. It was a part of the process which realigned exit 7, realigned exit 8; was done so at the request of the City and with great expenditures of money. It is part of the project which is newly completed. It was one of the last step, but nonetheless, it was part of the same project.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. We have nine more speakers for the first time and we have four for the second time. Just to remind you. Mrs. Goldstein, would you like to continue?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The only thing that I wanted to just have Mr. Donahue re-confirm, you mentioned a number before in relation to the amount of cars that would be pouring out on to Main Street and I really wanted to know the accuracy of the number, but I don't mean to the car. How many cars would be exiting from General Re? What kinds of affect would it have on Main Street?

MR. DONAHUE: This question has come up a number of times but we specifically asked it again the other evening. Under traffic and transportation safety and planning, there are different formulas for projecting that amount. Vehicular

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) trips can be reduced through van-pooling and through use of mass transportation which all corporations are urged to do in the City, but for a 560,000 square foot building, which this is roughly, they can estimate 4,000 vehicular trips per day. 4,000 vehicular trips per day would have one exit on to East Main Street, and the most critical time period obviously, would be from 4 to 6 in the afternoon.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mrs. Goldstein, are you finished?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I am. It's O.K. My questions have been answered. It is a very difficult question and I just hate to punish the people who will be using the streets now and need access for possible errors made so many years ago. It's really a horrendous problem.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MRS. HAWE: Thanks. Mrs. Goldstein is absolutely right. All these people who are going to be affected by this and yet, 4,000 cars coming out on East Main Street, this is really something that we can't win either way. I just want to ask Mr. Donahue, and I don't whether he really can say unequivocally what the answer is, but I'm going to ask the question anyway. If this is turned down, would there be any chance then that North State Street be reopened or if we turn this down, would it not be reopened anyway, or do we know that?

MR. DONAHUE: The Committee has struggled with this question for four months, and even myself, I'm concerned about the closing of North State Street, but, again, the consensus of the Committee is that we have pursued that question and have been told from all parties including as recent as this letter on your desk this evening, that State Street will not be reopend again for reasons of traffic safety primarily, and once the state goes on record as saying that a situation would be unsafe, I cannot see them reverting on that decision.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Are you finished, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: Yes.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Thank you, Madam President. This appears to be a classic example of "while Stamford slept." We've watched over the years development. The City has encouraged development with the URC program, but while we were watching the development, it never occurred to us that we would have over-growth. I'm afraid that we were never fully aware of the ramifications that both our Community and our traffic system would face in the future. Certainly, the term that was coined in New York, that being "gridlock" will be upon us in a very short time, I don't know whether the proper thing to do would be to refuse to pass this this evening, and have the state take action; by that I think that the state would have the right to condemn and do what they think is right for the health, and welfare for the entire area as far as moving traffic or whether they would further add to the burden and eventually consider what they call, "restrictive high occupancy travel hours," and that would only penalize our citizens more because it would not allow cars of one passenger to travel on our roads. I think it's a terrible problem, I think it's something that could have been prevented. I really feel that as Mr. Wiederlight has suggested, that it's time to strongly consider our roadways, our support systems, and, perhaps, declare a moratorium.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MCINERNEY: (continuing) Something must be done. There's got to be some relief and what we get is no better than the past plan. It appears that the developers are reaping the profits. The companies are coming into a state that provides no income tax, and they turn around and they really, if you will, cause problems, play havoc and chaos with the Community. It's really ashame what has happened, and, quite frankly, I don't know which is the right value judgement to make in this particular situation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to ask the Chairman a question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I ask the Representatives to please give the speaker your attention. Mr. Donahue, you're being asked a question. Mrs. Conti, continue.

MRS. CONTI: I would like to ask who has the power to reopen North State Street? I would assume only the state can do it. The City doesn't have the power to do this, is that correct?

MR. DONAHUE: State Street has not been discontinued as a City street. That's what we're doing here tonight. What they have done is restricted access to a state right-of-way and restricted access to a state highway which under the law, they have the right to do. That's unequivocal. The only who could decide to reopen it again, would be the State of Connecticut. But again, they have now said that because of reasons of traffic safety, they won't do that, and also traffic flow.

MRS. CONTI: The state has already been contacted and requested?

MR. DONAHUE: At my request, a letter was sent to the state and a response came in late last week, and it's on your desks this evening. It's dated September 7, and they state they are absolutely opposed to the reopening of North State Street at this interchange for the reasons I've stated, and also because they have expended a great amount of money on the realignment of 7 and 8, and the City gave its consent to this as part of the project. We also asked Jim Ford the other evening, if, in fact, we could come up with a plan to reopen North State Street, how could that happen? He said that the City would have to bear the cost of reopening it. The state would not spend a dime to do that, and he estimated it that it would cost the City \$200,000.

MRS. CONTI: But the City could do it without state permission? Or no?

MRS. DONAHUE: No, they would have to have state permission which has already been denied to the City and also to General Reinsurance who petitioned that they be allowed to use North State Street as an access way.

MRS. CONTI: O.K. Was this a decision of the State Transportation Department? Did it go before the State Legislature or who made the decision on this at the state level?

MR. DONAHUE: The State Traffic Commission was involved with it; the State Department of Transportation and, of course, the funding was approved by the State Legislature.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: Under the circumstances, I would like to move that we hold this in Committee and have the Committee send the petitions that have been presented to us tonight, to the State Transportation Department or whoever has jurisdiction here, and ask if, because of the overwhelming public sentiment, they would not reconsider this question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, your motion is to return this item to Committee?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, and have the Committee sent these petitions to the state with a request that the state reconsider the question now that there is such overwhelming public request for the reopening of the street.

~~PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti has made a motion. It has been seconded to return to Committee. Do you have anything further to say, Mrs. Conti, as maker of the motion?~~

MRS. CONTI: No, I just think that these are the first times that the petitions have been presented to us, and the state has been contacted. However, I don't know whether they are aware and at the same time we contact the State Transportation Department, I think we ought to send them to the State Representatives, also, and ask if there is any possibility that they might reconsider this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Speaking to the motion which is to return to Committee is Mr. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY: I'll pass.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to ask whoever would care to answer this, what the affect of this action will be? Mr. Donahue, perhaps, you could.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue is the next speaker so Mr. Donahue can answer the question, and then be the next speaker.

MR. DONAHUE: As I have already stated, we have been debating this for sometime, now. General Reinsurance has been very flexible in trying to hold off on their plans for the completion of their building. We've often talked about having to make decisions "under the gun." That has not been the case here, but, however, we are getting to a point now where it is doubtful that if we delay this any longer, that General Reinsurance will have no choice but to complete their building which under an accepted traffic plan, will put all this traffic on East Main Street, the case will be closed. I do not believe that it is in the best interest of this Community to delay this any longer because, I think in all good faith, General Reinsurance will be forced to complete their project under their accepted traffic plan, and I do believe and the consensus of the Committee agrees that the state is not going to allow that access. The decision was made in 1977. I just don't believe that there is merit at this point for delaying this decision for any longer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mrs. Goldstein, are you finished speaking?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I have just one more question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I have many speakers. We're speaking just to the motion to return to Committee.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I would like to know though I cannot see the harm in one more month of trying, and once again, I'm throwing this out to Mr. Donahue because I know how hard the Committee has worked, and I know how hard the Representatives in the districts have worked in relation to trying to represent their constituents. I want to know what harm in reality, one additional month would make? If we immediately dispatch a letter to the state, call them to see if there is any chance of their entertaining our suggestion, and by the same token, contacting General Re and informing them that it is just one month delay; that whatever the action will be ultimately, will occur at our October meeting.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I thought you were waiting for a reply from Mr. Donahue.

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Mr. Livingston. As I have already stated, that was one of the goals that the Committee had since our last meeting when this question was raised. We pursued it through the office of Jim Ford and the question came up and was discussed again the other night. It is his opinion and it is my opinion and the Committee's opinion at this point, that the state will not consider reopening North State Street. The decision was made back in 1976 and in 1977, with the consent of the Mayor and the approval of the Traffic Department; Ron Weber was the director at the time, and General Re wasn't even a factor then.

I think that any further delay is improper. I think we touched all the bases quite frankly.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I just want to bring you up to date. On this item alone, we have 7 speakers for the first time and a couple for the second time. Then to go back to the main motion, if that's defeated, we have about 9 more speakers. It's 10 after 10. I'm just asking you, Representatives, if someone has said the same think that you have said, please don't repeat it; just agree with the speaker. We have a long Agenda tonight and I know it has been a long week for everyone concerned.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. I agree with Mrs. Conti. This should be held. For us to accept more than 300 signatures from people all over the City of Stamford, and just to allow those petitions to sit here in our room and have no impact on the situation, I feel that we would be doing a disservice to the citizens who took their good time to come up with those petitions. I feel that we should by all means, vote for Mrs. Conti's motion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Livingston. We are now speaking to the motion to return to Committee.

MR. BLUM: I believe maybe there is an alternative, and what alternative am I talking about? In front of GTE, they have an access way to both sides of the road. In fact, they have a signalization right in front of their ramps that come out of the building which allows them to go from one side, either going east or going west; either side of Tresser Boulevard, they can go because there is a light in front of GTE's ramp out of the building. There are probably other methods that could be found, and I also want to say this, last month we did not have 300 petitions, and I think we should just look back to yesterday. I think the people of this City have spoken out on who they would like to govern them. I think that those 300 petitions; it's time that we ought to listen to the people, and I think that we should hold it for one month; see what affect we can do. Maybe, there is an alternative, and let's try it. Thank you.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum. I want to remind you that if you said the same thing as someone else has said previously, to please just agree with the speaker.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I agree that I think it would be wise to hold it a month to settle some of these questions. I believe there are serious reservations about this matter and feel that the Committee cannot ignore such a large expression of discontent from Stamford residents. I, myself, after listening to your presentation, have some questions about how such a tremendous volume of traffic can be funneled into the thruway safely. I find it difficult for even my own single car to enter the thruway safely at times. I'm concerned with the thought of our City possibly making a decision that could precipitate a significant increase in traffic accidents on the thruway.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MR. OWENS: Thank you, Madam President. This letter that was addressed to Mr. Ford, dated September 7, I have many reservations about this letter. #1, The Department is opposed to reopening North State Street at this intersection. To me, this is saying that it's not definite; just that it's their opposing. This letter also was signed by someone other than the Commissioner. With the issue at hand with such magnitude as this one, I would think the Commissioner would have signed this letter, personally. I also would like to support Mrs. Conti's motion to return this to the Committee because I really don't feel that there is anything that the state can do if we say we want a street open that the state can close a street on us, and not give us access to a main thoroughfare. There is also an alternative to this ramp of General Reinsurance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, Mr. Owens. I would ask the Representatives to please take their seats. If you are going to speak to that display in the back, I wish you would move that to the Democratic Caucus Room. The people in the back of the room cannot hear the speaker, and I would like Mr. Rybnick now to close both Caucus doors and keep them closed for the entire evening. It's very impolite to the speaker and it's impolite to this Board. Continue, Mr. Owens.

MR. OWENS: Madam President, while they are looking at that particular structure back there, this is what I'm speaking of, and, in fact, if you look at that particular display, model or whatever, you can see that the alternative for this whole thing is that we can work out something with General Reinsurance. They want access to North State Street themselves for egress in the afternoon. We can also use that same street to let our cars go down that street into Elm Street. There's no reason why we both cannot use that street, and it's obvious by looking at that display. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Owens.

MR. ROOS: I have just one small question of Mr. Donahue. Does he by any chance, know, this road has been inaccessible for quite a while now. What has been our experience with it not being accessible since it has been closed?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Donahue, do you have the answer to that question? That might be a difficult question for you.

MR. DONAHUE: It's an assumption on my part and I will preface what I say about that. During our discussions with the Traffic Department, the closier of entrance or the restriction of entrance on to that access way or on to the exit via North

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: (continuing) State Street, has not proved to present any significant problems to the City of Stamford. Now, that was stated a number of times in a number of ways and we also have to remember that this whole situation was studied indepth in 1977, and has been studied specifically, within the past year and a half jointly by the Traffic Department and General Reinsurance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: This is a point of information. I can speak on this because I have witnessed it, and I think that it should be clarified that for those persons, say for instance the ones on the petition, I witnessed it myself because I refuse to accept that the street is not closed. When you go down there, you have to back up to Ramada Inn to turn around because you can't go left. That is more dangerous. I would challenge Mr. Ford to put a box there and see how many people endangering their lives in having to back up to Ramada Inn and turn around because when they get to that dead-end, they realize the street is closed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville. Are you finished, Mr. Roos?
Thank you.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I think 300 petitioners signed there strictly spells out the problem that they've had. Frankly speaking, I think there's a whole lot of misconception being thought concerning this whole thing. There is no reason why that 900 cars have to go over East Main Street in the afternoon. If North State Street is open, they can come on right there. This was being done from the service station before General Reinsurance was there. The fact is that there is a lot of assumption, and I think the Governor should know what they are trying to do and I plan to inform the Governor that we are dissatisfied with the position of the Traffic Department. That's exactly what I plan to do. That's why I want it held for one month. Let the Governor deal with it since it affects these people who voted for him.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney has not spoken to this. Are you speaking, Mrs. McInerney, to the Floor or Mr. Boccuzzi?

MRS. MCINERNEY: I withdraw my remarks.

MR. BOCCUZZI: When is our next meeting, Madam President?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Our next meeting is October 11, which is a Tuesday because the 10th is a holiday which is Columbus Day.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I assume then by October 11, we can get our answer back if we send this petition up. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would assume so.

MR. BOCCUZZI: And once we settle the situation on closing or opening of North State Street, I think a lot of peoples' minds would be satisfied. I will ask Mr. Donahue if he thinks that if we held it to October 11, is this possibly

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: (continuing) something that we all, both the City, the state, Reinsurance, and the petitioners could live with, if October 11, we decide which way we are going?

MR. DONAHUE: Madam President, I have just discussed this very thing with representatives of General Reinsurance who are here this evening. As I stated before they are under a very strict time line, and that any further delay in this will cause them a great deal of problems and that is a legitimate concern on their part. However, because the petitions were introduced here this evening, and because of the concern that those petitions at least be given an airing in Hartford, they are willing to postpone their plans for completion of this project if we can, although I know we cannot guarantee this, but if we can say to them that this Board will make a decision by that October 11th meeting. They cannot go beyond that. We were talking about cost, about construction problems and we're talking about putting your builder on hold and saying, "We'll call you October 11th to tell you what to do," but as I say because of the fact that the petitioners were presented, they believe that they can wait that time period, and they have requested that I make that statement at this time. I, at this time, would recommend that this be returned to Committee with the understanding, I hope by those here, that we will have to make a decision at the October meeting in all fairness to the petitioner which was General Re to begin with.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have a motion made and seconded. All the first time speakers have spoken to return to Committee. I have one second time speaker.

MRS. CONTI: I would just like to reiterate that in that request to return it to Committee, that these petitions also be brought to the attention of the State Representatives inasmuch as many of their constituents have signed these petitions, and also I would thank General Reinsurance for extending us this additional time. I would like to impress upon the State Representatives when it is brought to their attention, that there is a very short time limit on some kind of a response on this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, I will direct the Administrative Assistant, the first priority tomorrow is to make the copies of these petitions and get them off to the Governor and all the State Representatives immediately. That will be first thing tomorrow.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: With the acceptance by this Board, I would like to personally, hand deliver them to the Governor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's perfectly fine. Since you Supervise the office staff, Ms. Summerville, it's in your hands. I give you that authority. We have no further speakers, we'll move right to the question. The question is on returning this item to Committee. We'll use a voice vote. All in favor of returning this to Committee, please say aye. Opposed? Will the no votes please raise their hands. 1 no vote, Mr. White. Everyone else unanimous. Thank you.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF LeROY PLACE AS A CITY STREET - submitted by Rep. Donald Donahue 8/24/83. Chapter 64.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE SALE OF RELAY PLACE
for new GTE Realty Corp. Bldg., pursuant to Chapter 64. Resolution
approved concerning Notice of Intention to Discontinue A Portion of
Relay Place approved 8/15/83 meeting.

MR. DONAHUE: As you know, last month we voted on a resolution of an intention to discontinue a portion of this street. The Committee has voted with 5 in favor and zero opposed to recommend publication of this ordinance with the intention that after publication, the Committee will hold a public hearing on this matter and be able to report back to the full Board with a final recommendation about this sale and discontinuance of the street and with that I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion. A motion has been made and seconded for publication the proposed ordinance concerning the sale of Relay Place. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a voice vote. All in favor of publication of this ordinance, please say aye. Opposed? One opposed, Ms. Summerville. PASSED with one opposition.

MR. DONAHUE: That concludes the report of the Planning and Zoning Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mr. Stork, you want to be recognized at this time.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to take this opportunity early in the evening while we are all still here, and make a motion to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda. That item concerns the veto of Ordinance No. 515 by Mayor Clapes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second? There's a second. to Suspend the Rules to consider over-riding the ordinance which the Mayor vetoed. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, we better use the machine. We need 27 votes to Suspend the Rules to take an item up not on the Agenda which is considering the ordinance which the Mayor vetoed. Has everyone voted? We are voting for Suspension of the Rules. We need 27 votes to consider an item not on the Agenda. The item is considering the ordinance which the Mayor vetoed, Ordinance 515. Has everyone voted? The motion to Suspend the Rules has PASSED 27 affirmative, 3 negative, 1 abstaining, and 1 not-voting. The machine calculates 27. The machine was in good working order. Someone must have changed it before it was calculated and I'm going by the machine tally. I have it right here because I announced the vote. Mr. Stork, continue with your discussion. The motion PASSED. I repeat 27 affirmative votes the machine has calculated, 3 no votes, 1 abstention, and 3 not-voting.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President and Members of the Board.

TO OVER-RIDE THE VETO OF MAYOR CLAPES OF HIS VETO OF ORDINANCE NO. 515 - Mandating compliance with Resolution No. 1489 by September 15, 1983, concerning refuse collection to all condominiums and multi-family dwellings in the sewered districts of the City.

MR. STORK: I'd like to make a motion that this Board over-ride the veto of Mayor Clapes of his veto of Ordinance No. 515 which was passed by this Board on August 15, 1983, by a vote of 28 to 1, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. Is there a second to that? Several seconds.

MR. DONAHUE: Madam President, I think we have discussed this quite at length, and I wish to be short and to the point. I think that, if nothing more, this Board should send a message to the Mayor of our displeasure because it wasn't with any intention to discredit the Mayor that we began this process. We requested important information on a very important issue. We have not received that information.

In the Mayor's reply to this Board concerning the veto, he talked about all the information we had been supplied with, and the solution of the tax credit. This Board voted against that tax credit. This Board did so because of inequities which it felt existed within the tax credit, and apparently without the knowledge of the Mayor, both Board members and condominium owners and condominium representatives were agreed that there were inequities. They agreed that the cost represented in that ordinance was too low, too high, should be different. Multi-family resident owners said that they shouldn't be included. Before the Mayor ever brought that ordinance in here, however, and before we were asked to consider a tax credit which may set a dangerous precedent at some point in time in the history of Stamford. The very things that we asked for, the very information that we asked for... That ordinance was truly in the best interest of this Community. Before it was ever brought in here, the questions that we have asked should have been answered by the Administration.

Some four years ago, we began a process with the original ordinance. It was voted down, and two years after it was voted down, the Administration walked into this room, to the Legislative and Rules Committee, and handed over back up material that was dated two years before we were asked to take a second look. That back up material was inaccurate at the time and it was even more inaccurate the second time they came down for the same reason, and there were no answers given to the question then and the answers that we have asked have never been addressed by the Public Works Commissioner or any of his Staff members. This has turned into somekind of a battle between us and the Mayor, and it shouldn't have ever happened, and the fact that we had to pass an ordinance to try to move this thing off the dime is absolutely unexcusable. There should be cooperation between the Administration and the Legislative branch of government. Why there can't be that on this issue, I do not understand. There are probably reasons far removed from this Body that we have no knowledge of. I can't understand it. So, I ask this Body tonight to over-turn this veto as of at least, at least, an example that we can set that we have not been holding this here. We have been sincerely trying to get answers to a serious question. A question that affects over 6,000 taxpayers, or the question of it not affecting the broad City of Stamford, I think that when you are talking about over 6,000 taxpayers, you're addressing a rather broad question because you are addressing the whole issue of refuse collection; not just a specific issue of condominiums. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I pass for now.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you very much, Madam President. When I first heard on the local radio that the Mayor had vetoed this ordinance, I was really shocked about it, and I dictated a letter to the Mayor from our Office, and I believe everyone here got a copy of that letter, and what disturbed me most of all was that the Mayor in his remarks on the radio, mentioned that we, the Board of Representatives, hire consultants to make somekind of a survey or study of this problem. I'm surprised that the Mayor doesn't know that we don't have any special fund in our budget set aside for any consultants to do that kind of work.

As far as I'm concerned, there's has been enough studying of this problem. It's been around for at least three years unfortunately, and nothing has been done about it. Those taxpayers who reside in condominiums and multi-family dwellings are paying taxes for a service that they are not now receiving, and I think they have been very patient up to now with the problem, and as some of us remember, we did defeat back in 1981, that previous Board, a proposal by the Mayor and his Public Works Commissioner to provide a tax credit of \$2.00 per unit. The Legislative and Rules Committee at that time, which I Co-Chaired did have a public hearing on it, and several members of condominium associations did come to that meeting, and did express their disliking the way the ordinance was drafted because in most cases, it did not adequately provide the funds necessary to hire private collectors to pick up their garbage. It was fine if it was a large building. Then the owners in that case would be well compensated above and beyond the cost of what it would be. However, the smaller units, the garden type units, would not be adequate. Again, they're paying for a service they are not getting, and I really believe that it is not our responsibility as the Board of Representatives, the Legislative branch, but the Executive branch and that the Mayor is flagrantly in violation of the Charter and our Code of Ordinances which does specify very clearly that in cases where there are sewer districts, in "A" districts, that the services be provided should get paid garbage collection by the City, and in conclusion, I believe that the Mayor of our City should exercise the strong Leadership and direct his Public Works Commissioner to determine first of all, the cost to the City of purchasing the necessary equipment.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, I think that that's part of the ordinance.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, I realize that. Thank you. I'm almost finished. I appreciate your patients, Madam President. To purchase the necessary equipment to have the City collect the garbage at those multi-family dwellings, and also to direct his Purchasing Agent to obtain bids from the private collectors to find out what the cost would be to the City of going out to bid to have the privates collect it, and whichever is the least costly to the City, that's the way we should go, and I think that's the only two solutions. The tax credit idea is not going to work. I don't believe any type of a separate taxing district is going to work. Now, all he has to do is those two things and the problem can be solved, and to have it come back to us and ask us to do this when it's his responsibility, is just unbelievable, and I think tonight that we should over-ride his veto and make sure that he does fulfill his obligation as the Chief Executive Officer of the City. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I want to remind the members that what we are voting on now is to basically, pass the ordinance that we sent to the Mayor in to-to that he vetoed. That is what we're doing here tonight according to Section 204.1 of the Charter, we have that power, and that ordinance becomes effective without any further action by the Mayor, but that's what we're voting on. We cannot change the ordinance. We cannot even recommend any changes. That's what we're doing tonight. One further speaker.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. Does the ordinance as constituted, because I don't have it in front of me, does it request that the Mayor look into the possibly of setting up a separate tax district?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, it does. That's item 6 of the ordinance, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any further speakers?

MRS. MAIHOCK: That's a question I also was interested in. Until tonight, we really hadn't considered a question of a separate tax district.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, we did when we passed the ordinance because it is part of the ordinance. We voted on that.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I mean in our Committee. We have been discussing other aspects.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That was part of the ordinance we voted on.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Right, but that's why I just wondered. Would there be any merit in investigating this with our State Legislature?

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion on the Floor now is to approve the ordinance over the Mayor's veto which would become effective immediately without any further action by the Mayor. We are actually voting upon the ordinance as we sent to the Mayor last month in to-to and that is #6 of the ordinance.

MRS. CONTI: Point of information. How many votes does it take to over-ride?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It takes 27 votes.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Roll call vote, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for a Roll call vote. There being no further speakers. I'm sorry, Mr. Wider.

MR. WIDER: Ring the bell....

PRESIDENT SANTY: I will ring the bell, Mr. Wider. I certainly will. Will the Tellers please come forward for their tally sheets. The motion on the Floor is to over-ride the Mayor's veto of Ordinance No. 515 Supplemental. 27 votes are required. We are going to proceed with a Roll call vote. A yes vote you approve over-riding the veto; you approve of the ordinance. A no vote means that you would go along with the Mayor's veto. If you want the ordinance in effect, you want to over-ride the Mayor's veto, you vote yes. If you agree with the Mayor in his action, you vote no. Does everybody understand how we are voting now? 27 votes are required. I would ask everyone to please be quiet. Speak into your microphone. Ms. Summerville will begin the Roll call. Mr. Stork and Mr. Wiederlight are keeping the tally.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE called the Roll for the vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would ask the Tellers to please come forward with your tally, and the three of us can confer. The motion has PASSED 32 affirmative, 1 negative, and 1 abstaining. That ordinance has passed. It needs no further action by the Mayor.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Audrey Maihock

MRS. MAIHOCK: A meeting of the Environmental Protection Committee was held at 6:30 p.m. on September 6, 1983. Present were Committee members Marie Hawe, Dennis White, and myself, Chairman. Also present were Mr. Paul Mazik of the Department of Health and Judy Slayback of the EPB.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING COMMERCIAL TREE SPRAYERS TO BE LICENSED BY HEALTH DEPARTMENT FOR PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLY -
submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock 7/21/83. Held in Committee 8/1/83.

Above also referred to Legislative and Rules Committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. MAIHOCK: It was obvious at this meeting that it is very necessary that this ordinance be enacted as soon as possible for the protection of our public water supply from possible contamination. Several incidences were cited when for instance, a 50 gallon container of toxic material burst and a brook was contaminated as well as instances when care in drawing water, resulted in pesticide flowing into a brook instead of water filling the tank, or persons were committing other actions that resulted in contamination of bodies of water in our City.

A copy of the proposed ordinance is on your desks for your review. A meeting of the Environmental Protection Committee scheduled for this evening at 6:30 p.m., did not have a quorum because of the grave illness of Mr. Dennis White's father, and a last minute meeting change, Mrs. Hawe was obliged to schedule because she did not have a quorum for her Fiscal Committee.

This ordinance is important to our health and to the health of our children, and I hope that all of you will examine it very carefully and that we will enact it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, your Committee did not for lack of a quorum, but do you want to bring it out on the Floor for publication or are you going to hold it in Committee?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I believe that because of the elections and everything, the members of this Board were not able to really take the time to investigate it, and I would like to feel that they all understand this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: So, you are holding this in Committee?

MRS. MAIHOCK: Yes, we will.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Your item is being held. Mr. Zelinski, you are the Secondary Committee but that item is being held.

MR. ZELINSKI: Right. Through you, Madam President, or to you, could I ask a question of Rep. Maihock on this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, it is being held, Mr. Zelinski, and why don't you wait until it's discussed in the Committee or to speak to her after? Since it's in your Committee also, you probably want to discuss it with her.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you.

- (1) PARKING AT CHAMPION INTERNATIONAL VS. RICE SCHOOL, ETC. - submitted by Rep. Gabe DeLuca 6/20/83. Held in Committee 7/13 and 8/15/83.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: The first item on the Agenda, Madam President, regarding parking at Champion International vs. Rice School, there is a report on everyone's desk from Paul Disario who is the Project Director of the Transportation Center, and I believe all the questions are answered in the report. Unless there is some question, I don't think it's necessary to discuss it. It's a very complete report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item 1 is completed with a report.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING THE LIMITATION OF TRUCK TRAFFIC ON CITY STREETS - submitted by Reps. Guroian and Betty Conti 5/6/83. Approved for publication as amended, 8/13/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (3) REQUEST FROM REP. PAUL DZIEZYC, Chairman, Health and Protection, that Fiscal Committee report on status and progress of collection agency handling parking citations and past-due tickets, since February 9, 1983 approval of \$235,050 for six-month period, which has expired.

Above also referred to Fiscal Committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Items 2 and 3 are held since we did not meet due to the Holidays.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein. Items #2 and 3 are held.

MR. GAIPA: Is it appropriate to convey to the Chairman of the Committee, the concern of many of our constituents about this item #2?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's being held, Mr. Gaipa. I would suggest that you discuss it with Mrs. Goldstein or attend her Committee meeting when she schedules it.

MR. GAIPA: We can expedite it.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: I'd love to answer that. We published the ordinance, and it's just a matter of our Board voting to pass it. We certainly would have held a public hearing had we not scheduled the meeting on the High Holy Days, Mr. Gaipa. It will be here for next month.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Gaipa, it should be enacted for action here on the 11th of October. It's being held.

MRS. CONTI: Mrs. Goldstein, are you planning a public hearing on it?

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes, this matter is really of great concern to the entire City, and obviously, the Board was very concerned about it considering the vote for publication and we will have a public hearing for anyone concerned to come. We'll announce it in the newspaper.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Probably, Mrs. Goldstein, the public hearing will be before our next Board meeting, and you all will receive notification.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, Madam President. I'm trying to be very patient this evening. I wanted to ask a question through you to the Chairman of one of the Committees on an item that was being held. You said that it was being held so I should talk to her after the meeting. Yet, now we have another Committee report; two items are being held and you allow two Representatives to ask questions. I think, Madam President, we have to be consistent here. Either there are no questions if an item is being held or there are some, but not pick and choose which ones are or not. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, Mrs. Maihock's ordinance was not even published. It's not even written; no action on it. On Mrs. Goldstein's Committee, it's for final adoption and that's the difference.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Marie Hawe and John Hogan

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Thursday, the 8th of September, to discuss item #18, I believe, which was the question of the \$2.2 million surplus. We also met last Monday on the 12th at which there was no quorum. Present were myself, Rep. Conti, Rep. Roos, Rep. Livingston, and Rep. Goldstein which are five people but there were never five people at any one time, and so we could not vote on it. I called a meeting for 6:30 this evening at which time were present, Reps. Betty Conti, Joe Franchina, John Roos, Gerry Rybnick, myself and Rep. Goldstein. So, we do have a vote on the items on our Agenda.

I would like to first move the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. HAWE: I'd like to move on the Consent Agenda, item #4.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #4 on Consent.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like that off, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #4 is off.

MRS. HAWE: Item #6.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #6 on Consent. Ms. Rinaldi, you want that off?

MS. RINALDI: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Off Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #7.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #7 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #8.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #8 is on Consent.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWES: Item #9.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #9 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #13.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #13 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #14.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #14 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #15.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #15 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #16.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #16 is on Consent. Mrs. Maihock, what is your question?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like to take 15 off from Consent, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 15 is off Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #19.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #19 is on Consent. Mr. Bonner wants it off Consent and so does Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. HAWES: Item #20.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #20 is on Consent. Item #20, Mrs. Saxe wants it off Consent.

- (1) \$ 6,650.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET #687 DIVISION STREET
TOT LOT - Board of Finance approved 4/21/83. Returned to
Committee 7/11 and 8/15/83.

Above also referred to Public Housing & Community Development Committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. HAWES: The Committee voted 5 in favor and none opposed to hold. There is some correspondence on your desks tonight that you might want to look at for next month.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #1 is being held in Committee.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

(2) \$1,590,132.00 - VARIOUS PAY INCREASES - MEA LABOR CONTRACT AND NON-UNION
APPROVED \$1,481,636.00 PERSONNEL - RETRO AND CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. Board of
 (Reduction: \$108,496.00) Finance approved 6/23/83. Mayor's request 6/22/83.
 Returned to Committee 7/11 and 8/15/83.

<u>Approved</u>	<u>REQUEST</u>	
\$ 32,864.	\$ 32,864.	Attach. I - Retro FY '81/82 Regular and Part-time pay for employees in jobs similar to MEA.
\$ 76,142.	\$ 76,142.	Attach. II - Retro FY '82/83 Regular and Part-time pay for employees in jobs similar to MEA; 8%+8%.
\$1,182,336.	\$1,277,368.	Attach. III - 1983-84 FY MEA Labor Contract Appropriation - Union Employees - current fiscal year.
\$ 136,798.	\$ 150,262.	Attach. IV - 1983-84 FY for employees in jobs similar to MEA - Perm. Part-Time, Part-Time, Over-Time, Stand-by, Differential.
\$ 53,496.	\$ 53,496.	Attach. V - Stamford Museum & Nature Center employees - Fiscal Years: 1981/82, 1982/83, 1983/84 - Retroactive with raises ranging 7% to 9%/yr.
\$1,481,636.	\$1,590,132.	Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

MPS. HAWK: If you recall last month, the Board held this in Committee, and the Fiscal Committee wrote a letter to the Mayor asking for a plan for the funding of this contract for the entire year. There had been some discussion as to partial funding of it, and should we fund part of it now, part of it later, and we felt that we wanted a plan from the Administration for the whole year. What they thought we should do. Should there be lay-offs; should we fund the whole thing; or whatever, and that we would consider it this month. Now, on all of your desks, there is a response to that request by Mr. Hogan and myself, and it comes from Commissioner Marra. It's on your desks. It's three pages long. It goes into a bit of the background and all that. I won't read it but I will call your attention to what in effect, is the bottom line of what the Administration is recommending and that is on the last page, next to the last paragraph which says, "However, I presently recommend against full funding of labor contracts. Funding should be approved at a 90% level as a means of keeping budgetary pressure on managers and challenging them to manage the budget tightly."

I'd just like to say a few brief words about this. I feel, and I believe it's the Committee's feeling that we are not pleased with the fact that the arbitrator has said that the City has to pay these kind of increases. However, at this point, we seem to have just several options. One of them is to fund the contract entirely in the amount originally requested, the \$1.5 million. Another is to make a substantial cut which would result in lay-offs of personnel in the City, and the third would be to fund it at this 90% figure. The Committee voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed to fund at 90%. We felt that even though this would not effect any long term savings because the only way you can effect savings is really by laying-off people, that it would save a small amount of money this year and would encourage the department heads to conserve in their spending.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) It must be brought up that if we do lay-off people, we don't save that much money the first year because there's a lot of hidden costs that are involved with lay-offs, and we wouldn't be saving any substantial money this fiscal year anyway with lay-offs. You would have to lay-off like two people for each one person's salary that you hope to save.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, do you want to make your motion? Include the figures in your motion.

MRS. HAWE: The Committee has voted with a vote of 5 in favor, 1 opposed to recommend the approval of \$1,508,636.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded.

MRS. HAWE: I'll tell you where that was taken out. If you look on the Agenda, you'll see attachments I, II, III, IV, and V. Attachments I and II which are retroactive pay are left intact. Attachment III which is \$1,277,368 has been reduced to \$1,209,336, and that represents 90% funding of it. Attachment IV, the \$150,262 has been reduced to \$136,798, and attachment V, Stamford Museum has been left as is because this is not the full appropriation to fund their raises. They have been very aggressive in raising funds on their own, and have used their own funds to fund some of this, and we didn't feel that they should be penalized because of that.

I just want to bring one thing to your attention that item #10 on the Agenda, which is \$38,790.00 for pay increases for people who are linked to the MEA contract. In these figures that I gave you, those people raises are included in #2 now at 90%. So, if we approved these figures that I just mentioned, item #10 will not be dealt with. We don't have to approved that money.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded. I would the Personnel Committee as the Secondary Committee, their report, please.

MR. STORK: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? The Secondary Committee report is waived. We are now speaking to the main motion.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I am speaking against funding 90% of this contract. If we fund 90%, all we are doing is guaranteeing that toward the end of the fiscal year, they will be back for an additional appropriation for the last 10%, and we are also guaranteeing that we'll have a big increase built into next year's budget. I don't think that we should fund at 90%. I think it would be wise to fund at 50%. While it is true that there are hidden costs involved with laying-off people, they are one-time costs. Keeping everybody on is an automatic built in increase in each subsequent year's budget. While there may be additional expense involved in the first year of lay-offs, that is only a one-time expense. It does not recur like an increase does, and I would advise everyone to think seriously what you are doing to next year's budget if you fund this at 8%. 90% which is an 8% increase for the third year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you making a motion, Mrs. Conti?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: I would like to make a motion to fund it at 50%.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made, and it's a proper motion, to fund... Do you want to give me a figure, Mrs. Conti, to fund the MEA contract?

MRS. CONTI: Let's see if there is a second. I'll figure out the figures.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? I need a second before the motion is properly before this Board. Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to that motion, Mrs. Conti.

MR. BONNER: Point of information. Is the 50% on attachment III and attachment IV which would be instead of the 8%, would be 4% on those two items?

MRS. CONTI: No, I would fund items 1, 2, 3 and 4 at 50% because actually we're not even required to fund items 1 and 2 at all, but if we fund it at 50%, it would be a 4% increase rather than an 8% increase.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti has made a motion to fund the contract, the MEA contract at 50% which would be 1, 2, 3 and 4, but I need a total. Hereafter, if you make a motion, have the figures available especially during the Fiscal Committee report. You raised your hands Mr. Zelinski and Mr. Dudley, to speak to the main motion. We have an amendment to the motion to fund at 50%. You were speaking to the 90%. Mr. Dudley would like to speak to the amendment.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to speak against funding 50%. A number of things have bothered me with this contract from the very beginning. We've heard that there hasn't been, there wasn't enough money, there would be a supplemental tax increase, \$2.2 millions was suddenly found. My reservations were correct. Possibly there was money to fund this contract. Possibly there was more money. I'm deeply disturbed to find out now that the Mayor asked for an increase in the new term of whoever the Mayor may be at that time, and his Cabinet. Where does that money come from? Is there more money laying around? I'm bewildered at this point. I do not want to see a tax increase. I do not want to see lay-offs. At this point, I do not know where I stand on this. I do know that I cannot support a 50% reduction because I think that would be a substantial lay-off which I would not be in agreement with. 90% I may agree with, but 50% I cannot go along with, and if I may, I'd like to ask through you to Mrs. Hawe, will a 90% increase result in...how many lay-offs would that result in if any?

MRS. HAWE: None.

MR. DUDLEY: And if Mrs. Conti or Mrs. Hawe knows the answer, what would a 50% reduction?

MRS. HAWE: It's hard to say. In round figures, every \$20,000 average would be one person so you would have to see what Mrs. Conti's figures are and divide by \$20,000. That would be very approximate because there are a lot of costs involved in laying-off, termination pay but see what figure she comes up with and then divide by 20,000, you'll get it. It's a lot of people.

MR. DUDLEY: Once the figures are arrived at, I would appreciate an answer from somebody if I can get it, Madam Chairman. Thank you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let the record show that Mrs. McInerney has left the Floor and will not participate in the discussion, or the debate or vote on this item.

MRS. CONTI: I still don't have the figure, I'm sorry.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. You have to remember that we are not just talking about dollars; we're talking about people. We're talking about families and households here, and I think that Rep. Dudley brought out the most germane point about this whole thing. What I'm saying applies to Mrs. Conti. She's not listening so I'll wait until she finishes her complex computation over there, Madam President, but I do reserve the right when she is finish, to continue.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I sat with the Fiscal Committee the other night, and I listened to the Finance Commissioner, and the 90%, the Finance Commissioner's suggestion in order not to have any lay-offs, and I'm certainly opposed to the 50% cut in the budget. Right now, we are short of giving the citizens the services they are paying for and I wouldn't like to see any reduction in service. If we are going to cut this 50%, we can look for a reduction. I'm certainly opposed to it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MRS. CONTI: I have the figures. Item 1, the corrected figure...

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have the total first, Mrs. Conti?

MRS. CONTI: The total of the reductions you want first?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I want the total of your motion. You made the motion to fund at 50% bringing the total of item 2 on the Agenda to what total?

MRS. CONTI: \$704,544.00

PRESIDENT SANTY: Now you can break it down, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: Item 1 would be a reduction of \$16,432 and the remaining figure of \$16,432. Item 2 would a reduction of \$38,071 and a remainder of \$38,071. Item 3 would be \$638,684 reduction and a remainder of the same. Item 4 would be \$75,131 deduction and \$75,131 remaining. Attachment 5 would remain the same because this is only a partial funding and the Museum gets a lot of its funding from private sources. The total reduction would be \$885,588 and the total appropriation would be \$704,544.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. As I started to say, this is quite a drastic reduction. It's going to result, no doubt, in a reduced work force, but a reduced work force is really just laying-off people with households and families. It's going to result in reduced services, and my question through the Chair to Mrs. Conti who made this motion is, can you tell me what, in exactness, the reduction in the work force be; how many people, and what reduction in services can the citizens out there look forward to if we pass this motion?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: It depends very much on what the Administration does. They can lay-off; they can suggest to the union that they open their contract for re-negotiation, possibly take 4% instead of 8% and keep the entire work force intact. It's entirely up to a number of things that can happen. I can't predict what anybody will do, but I would hope that they would consider reopening their contract, and taking less and keeping everybody on. What we have to bear in mind is that we represent, maybe you don't, but I represent a number of taxpayers that work in the private section. They're calling me and saying to me, "We have had no increases this year or next year, and why should we be forced to pay 8% increases to other people?" And, I must take that into consideration, and I think all of us should.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Wiederlight, does that answer your question?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: It was an answer. Unfortunately, it's an unsatisfactory answer because it's still going to keep these people in a dangling position, who are going to be laid-off; how many and who? It's still not going to answer the question of what services will be reduced and the bottom line is going to be that it's going to fall back on the Board of Representatives, someday, somehow, somewhere; you know it and I know it. I think a 50% reduction without a plan, I repeat, without a plan, is not a good move. If this motion had been thought out previously, and discussed with whether it be department heads, or the Administration, and an exact plan presented to this Board as to what would the implementation be on a 50% reduction, then I might be able to vote for it. As it stands right now, I'm not willing to take the shot in the dark which this really amounts to, so I have to vote against it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dudley, when you were questioning, she was computing.

MR. DUDLEY: Again, my question is what exactly would this amount to as far as a reduction in the work force; meaning the maximum? Can anyone on this Board give me a maximum figure?

MRS. CONTI: I believe it is one person for every \$20,000 approximately. For every \$20,000, it's one employee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MRS. HAWES: This is rough figuring because there's a lot of costs that go into it that we don't have the figures for. I would say that if this entire cut were taken out in people which we couldn't say, because we're talking about 90% funding and there would be no lay-offs, but if the entire cut proposed by Mrs. Conti were taken out in reduced people, I would say probably about 50, 45, 50.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Blum, thank you for being patient.

MR. BLUM: I move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. There are three first-time speakers. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We'll have to use the machine. We need two-thirds. If you are in favor of moving the question, please vote yes. If you are not, vote no. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? 23 votes are required. The motion to move the question has PASSED 23 affirmative, 10 negative and 1 not-voting.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, let the record show I'm not voting because of a possible conflict.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let the record show that Ms. Summerville is not voting because of a possible conflict; both Mrs. McInerney and Ms...did you vote on the...

MS. SUMMERVILLE: That was about two hours ago that I pushed that. It wasn't clear. I didn't push the button.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, it's already recorded and I already announced the vote, so we can't change that, Ms. Summerville. I'm sorry.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I didn't vote, Madam President.

MR. PERILLO: Madam President, point of order. She only voted on moving the question. Just on moving the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's just on moving the question.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I didn't vote, Madam Chairman. I did not push the button when you called for the vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Alright. We are going to have to take another vote. Please clear the machine. Ms. Summerville is leaving the Floor. We need 23 votes to move the question. It's just on moving the question. Will you please vote again. Has everyone voted? The motion is DEFEATED 21 yes, 9 no and 4 not-voting. We will continue with debate.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam President. I think we must keep in mind that inflation has been in the neighborhood of 4%; 4% is a reasonable increase rather than 8%. Now if an 8% increase were reasonable, then we should be able to show which we have not produced any information to this effect. We should be able to show that there's been a 4% increase in productivity in the past year or in the coming year. Therefore, I think that the 4% is a reasonable amount to work with. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. May I speak through you to Mr. Wiederlight? Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight, I have a problem with what you had to say, and that is our position on this Board is to set policy, and if our policy is to have a cut in costs of 50%, that's what the policy is. If it terminates in numbers of people, that's something else. It is not our position to worry about what the number of a person is; it's to set the policy, and I think that's one of our problem here.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I have to remind the members that we are now speaking to the motion for 50%. We have many speakers for the 90%, but we went right to Mrs. Conti's motion for 50%. That's what we are discussing now.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. Through you, I'd like to ask a question to Rep. Conti. She made a statement that this Board does not have to approve retroactive funding. I'd like to know what her basis is for that opinion?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: I'm talking about retroactive for people who are tied to the union contracts. The people in item 1 and 2 are not union members. They are simply tied to the union contract by virtue of custom. We have no legal obligation to pay these people who are tied to a union contract but are not members of the union.

MR. STORK: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. My question was very similar to Mr. Stork's. Mrs. Howe and the Fiscal Committee did not decrease attachments 1 and 2, and since it is retroactive pay and if these people have already been given pay increases as I understand they have been, I don't see how we cannot fund it. Would Mrs. Conti, perhaps consider funding those items in full and cutting only items 3 and 4?

MRS. CONTI: Actually, Mrs. Gershman, they have not been paid I wouldn't say because it's retroactive, and they have not been paid at all yet. How could they be if this is their retroactive? The attachment 4 is the current fiscal year for these people. Attachment 1 and 2 and 4 are for the same people. 1 and 2 is for the 81/82 retroactive. Item 2 is for the 82/83 retroactive, and item 4 is for the current year 83/84. So without the funding, they should not have been paid any increases.

MRS. GERSHMAN: But the union people have been paid their increases, and that's what led me to believe that the employees with jobs similar to MEA have also been given increases. I don't know.

MRS. CONTI: It seems to me they should not have been unless there was an appropriation by this Board. If they have been, then there is a violation of our Charter I would say, because money is not suppose to be paid before it's appropriated.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're not aware of that fact.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Listening to this discussion, it seems we are getting a lot of amateur evaluations. I make a motion that this matter be referred to the Finance Commissioner to tell us precisely what would happen if less than 90% would be the amount funded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Maihock, a proper motion would be to return this to Committee at this time; not to the Finance Commissioner. Do you want to make a motion to return this item back to the Fiscal Committee?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like to do so, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to that motion. We now have a motion on the Floor to return this to Committee. Mrs. Maihock, do you have any further comments on that?

MRS. MAIHOCK: None, other than the fact that I would like to get the facts and I don't think anybody sitting here, from what I've been hearing, understands this.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWES: ...the facts Mrs. Maihock is talking about. We've had this thing for a couple of months. This Board has two more months to go. I would really urge you to make a decision on this thing. I know it's not easy. It's a very hard decision to make. We don't want taxes to go up. We don't want to lay people off, but we just can't keep putting off this decision. We have to make it, and I think the 90% is reasonable. If you don't vote against it, vote for the 50%, but for heaven's sake, let's just do something on this. We send it back to the Mayor; we got a letter back from him. I don't know what else you want us to do. I really think that we have to bite the bullet here and make a decision one way or another; vote for whatever you want but just vote on it. I would urge you not to send it back to Committee.

~~PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now discussing returning it to Committee.~~

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I strongly urge this Board not to return this to Committee. The question has been answered, Mrs. Maihock. Commissioner Marra appeared before Fiscal. He appeared before Personnel, and he said the ramifications of reducing this amount of money are 5 employees per \$100,000; that's the bottom line. Let's move on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would hate to see this returned to Committee after the Commissioner of Finance has already appeared before the Fiscal Committee; already made his recommendations, what more can he do? I ask you, what more can the man do? I would like to see this dealt with tonight so we can get it all together.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I want to remind the members that this Board has only two more months of its existence. We have many items to complete before we leave this Board.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to agree with the speakers who spoke against returning this to Committee. How long are we going to keep these people hanging? It's to the point of absurdity at this stage. One other thing that was said here tonight. Before I get to that, I just want to mention something. We talk about City morale and employee morale. This is the kind of thing that demoralizes a work force, and I think if anyone of us were in this situation, he or she would also be demoralized by it. Another thing that was said, we are not obligated legally to fund non-union personnel. Maybe we're not obligated legally, but by God, I think we are obligated morally for people who do the same job for far less benefits.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore. No further speakers.

MR. BLUM: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are no further speakers, Mr. Blum, so we are going to move right to a machine vote. The vote is on returning this item to Committee. A majority of those present is all that's necessary. Returning this to Committee. If you agree, vote yes. Would everyone please vote again on returning item #2 under Fiscal, back to Committee. If you approve of sending this back to Committee, vote yes. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has been DEFEATED 3 affirmative, 27 negative and 4 not-voting. We are now going to return to the amendment motion which is Mrs. Conti's, to fund at 50%.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SIGNORE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to moving the question? Seconded. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We are going to use the machine. The vote is on Mrs. Conti's motion to fund the contract at 50% as she stated, bringing the total to \$704,744 with the breakdown that she stated. If you agree with Mrs. Conti's motion, vote yes on your machine. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? Mr. Dudley, would you like to vote? The motion to fund at 50% has been DEFEATED 4 affirmative, 26 negative, 1 abstaining and 3 not-voting.

We are returning to the main motion to fund at 90%.

MR. BONNER: Pass.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam President, through you, I'd like to ask Rep. Hawe a question. She mentioned earlier, regarding this appropriation, that included in this item was also item #10 down the line there under Fiscal. Is that correct? In other words, if we vote on this, then we don't have to vote on item #10?

MRS. HAWE: Correct.

MR. ZELINSKI: Being that is the case, I'd like to ask you a question which refers to item #10, which is now item #1. Salaries on the Commission on Aging, that \$30,000, does that by any change include an increase for the Executive Director of the Commission on Aging?

MRS. HAWE: If you will hold on a minute, I'll try to find out.

MR. ZELINSKI: I appreciate that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information while we are waiting for this,

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Is it possible for a person to make another motion at a different percentage for funding?

PRESIDENT SANTY: It certainly is.

MRS. HAWE: The worksheet I have here, Mr. Zelinski, just lists the funding for the various departments and I don't have a breakdown for this of exactly who gets what amount.

MR. ZELINSKI: My only concern is, I was just concerned because I happen to see Commission on Aging and I know that the person that has filled that slot is new and I was just wondering if the increase was included for a brand new employee and that would concern me. If not, everything would be perfectly alright, but you haven't got that?

MRS. HAWE: If the position is linked to the MAA scale, I don't know; it might be linked to the MAA. I really don't know, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: I appreciate your trying to help.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. This is on the main motion, 90%.

MR. STORK: I pass.

MR. BLUM: I would say move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. There is one other speaker, Mr. Boccuzzi. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Would the no votes please raise their hands. We'll have to use the machine. We need two-thirds to move the question which is 23 votes. Please use your machine. We're voting to move the question. The question is to move the question, and the question is on funding 90%. We need 23 people to want to move the question. There is only one other speaker. Has everyone voted? We are voting on moving the question. The motion to move the question has been DEFEATED 15 affirmative, 16 negative and 3 not-voting. Mr. Boccuzzi, you are the remaining speaker.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I'd like to make a motion that we fund this contract at 75%.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, I need some figures.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I knew you were going to do that. Leaving the \$53,496 as is. 75% of the total would come to \$1,154,727 plus the \$53,496 which would make it \$1,155,261.96 or a reduction of approximately \$440 thousand...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, you'll have to go a little slower because everyone is trying to write this down. Your motion is to fund the contract at 75% bringing the total to...repeat the total figure including what your total...

MR. BOCCUZZI: \$1,155,261.96 subject to you know. \$1,155,261.96, I think that's right.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's the total.

MR. BOCCUZZI: This would bring the reduction to \$440,871. At the rate of 5 per 100, you're talking approximately, I would say, 22 people; reduction of 22 people or a renegotiation of the contract. The amount that they were talking is 8%, 75%, 8% is approximately about 6% increase. I think that's the type of an increase, I don't know if that 6% is exactly right, but I think 6% is a good increase, and I think that renegotiating the contract is what they should do.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I didn't ask you for the figures on 1, 2, 3, and 4, but each one of those items is 75%?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are not speaking to that motion.

MR. BLUM: I think it's a little late, Mr. Boccuzzi, if you are not aware that this contract is an old contract that went to binding arbitration. I don't know if you are aware what binding arbitration is.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'll save you a lot of trouble, Mr. Blum, I am.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: You are. Alright. That means the state or the mediator has come down with a decision, has told the City or the municipality, you have to comply. It's a labor law. All we're talking now is the funding. We had the chance and we knock down the contract. We allowed it to go to the state. Now if we can't get it one way, we'll try and get it on the money way. It is said, also, in the labor laws that you have to comply with the finances as well. You can't have that second chance. If you feel that you could and your 75% does make it, well let's see what the union will do. Maybe we'll go to court again.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I have to answer this because he made a statement directly, mentioned my name.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Alright, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I understand what binding arbitration is and 75% of the contract doesn't mean that we are only going to pay 75% of the increase. We pay a 100% of the increase, but only 75% of the total or a lay-off. Anybody left working for the City will get the full increase. Now it's up to the union to decide if they want their brothers and sisters to continue to work or lay-off the lower echelon within the unions who came in last. That's all I'm saying.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum. Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi. Mr. Zelinski. Mr. Zelinski is not in his seat.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to support Mr. Boccuzzi. I feel very comfortable going with this figure and I think that it answers the question of keeping the costs down and productivity up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would be happy to support your motion. I believe that it would also indicate that we are very concerned about the inflation rate, and the increase in production. I would go along with Mr. Boccuzzi's recommendation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. There's no further speakers. Mr. Zelinski is not in his seat. He wanted to speak. We'll just go ahead with the question. The question is on the funding of 75%. Two-thirds is necessary. Mr. Livingston has left the Floor. He is ill and he has to be excused to go home. We have 33 members present. 22 is two-thirds. We need 22 votes to pass this contract at 75% funding.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'd like a Roll call vote, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made for a Roll call vote. All in favor, please raise your hands. Not sufficient. There's only 4, 5. All in favor or a Roll call vote, raise your hands. There's sufficient now. Roll call vote. Mrs. Maihock, would you please come up and call the Roll as Acting Clerk. Mr. Wiederlight and Mr. Stork, would you please. Ms. Summerville and Mrs. McInerney are not participating in this vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please, Representatives, I would ask Mr. Rybnick, to please close the Caucus doors. Please take your seats. We'll call the Roll. Use your machine. The motion is funding the contract at 75%. 22 votes are required. Mrs. Maihock will call the Roll.

ACTING CLERK MAIHOCK called the Roll.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Tellers please come forward. 22 votes were necessary. The motion is DEFEATED 15 affirmative, 16 negative and 2 absent from the Floor during the vote.

We are now going back to the main motion made by Mrs. Hawe in behalf of the Fiscal Committee to fund at 90%. Are there any speakers? No further speakers, we are going to move right to a machine vote. The machine vote is on the 90% funding of the contract. Don't vote yet until the machine is cleared.

A motion has been made for a Roll call vote. Is there a second? Seconded. But the motion is on the Floor and he made a proper motion. We need one-third for a Roll call vote. All in favor of a Roll call vote, raise your hands high. Not enough. We will now use the machine. The vote is on 90% funding. Please use your machine. 22 votes are required. Has everyone voted? I will allow the Press to come further on to the Floor if you would like to keep a tally of that vote. We're voting on 90% funding of the contract. 22 votes are needed. The motion has PASSED 23 affirmative, 6 negative, 2 abstaining and 3 not-voting. That motion PASSED.

- (3) REQUEST FROM GRANTS DIRECTOR SANDRA GILBANE OF 7/1/83 FOR APPROVAL OF A \$584.00 TRANSFER FOR SYPCA, approved by Board of Finance 6/23/83; \$384.00 of which is to go into 792.1110 salary account "to insure salaries are comparable to MEA contract increase for appropriate grade and step," per Mayor's letter 6/7/83, who refers to a new Acting Director and newly-hired Secretary, F/Y 82/83. Ord. 510 appears to apply to this request. Held in Committee 8/15/83.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: This is a request for a transfer for the Stamford Youth Planning and Coordinating Agency. This is pursuant to Ordinance 510 Supplemental. It's a transfer of \$384.00 from the Medical and Life account into the salary account to raise the salaries of the SYPCA director and the secretary to bring them in parity with the MEA, linked to the MEA raises. Fiscal voted in favor of this with 3 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Mr. Stork, Personnel Committee.

MR. STORK: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? Secondary Committee report waived.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to bring it to the attention of the members of the Board, that this money is for an increase for the director and the secretary of SYPCA. The director has been on the job all of a month, and the secretary has been on the job all of two weeks, but they are going to get a 16% increase because of the MEA contract. I think it's unconscionable to give people a 16% increase after one month and two weeks on the job respectively, and I am opposing this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Any other speakers? No other speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote. It's on the approval of the transfer of \$584.00 transfer SYPCA per our ordinance that we passed 510. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has been DEFEATED 3 affirmative, 20 negative, 2 abstaining and 9 not-voting. Item #3 has been defeated.

- (4) \$135,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - GLENBROOK FIRE DEPARTMENT (NEW HOPE) - Request for addition of a new project to be known as #472-297 PUMPER REPLACEMENT, to be financed by bonds - to replace 1963 Pumper, per Mayor's request 7/29 and Chief Battinelli's 5/19/83. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Health and Protection Committee, Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report. Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. HAWE: The Glenbrook Fire Department had requested a replacement for their 20 year old pumper during the budget process last year. It was removed at that time primarily, because of the debt limit funding restraints. However, the Boards at budget time reduced approximately \$1.5 million from the capital projects budget, and, therefore, enabling this additional expenditure to take place within the safe debt limit.

The Committee felt that this was really something that was essential to the safety of the area that the Glenbrook Fire Department serves. The pumper they have is 20 years old which is the life expectancy of these things. They are going to use the old one as a back up pumper. The Glenbrook Fire Department also serves as a back up for the City Fire Department on fires and it's essential that they have one in good working condition. Chief Battinelli spoke to us at some length about this. These things usually cost about \$30 or \$40,000 more. However, they shopped around and got a very good deal on this from a company in the mid-west, I believe, who is very eager to introduce their product into the east, and is resulting in about a \$30 or \$40,000 savings for the City on this.

The Committee really felt that it was something that was really essential; that a 20 year old pumper that is in use now, really should be replaced. Fiscal, as I said, voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: We've had that motion on the Floor.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I want to say two things. First, a question through you to Mrs. Hawe. You say that they shopped around. Don't they have to go to competitive bidding on an item such as this?

MRS. HAWE: The pumper that they need, there are certain requirements for an area such as Glenbrook. For instance Turn-of-River, the needs for a pumper for that fire department would be different from Glenbrook because of the area and the kind of fighting of fires that they do; so the specifications are very narrow. I believe, according to the Chief that it was at, like a fire chiefs' convention, that they came in contact with the representative from this company in the mid-west, and this specifically fit the exact need of what they wanted with the certain accessories that they needed for their particular purposes, and this is certainly legally within the way things are bought.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Why don't we have to go through the Purchasing Agent to send out bid specifications on something like this?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, can you answer that question? Mrs. Hawe cannot answer that question, Mr. Wiederlight. Mrs. Guroian, you are the next speaker.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I don't want to relinquish the Floor. Maybe she can answer the question. I'd yield the Floor to her to answer it as long as I could get it back.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, she said she does not have the answer, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Well, the only other thing I want to say is that I am obviously in favor of upgrading the level of fire protection in the Community and of the fine job our volunteer fire departments are doing, but keep in mind, whenever criticism is voiced of any volunteer fire department; I'm not singling any one particular one out, it is the common retort back that we, the volunteer fire department, don't cost the taxpayers anything. Well, there is a \$135,000; so the next time somebody says we don't cost the taxpayers anything, it's going to be a \$135,000 whether it's bonded or paid out of the General Fund.

MRS. HAWE: I just want to point out that in the mill rate calculations, the debt service for this is calculated into the district that this particular volunteer fire department serves.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wiederlight, are you finished?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I'm finished, thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. I don't know if your mike is working. It's not working.

MRS. GUROIAN: I don't know for certain whether my answer is completely accurate but it might very well be that they don't have to go through bid procedure because they are a volunteer fire department and not associated with the City insofar as their purchases go. I think I'm right.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GUROIAN: (continuing) #2. When the volunteer firemen say that it does not cost the City anything, they mean it does not cost the City anything for their services because they work without compensation, but certainly, it cost the City for the capital expenditures but not for their services. And, if their services were included in your budget, it would, I think the last estimate I heard, cost half a million dollars a year; more than we appropriate for our district.

#3. Mrs. Hawe is absolutely correct in saying that this will be charged to the mill rate in our district. However, when the underwriters declare that a piece of equipment has now reached its maximum usage according to their scheduling, and that it is now listed as obsolete, that also has an affect on the insurance rates in the area.

#4. Glenbrook is growing still by leaps and bounds, and the service that it renders as a back-up to the City fire department, necessitates that it have proper equipment because the inner City is a different area to service with its high rises than it is in the area that they primarily service, and so, consequently, I think it's encumbent on us to make certain that they have absolutely the most adequate equipment in order to service both areas properly, and I would hope that the Board would vote them the appropriation because I think one of the first priorities of government is to provide their constituency with the proper fire service since they cannot purchase it on a volunteer basis themselves, and must take the services that are provided for them. And I hope you would all appropriate the money; it is sorely needed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Guroian. Before I go on to the next speaker, Mr. White is leaving the meeting. We have 32 people present at this point. 32 on the Floor.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I'm upset about putting this pumper through on bonding because of the additional cost that is going to be. Do we have a procedure on which we can over a 20 year period, have some kind of funding where we would have a replacement cost on this, Marie?

MRS. HAWE: I don't understand the question. What do you mean; over 20 years that you have a replacement? What do you mean, Ann?

MRS. SAXE: It was said that in 20 years, this piece of equipment became obsolete. If that is the case, don't we have some kind of a financial set-up within the City in which we could be funding an account so that we wouldn't have to put this through bonding; that we could just pay for it outright at the end of 20 years?

MRS. HAWE: You mean putting money aside?

MRS. SAXE: A sinking fund. Yes, like a sinking fund.

MRS. HAWE: No, that's not the way things are funded according to the Charter. There are certain requirements for things to go out to bond. One of them is time; how long a thing lasts. Over 5 years, it is required that it go out to bond. If it is something that is only going to last a year, we can't bond it but we have to if it is going to last over 5 years, and also over a certain amount of money and this is something that meets the requirements for bonding or capital projects, but what you are talking about is not done, Mrs. Saxe.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SAXE: Do you bond this thing? Would this go under a bonding system for 5 years or would it be a bonding system for 20 years?

MRS. HAWE: That's really impossible to tell at this point, because depending on when we go out to bond and what the interest rates are and what bonds are sold at that time, and what those funds are used for. They're not ear-marked for specific projects when we go out to bond. It's impossible to say at this point whether they would be 5, 10, 20 year bonds or what, depending on the most attractive interest rates at the time when we go out to bond.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question?

MRS. SAXE: It answers my question but I find it financially cockeyed that we don't do things differently.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm not attempting to cut-off debate; I'm not attempting to cut-off anyone who asked to speak, but it is quarter to twelve; two more people have left; we are down to 30 members. From this point on, we need 21 votes for every passage. We are down to 30 members present. If someone has spoken the same words you said, please agree with the speaker. We have two speakers next on item 4 under Fiscal, and I think there are 19 items, 20 items.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I realize that there are probably ways of obtaining such a capital expenditure as this that might be more prudent. However, I think we absolutely must fund items such as this needed by our fire departments to protect the welfare of our people. If you have been in Glenbrook, you notice that there is this big increase in population, and I don't think we can procrastinate on items so essential and vital to the safety of the people living in this area.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to address Mrs. Saxe's question a little further because I understand her question, and I know what she's driving at. Actually, many municipalities do have a capital fund wherein they put money so that they don't have to bond their capital expenditures. Our Charter does not call for that type of funding, but many municipalities have it, and we could certainly think about it for the next Charter Revision.

I also want to explain something else which may not have occurred to others. As far as the bonding goes, when you are bonding for a capital expense in a particular district, those bonds and that interest are chargeable only to that district which is serviced by that. They are not chargeable throughout the City. So, therefore, if those who are concerned about it think that they are going to be taxed for it if they are not within the districts that are covered by this piece of equipment, they will not be taxed for the interest or the bonds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. GAIPA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, say aye. Opposed? We are going to move the question. The question is on the approval of #4 under Fiscal. Please use your machine. 21 votes are required from now on because that's the minimum. We have 30 members present. We are voting on #4 under Fiscal, \$135,000 for the Glenbrook Fire Department pumper replacement. Please use your machine.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi is a yes vote. It's PASSED UNANIMOUSLY by those present. 30 yes votes and 4 not-voting. Those are people that have left. Mr. Wiederlight is now leaving. We're down to 29 member. We better get going on these items.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'd like to ask through you if permissible to the Chairperson, at this time before everybody leaves, we could sing Happy Birthday to Mr. Wider?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We just moved the question. Alright, go ahead.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Marie doesn't mind.

(The members of the Board sang Happy Birthday to Mr. Wider)

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's to wake you all up.

MR. WIDER: Thank you.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, we also have another birthday, our Administrative Assistant.

(The members of the Board sang Happy Birthday to the Administrative Assistant, Helen McEvoy)

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sorry I didn't mention that at the beginning of the meeting. You can tell we are not on the radio. It is now 10 minutes to 12. We just passed that item. \$135,000 was approved unanimously.

MR. BLUM: (inaudible)

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, I didn't, Mr. Blum. We did not.

(5) \$ 2,400.00 - CHIEF EXECUTIVE - Group 20 (Ref. 201) - 3483 COMMUNICATIONS MISCELLANEOUS - per Mayor Clapes' request 7/13/83. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83.

Above also referred to Education, Welfare & Government Committee.

MRS. HAWES: This is actually a request from the Communications Department under Mr. Oefinger. It appears on the top of St. Joseph's Hospital, there are various microwave transmitting dishes that were there from years ago when we use to have the Metropolitan Regional Council, which would beam shows in and City employees would go to a place and see these informational series. This company went bankrupt and abandoned these dishes. They have become a safety hazard, and at one point, one of them fell down. It didn't fall down to the ground but pulled part of the parapet off of the hospital. St. Joseph's Hospital allowed the City to have these things put up on their roof. The hospital really had nothing to do with it. It wasn't theirs. They allowed the City to do it so the City could tie into this Regional Council transmission, and this is the money to get them down. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed to approve this. However, with the recommendation that Mr. Oefinger be sure to get an estimate and to sell these things as scrap and try to recover some of the cost of it. We had a great deal of discussion

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) with him on this about selling it. He was going to put it up at the Haig Avenue yard, and we got verbal assurances from him that he would dispose of it and try to get some money recovered for the City's fund for this. I so move. I believe E, W, & G has a report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has been made. Is there a second? Several seconds. Secondary Committee, E, W, & G, Ms. Rinaldi.

MS. RINALDI: Our Committee voted unanimously to return it to Committee. We felt that before we appropriated the money, we might investigate the possibility of selling the material as scrap and maybe we wouldn't even have to appropriate the funds.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion is on the Floor made and seconded, bearing in mind that the Secondary Committee made a recommendation to return to Committee. Do you want to make that in a motion, Ms. Rinaldi? Do you want to put that in a motion on the Floor.

MS. RINALDI: I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion made and seconded to return this item to Committee. We are now discussing that.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would agree with the Secondary Committee to return this to Committee and I'll tell you why. When Hawley Oefinger was there, he spoke of this price was to remove this apparatus and to haul it to Haig Avenue to store it. Now, most of the Committee members were concerned about this hauling it and storing it at Haig Avenue. Our feeling was that it should be immediately sold and hauled by the buyer, and until such time as we have written confirmation that this is what will be done, I see no reason on earth, why we should haul this up to Haig Avenue and a year from now, we'll be asked for another \$2,000 to haul it to some junk yard. I think it should be held in Committee until such time as we can dispose of it once and for all with this one appropriation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now discussing the motion to return this to Committee.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you Madam Chairman to the Chairperson Marie Hawe. What year were these dishes put up?

MRS. HAWE: I don't know when they were put up, but, I believe, it was about four or five years ago, that this Metropolitan Regional Council went out of existence. I really not too sure when they were put up.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think Ms. DeGaetani may have the answer.

MS. DeGAETANI: I believe at the meeting the other night, Mr. Oefinger said that they were put up in either 1972 or 73.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Approximately 10 years ago. Thank you.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you. Through you to Mrs. Hawe, was the matter explored? Exactly who is hauling this away? Are we hauling this away? This is the cost to the City and were there other avenues explored where it might be cheaper?

MRS. HAWE: No, we're hiring someone to haul this away. Can I say something?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Not really.

MR. DUDLEY: I'm not finished. I don't know if that totally answers my question. Were there other avenue explored? I don't know who we are having doing the hauling or whatever it entices, but were there other companies or avenues explored which may be at a lesser cost?

MRS. HAWE: I believe they had the Rubino Company go look at this and this was the most reasonable price that was thought that it could be done for.

MR. DUDLEY: You said it was the most reasonable price. Who else was...

MRS. HAWE: I don't know the name of any other company that was...

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you.

MR. BURKE: Through you, Madam Chairman to Mrs. Hawe, is this a safety hazard now or is it something that we may have to spend \$2,000 times 2,000 to settle a law suit rather than to haul it away?

MRS. HAWE: According to Mr. Oefinger, it is a safety hazard. I don't believe, however, that holding it in Committee another month is going to bring about the end of the world, and I would be in favor of that. Essentially, it is a safety hazard. Several years ago, it did fall and pull part of the roof of the hospital off. There's a problem there; especially, when the winter comes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I remind you that the motion on the Floor is to return to Committee. You should just be addressing return to Committee.

MR. DUDLEY: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MR. DUDLEY: I had raised the question before, who else was involved in this? This is a company out of Woodbury, CT. It is not Rubino as was earlier stated.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, thank you, Madam President. I really feel that we should vote on this this evening. As Rep. Hawe mentioned, Mr. Oefinger did mention that has been a slight accident there now, and I don't think any of us would want it on our conscience if one of these dishes should fall and injure somebody on the hospital grounds, then I think the City would be liable. May I also remind my colleagues, that we're into the hurricane season and with strong winds, there is a strong possibility. You may say, "Okay, one month, what difference does it make?" I wouldn't want it on my conscience. Then again, we're not talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars; we're talking about \$2,400 as opposed to a safety hazard of those residents. Don't forget, a lot of people come to visit people in the hospital, and a lot of them are elderly people. If something starts falling, they may not be in a position to get out of the way. So, really, for \$2,400, I think it's money well spent. I hope we don't move it back to Committee but we vote on it tonight. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. PERILLO: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Will the no votes please raise their hands. Not sufficient. We're going to move the question. Use your machine on the returning of it to Committee. The motion is to return this to Committee. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has PASSED 15 affirmative, 9 negative and 10 not-voting. This item is returned to Committee.

- (6) \$ 5,622.00 - HEALTH DEPT. - S.H.A.P.E. - CODE 571 - Pursuant to Ord. #510, transfer request from Dr. Mastrangelo 6/28/83. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83.

Transfer from:

571.1110 salaries \$5,622.00

Transfer to:

571.1130 Part-time salaries \$5,622.00

-0-

Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

MRS. HAWES: What Dr. Gofstein is doing here; no one's pay is being raised here. There was a full-time position and he's transferring money into the part-time account because he has hired two part-time people to take the place of the one full-time person. Actually, I think this is kind of "border line" ordinance 510, but I'm not too sure whether we even have to vote on it, but, perhaps, we should. There is no increase in salary of anything like that; it's just a transfer.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Secondary Committee, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion is made and seconded to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report. We have the motion on the Floor. There are no speakers. We'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of the transfer of \$5,622, the Health Department. Has everyone voted? We're voting on item #6 under Fiscal. The motion PASSED 23 affirmative, 3 abstaining and 8 not-voting.

- (7) \$164,864.00 - HEALTH DEPT. - W.I.C. PROGRAM - CODE 573 - additional appropriation per Mayor's request 8/1/83, representing contract from State Dept. of Health Services for year 10/1/83 - 9/30/84 for 8 personnel, includes salary increases. Reimbursable by Grant. Ord, 510 applies. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83. See back-up material for breakdown of expense line items.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH 1 ABSTENTION (B. CONTI)

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (8) PURSUANT TO ORD. 510, REQUEST FOR APPROVAL FROM HEALTH DIRECTOR GOFSTEIN 8/16/83 for two re-classifications and funding from existing salary account 550.1110 salaries: (effective dates not indicated)

- (a) Clerk Typist II to Secretary, from \$15,047 to \$16,214 per annum, at top step, plus longevity. Approved by Personnel Commission 7/28.
- (b) Sanitarian II to Sanitarian III, from \$24,627 to \$28,722 per annum, at top step. Approved by Personnel Commission 8/2: "The creation of Sanitarian III position and subsequent appointment process met all rules and requirements of Charter and Merit System Rules."

Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH 1 ABSTENTION (B. CONTI)

- (9) \$ 2,500.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - V.D. CLINIC - CODE 554 - additional appropriation per Mayor's request 8/1/83, representing an increase of \$2,500 over the \$6,500 already budgeted F/Y 83-84, to be reimbursed by State Grant (11 line items, none for staff). Approved by Board of Finance 8/18/83.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (10) \$ 38,790.00 - REQUEST FROM MAYOR CLAPES AND BUDGET DIRECTOR 8/2/83 - for 1983/1984 pay increases, similar to those in MEA labor contract, for the following. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83. (No details submitted)

114.1110 salaries - Commission on Aging	\$30,405.00
115.1110 salaries - Fair Rent Commission	4,209.00
571.1130 Part-time salaries - S.H.A.P.E.	1,723.00
Group 29.1330 - F.I.C.A.	<u>2,453.00</u>
	\$38,790.00

Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

MRS. HAWES: #10, we don't have to vote on because we passed #2 at the figures I gave you, and that included these salaries. Can we just withdraw it. How should we effectuate that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Just remove from Agenda by virtue of the previous vote.

- (11) ~~\$1,664,444.00~~ - FIRE DEPARTMENT - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS - additional appropriation to fund salary increases and related benefits to members of Local 786, International Assn. of Firefighters resulting from Arbitration Award of 7/27/83 between City of Stamford and Local 786 IAFF. Board of Finance approved 8/18/83.

	<u>REQUEST</u>	<u>APPROVED</u>
9% 7/1/82 - 6/30/83 retro	\$ 706,927.	\$ 706,927.
7% 7/1/83 - 6/30/84 salaries plus related items	957,517.	861,765.
	<u>\$1,664,444.</u>	<u>\$1,568,692.</u>

Includes addtl. level for Battalion Chief-
Training Officer not in previous contract)

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal has a recommendation to fund this at 90% similar to the MEA contract, and I will give you the figures for this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe is making a motion to fund item #11 at 90%. Mrs. Hawe, do you want to give us those figures slowly, please?

MRS. HAWE: Yes. On your Agenda, you'll see two figures there; one for year July 1, '82 to June 30, '83 retroactive and that remains the same at \$706,927. The next one which is for '83/'84 fiscal year, \$957,517. That would be reduced to \$861,765. That would bring the total for the appropriation to \$1,568,692, and fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Secondary Committee, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We'll waive the Secondary Committee report. We are now going to the main motion there being no speakers. We'll move right to a machine vote. The vote is on funding 90% of the contract which would change the total to \$1,568,692. Please use your machine.

Ms. Summerville is not participating in this vote. She will be recorded as absent. Has everyone voted? We need 21 votes. You're voting on this?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Has everyone voted? We need 21 votes for this item; people in the Caucus Room. There's only 29 present. I'm going to close the voting. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 21 affirmative, 3 negative, 3 abstaining, and 7 not-voting.

- (12) \$ 34,074.00 - NON-UNION MANAGEMENT SALARY INCREASES - additional appropriation requested to fund 5% retroactive to July 1, 1982. See correspondence from Comm. Marra, Sim Bernstein, Ed Kivell, Frank Harrison, et al.

Board of Finance approved 8/18/83 under the assumption that overpayments had been settled. Later, they learned this was not so; therefore, in their letter to this Board's Fiscal Committee, Chairman Pollard under date of 8/24/83 recommended reduction of this \$34,074.00 if the overpayments are not resolved by the Personnel and Finance Departments in the interim.

Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (13) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SIGN CONTRACT WITH STATE HEALTH SERVICE DEPARTMENT CONCERNING SEXUALLY-TRANSMITTED DISEASE PROGRAM (V.D. CLINIC) - per Mayor's letter 8/9/83 (received 8/22/83) for \$9,000 grant to fund program for fiscal year 1983/84.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (14) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACT WITH STATE HEALTH SERVICES DEPARTMENT TO FUND 1983/84 W.I.C. PROGRAM FOR \$164,864.00 commencing 10/1/83, per Mayor's request 8/9/83 (8/22/83). Reimbursable grant.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH 1 ABSTENTION (B. CONTI)

- (15) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO FILE APPLICATION FOR PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES FOR MODERATE HOUSING RENTAL UNITS per Mayor Clapes' letter 8/11/83. Amount to be determined later, but approximately \$548,294 is expected. Request received 8/22/83.

Above also referred to Public Housing and Community Development Committee.

MRS. HAWE: This is the PILOT Program; the resolution which we pass every year which enables the City to receive state funds in lieu of taxes that the moderate rental housing projects do not pay. Last year, we received \$522,562.00, and if the state continues to pay at the current rate, it is anticipated that the City will receive into the General Fund \$548,294.00, and we have to pass this resolution in order for us to get this money. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Secondary Committee, Public Housing and Community Development, Mr. Wider.

MR. WIDER: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report because we didn't have a quorum.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to waiving the Secondary Committee report? There is a second. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I have the information from Mrs. Hawe. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No other speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote. We're voting on #1 under Fiscal. Use your machine. Please vote quickly, Ladies and Gentlemen, sometimes it takes us quite a while to get down to those machines and vote. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 25 affirmative, 1 abstaining, and 8 not-voting.

- (16) PROPOSED RESOLUTION DESIGNATING THE FERGUSON LIBRARY AS STAMFORD'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC LIBRARY IN ORDER TO RECEIVE STATE AID GRANT FOR 1983-84 fiscal year, pursuant to P.A. 83-364, per Mayor's letter of 8/16/83 (8/22/83). Amount expected approximately \$8,000-\$10,000 annually as in the past.

Above also referred to Education, Welfare and Government Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (17) \$ 700,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET - PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. - ADDITION OF A NEW PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #330.266 NORTH STREET BRIDGE to be financed by bonds. Emergency appropriation, pursuant to Charter Section 619.1, used by Comm. Marra and Chairman Pollard of Board of Finance to handle this emergency situation.

Board of Finance at 8/18/83 meeting DEFERRED this expenditure pending receipt of Planning Board Advisory opinion.

Above also referred to Public Works Committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

- (18) REQUESTS FOR FULL DETAILS CONCERNING THE \$2.2 MILLION PLUS "FOUND" MONIES as reported by Finance Commissioner Marra - 8/16/83 letter from Rep. Gabe DeLuca and 8/22 letter from Rep. John Boccuzzi.

MRS. HAWE: This is the request from Messrs. DeLuca and Boccuzzi concerning the \$2.2 million surplus. There is a report that the Fiscal Committee has approved with a vote of 5 in favor and none opposed and 1 abstention concerning this. It was on your desks tonight.

PRESIDENT SANTY: These were all on your desks tonight. It should have been right on top of your desks or in a folder. Mrs. Hawe wants to make some changes on this report. Very few changes, but there are changes.

MRS. HAWE: There are a couple of changes, clarification of wording that the Committee would like to put into this report, and I'll just tell you about them because I just couldn't get to all of these and mark them myself. If you will get it, and you will look at the 4th paragraph down, the fifth line of the 4th paragraph, fifth line down where it says, "surplus of \$2,183,924 was noted, in what was essentially a footnote to the," you all see that line? Cross out "foot" and just leave "note" because actually the technical term for the note in the financial report is not technically a "footnote." It's called a note to the financial report. It's a technicality. Cross out "foot."

The next paragraph, the fourth line, the last two words of the fourth line in the next paragraph, "and every" cross those two words out and change them to, "or any."

The fourth line down in the next paragraph, 2nd from the bottom, that line says, "was the first time it could have gone into the mill rate calculation or any year thereafter" instead of "and every." It just clears up what we were trying to say. It makes it a little clearer.

And, in the last paragraph on that page starting with, "At this point in time, almost 10 years later, it is impossible to determine who was to blame for not using this money," instead of "money," we are going to say, "for not using this surplus in calculating the mill rate."

What would you like me to do, Madam Chairman, would you like me to read this or..no.

FISCAL COMMITTEE; (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, I think that everyone has it in front of them. Those were the only changes. You went over it very clearly. I think everybody understands it, and this is your full report.

MRS. HAWE: That's the report of the Committee. Let me just say that we met on September 8th to discuss this question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think that is in the first paragraph.

MRS. HAWE: All those people were there and this is what the Committee's findings are on the matter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is the Committee's report and I'd like to compliment the Committee because this was only given to them at the last meeting. They went right ahead and they met and they had discussions, and they got everyone there, and I congratulate the Committee for the hard work they did and this is their report. We don't even have to have a motion to accept that report unless you want to make that into a motion.

MRS. HAWE: Do you want me to?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MRS. HAWE: I make a motion to accept the report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Second to that? Seconded. No discussion, we will move right a voice vote. All in favor of the acceptance of this report as submitted by the Fiscal Committee, please say aye. Opposed? 1 no vote, Mr. Boccuzzi. 1 abstention, Mr. Dudley, and 1 abstention, Mrs. Conti.

- (19) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR STATE ASSISTANCE AND EXECUTION OF STATE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT FOR INFILL HOUSING PROJECT (WEST MAIN AND GREENWICH) - submitted by Margot Wormser, Deputy Director of the Housing Site Development Agency (Housing Authority), 8/24/83. This \$100,000 grant for "infill housing program" for site improvements, including foundation work, grading, parking, landscaping and fencing. The City's share is sale of land for \$1.00.

Above also referred to Public Housing and Community Development Committee.

MRS. HAWE: This is regarding the building on West Main and Greenwich Avenue. The City has donated the property, actually they sold it to New Neighborhoods for \$1.00. The property was appraised for \$137,000.00. Trizec Corporation donated \$200,000.00 cash to New Neighborhoods for this project. There are going to be 28 townhouses that are being built by New Neighborhoods.

Under the Infill Program, the Infill Housing Program of the state, the state has allocated \$100,000.00 as a match to the City's share. The City's share being not in cash, but the fact that we sold the property for \$1.00, so that's actually \$137,000.00 donation. So, they are going to match \$100,000.00 of this and the money will be used essentially for site preparation, grading, landscaping and part of the foundation. The money has already been set aside and the money will come to the Housing Site Development Agency which will pay it out to New Neighborhoods as New Neighborhoods presents the bills for this. The money comes from the Department of Housing, State of Connecticut. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Secondary Committee, Public Housing and Community Development.

MR. WIDER: We did^{not} have a quorum and in taking a vote, Madam Chairman, there was 2 to 1 against so that didn't give me a quorum and I just want to express our approval of this grant coming from the state.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, that's not a Committee approval, is it?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, he made the statement prior that it wasn't a Committee report. A motion has been made to waive the Secondary Committee report. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? Who is the no vote? No no votes. We are waiving the Secondary Committee report. We're moving right to the acceptance of the resolution.

MRS. SAXE: I am not in favor of this particular grant being given to anybody in the City of Stamford. These projects were approved. The financing for them were set. All of the who do that goes with this has been done. Why, at this point, has somebody come up with a \$100,000 and say, "Here, we're going to give you something for nothing." It's not something for nothing. It's something the taxpayers are paying, and if somebody thinks you are not a taxpayer because you are not at the state-level, then I have a problem with them. We are a taxpayer whether we are at the state-level, the city-level or the federal-level. These projects have been taken care of. The results of them have been given to us. You have improved them; there is no need now to think that there should be additional monies put into them. This is nothing more than additional monies to be given to somebody for whatever reasons you want to find, and I don't think it's right.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, I'd like clarification on one of Mr. Wider's statements. Did he indicate that the Committee vote was 2 against and 1 in favor?

MR. WIDER: No, 2 for and 1 against. Mrs. Saxe was against it.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Alright, and you indicated that you had no Committee report because you didn't have a quorum?

MR. WIDER: I didn't have a quorum. (Mr. Wider not speaking into the mike; cannot hear his remarks) I didn't ... 5 ... at least have 3 spoken for.

MRS. MCINERNEY: My understanding then is that if you had 2 in favor and 1 against, that was your quorum, and your Committee had a favorable report.

MR. WIDER: We voted 2 in favor and 1 opposed.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Wider. You clarified that for me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers. I'm sorry, Mr. Bonner.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BONNER: Perhaps, Mrs. Saxe has cleared this up but she indicated that this was an additional \$100,000; was this part of the original concept? Was this part of the original program that before the end of the program, they would come back for this \$100,000 and it was set apart for this purpose, or is this something additional over and above what they originally started out with? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe, would you like to answer that question or Mr. Wider?

MRS. SAXE: It doesn't make any difference. He's is welcome to answer it, but as far as I'm concerned, this is additional monies.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The state was short on their end of the deal from jump street. So, they found this extra money and they are only making this as a contribution towards the site development. It really is money that was counted in as additional money that the state has found that they had that we could use.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question, Mr. Bonner?

MR. BONNER: Yes, thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No further speakers, we are going to move right to a machine vote. Please use your machine on the approval of #19 under Fiscal. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED because it is a resolution, 19 affirmative, 6 negative, and 9 abstaining.

- (20) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION FOR STATE ASSISTANCE AND EXECUTION OF STATE ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT FOR SITE DEVELOPMENT FOR HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY. Submitted by Margot Wormser, Deputy Director of The Housing Site Development Agency (Housing Authority), 8/24/83. Grant not to exceed \$439,212.

Above also referred to Public Housing and Community Development Committee.

MRS. HAWES: Let me tell you a little background on this. I'm sure it will be brought to mind as I mentioned it because this was quite a thing a year or so ago. We're talking about the...

PRESIDENT SANTY: I know it's late, but please give Mrs. Hawes your attention so you understand that we are on item #20 under Fiscal. Maybe, when she speaks, you won't have to ask as many questions. She will answer your questions before you ask them.

MRS. HAWES: This is regarding the North Street Elderly project. If you recall, the Housing Site Development Agency bought the land for this project, 81 units on North Street of elderly housing. There was a problem with the river there, the flooding, and all that and the Environmental Protection Board stipulated that a bridge had to be built over the river so that there could be a way to get out in case there was a flood.

The City has appropriated, already, \$90,000 in the Capital Budget to build this bridge. The bids for the bridge, however, came in over the \$90,000. The bridge was redesigned in an effort to reduce the cost. It still came in over the \$90,000.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) The state has agreed to pick up the difference between what the City has appropriated which is \$90,000; well, it's approximately \$140,000. Rather than making new applications to the state, we are revising the original application to this date and this is what we have to pass in the form of a resolution. In essence, the bridge came in over what the City had intended to pay for it, and the state will pick up that additional money, and this new resolution, an amended resolution will enable the City to get that additional money from the state. Fiscal voted 4 in favor, none opposed, and 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second? Several seconds. Secondary Committee. Mr. Wider, you only need 3 people voting to have a quorum.

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, we met with Fiscal on this and we concurred; 2 in favor and 1 against. I certainly appreciate the state coming through with this because of where the housing is built. We did have to build a long ramp to serve the needs. I feel that this will help us to complete it. Thank you so much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you. When I came on this Board, the Elderly Housing thing on North Street was just starting and there was nothing more than a lot of gibberish about this and \$90,000 was put aside for a bridge that nobody knew anything about.

At this particular time, we still don't have pictures of this particular bridge nor do we have cost, nor do we know what we're talking about, and right now, I object strenuously to adding additional costs and additional monies to things we don't know a thing about, and we still think that we are going to be able to be finished a project when we don't even know what the number is; we don't know what the costs are, and we don't even have a plan, a picture or anything else for it, and I object to it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe.

MRS. HAWE: I might say that if you went down to North Street, you could see the bridge, and I don't think it is really accurate that we didn't know anything about the bridge. If you recall at the time, this was the whole big thing about this project. We had meetings; we kept returning it to Committee to find out a safe way so that these people's lives would not be jeopardized if we did have a 100 year flood in that river, and it was finally resolved by building a bridge over the river into what is, I guess, the playground there. I don't know how anyone can say that no one knew about this bridge. This was the whole issue at the time; it was the bridge, and if it is not completed now, it's very much near completion so I don't think we really need a picture of it.

MRS. SAXE: Mrs. Hawe, I would like very much at this point, to rebut what you said. You said we needed a bridge and the cost was going to be \$90,000. You got the information. We gave you \$90,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe, one moment. Mrs. Saxe, I will allow you to have the floor, but you should go through the Chair, and there are other speakers, but I allow you to speak now.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you finished?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. SAXE: No, I'm not because the difference between 90 and \$435,000 is an extremely large amount of money, and at some point along the line, nobody knows what they are talking about in costs.

MRS. HAWE: Can I answer this question?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're not going to have any cross-debate or any arguments here on the Floor. You are going to go through the Chair, and you are going to raise your hand and be recognized. Now, you raised the point. Mrs. Saxe rebutted it. Mrs. Hawe, do you have anything further to add because Mr. Boccuzzi is the next speaker. Mrs. Hawe, I'll allow you to answer if it was a question.

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. This matter of the \$439,000 is very important and I mentioned it before and it was brought up quite clearly at the meeting the other night that Mrs. Saxe attended. The 439,000 is not an additional amount. The additional amount is \$58,715.00. This is an amended resolution. We had passed the original resolution several years ago. The state has said that we do not have to put in a whole new application for the grant money; that we can pass this amended resolution; we put in this \$439,000 figure because that's the original figure plus the additional money that they will give us. It's just an amended resolution from the one we did several years ago. The additional money that we're going to get is \$58,715 and that is the difference in the \$90,000 that the City put in and what the bridge is going to cost.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. I think that clarifies it for everyone. Mr. Boccuzzi, does that answer your question?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I didn't have a question. That's what I was going to say.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MRS. MCINERNEY: The only other point of information or clarification was that when this item was approved, there were several people on this Board that had great reservations that it was even considered to put senior citizens in a floodplain. There were people who voted against the item; they voted against the \$90,000, and I believe, also, this Board chose to refuse the waiver of the building permit fee on this project. It's unfortunate that when the project was initially approved, that they didn't come in with the proper bid figures to begin with so this Board knew what they were dealing with totally. It does become a problem when your facts change from one year to the other year in any of these items. However, the City made a mistake. They approved something in the floodplain; now they have the right to protect those people.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. No further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of the proposed resolution, #20 under Fiscal. Has everyone voted? The resolution is ADOPTED 22 affirmative, 1 negative, 4 abstaining and 7 not-voting.

Mrs. Hawe, we're down to moving the Consent Agenda.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, thank you, Madam President. On the Consent Agenda is item #7, \$164,864.00 for the Health Department W.I.C. program Code 573.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Health and Protection Committee.

MR. DZIEZYC: Waive it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second? Seconded. A motion made and seconded to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? Secondary Committee report waived. #7 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #8. This is two reclassifications for the Health Department pursuant to ordinance 510. One classification from clerk-typist II to secretary, and the second one from Sanitarian II to Sanitarian III.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Personnel Committee, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: A motion to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. HAWES: Item #9, \$2,500.00 for the Health Department V.D. Clinic Code 554.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc, do you want to make a motion?

MR. DZIEZYC: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Several seconds. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. HAWES: Item #13 is a proposed resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign a contract with the State Health Service Department concerning sexually-transmitted disease program, V.D. clinic. This is the resolution for it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. HAWES: Item #14 is a proposed resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with the State Health Services Department to fund the 1983/84 W.I.C. Program for \$164,864.00 commencing on October 1, 1983.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dziezyc.

MR. DZIEZYC: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. HAWES: Item #16 is a proposed resolution designating the Ferguson Library as Stamford's principal public library in order to receive the State Aid Grant for the 1983/84 fiscal year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Rinaldi, E, W, & G.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. RINALDI: We concur.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You met and had a quorum, congratulations, Ms. Rinaldi.

MS. RINALDI: Yes, we did.

MRS. HAWE: That's it; that's the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of the Consent Agenda as read, please say aye. Opposed? Anyone opposed on any of those Consent items?

MRS. CONTI: I would like to be counted as an abstention on 7, 8, 14, and 18.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The record so states. Any other abstentions or no votes? Repeat that, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: #7, #8, #14, and #18.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you very much.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Chairman Robert "Gabe" DeLuca

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Gaipa is giving the report for Mr. DeLuca.

MR. GAIPA: Who is on a cruise to the Caribbean.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Roos is leaving the meeting. We have 28 members present.

MR. GAIPA: The Parks and Rec Committee met on Tuesday, September 6. Present were Chairman Gabe DeLuca, Mr. Franchina and myself. Items 1, 2 and 3 are on the Consent Agenda by votes of 3 - 0.

- (1) PETITION TO HOLD A "WALK OF AGES" on Saturday, September 24, 1983 at Cove Island Park (Loop Drive) - submitted by Commission on Aging 8/16/83, with Stamford YMCA as co-sponsor.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (2) PETITION TO HOLD AN "EVENT" IN VETERANS' PARK on September 14, 1983 from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., to celebrate "Older Americans Day"; to include senior art exhibit, strolling musicians, community agency displays, etc.- requested by Commission on Aging 8/13/83.

BOARD TOOK NO ACTION - TAKEN OFF AGENDA (PROPER PROCEDURE NOT FOLLOWED FOR APPROVAL)

- (3) PETITION FOR PERMISSION TO HANG BANNER AT RIDGEWAY CENTER FROM OCTOBER 2ND THRU OCTOBER 12, 1983 TO PUBLICIZE THE EARLY LEARNING CENTER SCHOOL'S ANNUAL FAIR "MAGIC WORLD" to be held Sat. and Sun., Oct. 15 and 16, 1983, at 12 Gary Road from 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. - submitted by Barbara Kong-Brown, 1016 Rockrimmon Road 8/18/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (4) REQUEST TO CHANGE THE NAME OF "HERITAGE PARK" TO "EDWARD ANTHONY CONNELL HERITAGE PARK" - submitted by Parks Supt. Robert Cook 8/17/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. GAIPA: Item #4, the Committee approved 3 to 0, but we had to hold this because of the fact that the mechanism for doing this is in doubt, and it is being researched by our Staff whether we need an ordinance or resolution, so we are holding that.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 4 is being held.

- (5) APPROVAL OF NEW LEASE FOR HALLOWEEN YACHT CLUB - text to be submitted, per call from Ed Condon 8/24/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. GAIPA: Item #5 we held because we did not have a copy of the lease to review.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #5 is being held, Mr. Gaipa?

MR. GAIPA: That's right.

MR. DUDLEY: Point of information, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, Mr. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY: Why are we going to be voting on something that was held this morning? Item #2 took place this morning and it is before us today, and I would like to know why?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Gaipa, can you answer that question?

MR. GAIPA: It was held this morning; it started about 12 hours ago; that's right. I don't know how it was held without the approval of this Board.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That is a very good question but we cannot vote on that because it was already held and we can't take any action on something that has already taken place.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't think that we should take this very lightly, Through you to the Chairman, that they be directed to send a letter to the Honorable Mayor Louis A. Clapes, telling him that the procedure remains the same.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It was a request from the Commission on Aging.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: But it comes through the Mayor's office, Madam President. I'm saying the Mayor's cover letter has to come before this Board like all other items when we're holding parades, anything in this City, and this Board is the final approval. A letter should go from the Committee Chairperson telling the Mayor that this event was illegally held.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Maybe it should come from the President of the Board.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: We should have caught it, really.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Definitely. I don't know how that got by us, but it did and there is nothing we can do about it now.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, along those same lines where events are held without permission, I'd just like to say that an event was held in back of Ryle School for 5 weeks without permission and no way could I find out who gave the permit because no permit was had.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We have to take this very seriously because I think people are over-stepping their authority in by-passing us, and that's very, very unfortunate. Mr. Gaipa, we will just take #2 off. I will direct the Administrative Assistant; we'll have a letter sent out tomorrow to the Mayor and the Commission on Aging that we are very disturbed that this took place without our permission. How it ever did, I would like an explanation.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, the date of the letter from Anita Sanborn is dated August 18th which was after our Steering and meeting date for the month of August. Therefore, it had to be put on the Steering Committee Agenda as of, I believe, it was the 29th or the 26th; whenever we met, and there was no other month to go except September. At that particular point in time, they should have been notified that they would be doing something in the rears, and the request came not through the Mayor's office. It came to this Board through the Commission on Aging office, and it was their activity.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You're right, and there is nothing we can do about it, but we will have a letter go out. Mr. Gaipa, do you want to move the Consent Agenda which is items 1 and 3; then I think you have something under Suspension of the Rules.

MR. GAIPA: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Gaipa is moving the Consent Agenda, 1 and 3. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. GAIPA: I have a request to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda. It concerns the petition to have a parade by UNICO from the Sacred Heart Church to Columbus Park on Sunday, October 9, 1983.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to Suspend the Rules. How many members do we have present now? I think we only have 28 members present. We have 28 members. All in favor of Suspending the Rules to allow the Stamford Chapter of UNICO to have a parade for Columbus Day, please say aye.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: How many votes do we need to Suspend the Rules?

PRESIDENT SANTY: To Suspend the Rules, we need two-thirds of the entire membership.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: How many are present? Everyone, please takes their seats. Let's establish how many we have. Everyone, come out of the Caucus room. Two of you there, alright. 19 votes are required to Suspend the Rules. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

(6) PETITION FOR A PARADE BY UNICO FROM SACRED HEART CHURCH TO COLUMBUS PARK ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1983 - submitted by Rep. Gaipa.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion, Mr. Gaipa, that we approve this.

MR. GAIPA: I move that UNICO be permitted to have a parade from Sacred Heart Church to Columbus Park on Sunday, October 9th.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to allow UNICO to have a Columbus Day parade on October 9th. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. GAIPA: That concludes the report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Gaipa.

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

MRS. SIGNORE: I'd like to start the report this evening with a statement. Earlier this evening, I received a verbal resignation from Mr. Francis Burke of the Health Commission. Mr. Burke has joined the Board of Representatives this evening, replacing Burt Flounders. Mr. Burke has stated that he will submit a written resignation from the Health Commission to the Mayor, the President of this Board, and Dr. Mastrangelo, Chairman of the Health Commission. He stated that he would do that tomorrow. Tomorrow is today. We will be expecting Mr. Burke to do that today. I'd like to go on with the report.

The Appointments Committee met on Thursday, September 8, at 6:30 in the Republican Caucus Room. In attendance were Ms. DeGaetani, Mr. Tarzia, Mr. DeLuca, Mr. Dixon, and myself, Mrs. Signore.

STERLING FARMS GOLF AUTHORITY

TERM EXPIRES

(1) <u>MR. CHARLES DeLUCA (D)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
30 DeBera Lane		
Held 5/23, 7/11, 8/15/83.		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

(2) <u>MS. KATIE JANNICKY (D)</u>	Re-appointment	Dec. 1, 1986
96 Alexandra Drive		
Held 6/6, 7/11, 8/15.		

HELD IN COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)PARK COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| (3) <u>MR. FRANK VALLUZZO</u> (R) | Replacing W. Sheck | Dec. 1, 1985 |
| 34 Prudence Drive | whose term expired. | |
| Held 8/15/83. | | |

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. SIGNORE: Mr. Frank Valluzzo did not appear at our Appointments Committee meeting. He called and stated that he received our notice of the meeting after the Appointments Committee meeting was held. He stated that the postmark on the letter was dated August 31. It took the letter 9 days to get to his house. It had gone back to the postoffice; it was stamped "moved," the man has lived at that same address for many years. Obviously, it was a mistake on the part of the postoffice. So, it is being held.

Item #4 is on Consent. Ms. Katharine Roebuck, Commission on Aging. Off Consent.

Item #5, Ms. Mary Carvalho for Urban Redevelopment Commission is on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want Mrs. Carvalho off? So, there is nothing on Consent. Before I go any further, Mr. Gaipa has left. We have 27 members present.

COMMISSION ON AGING

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| (4) <u>MS. KATHARINE ROEBUCK</u> (R) | Replacing E. Massier | Dec. 1, 1984 |
| 18 Hazel Street | who resigned. | |
| Held 8/15/83. | | |

MRS. SIGNORE: Mrs. Roebuck appeared before the us. We all have copies of her resume and her questionnaire. She has attended past meetings of the Commission on Aging. She's been involved with the elderly in her church. She enjoys working with the elderly, and stated that she has done work with Meals-on-Wheels, and feels that now that her children are grown, she has more time and would like to devote time to the elderly community on the Commission on Aging. I'd like to move for approval. Our vote was 3 in favor, none opposed and 2 abstentions.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. A motion has been made and seconded to approval Mrs. Katharine Roebuck for the Commission on Aging. Any discussion?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I took it off Consent for one reason, because the Agenda is wrong. It is not E. Massier. The correct name is that she is replacing is Effie Massie, known as Ralph Lockheart's mother. She lives at 26 Main Street; the person she's replacing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. All in favor of; we'll use the machine. Use the machine on approval of Mrs. Roebuck to the Commission on Aging. Has everyone voted? Mrs. Roebuck is CONFIRMED by a vote of 15 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 14 not-voting.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONTERM EXPIRES

(5) <u>MS. MARY F. CARVALHO</u> (R)	Replacing N. Raymond	August 7, 1988
39 Gaxton Road	who resigned.	
Held 8/15/83.		

MRS. SIGNORE: Mrs. Carvalho appeared before us on Thursday night, as a perspective candidate for the Urban Redevelopment Commission. She stated that she has had a sense of Stamford and a feeling for the City for many, many years, and if you look over her resume, you can see the numbers of organizations that she has belonged and not just belonged to in name only, but has belonged to in terms of a worker and a researcher. When we asked what she could bring to the Commission, she said, "I can bring common sense and to look at things as a whole." She said, "I don't get tied into details." She said, "I feel that I have a breadth of experience and can take things in as a whole." She said, "I'm not afraid of controversy or controversial issues." She is a good researcher, and she asks questions. She doesn't take things for granted. This is her first foray into City government as such. She wants to be a positive force and get people moving. The Committee felt that she would do this; that she was the kind of person who could really get in there and make this group come to completion and a fruitful completion.

The vote for Mrs. Carvalho was 4 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to confirm Mrs. Carvalho to the Urban Redevelopment Commission.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to speak in favor of this. I really do not know Mary Carvalho very well, but I have run into her at so many committees and on so many doing things that I can only support what Mrs. Signore says.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. DUDLEY: Through you, how long has she been a resident?

MRS. SIGNORE: 21 years.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I would like to speak in favor of Mrs. Carvalho as well. I've worked with Mrs. Carvalho on one or two projects with an organization that we're both members of, and she has a lot of vitality; she has a lot of get-up and go, and she certainly is not afraid to question or ask questions and/or make decisions, I think she would be good on the Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you very much. No further speakers, we'll move right to the confirmation vote on Mrs. Carvalho. Please use the machine.

AK

I. MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING - WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 14, 1983 I.
HMM

APPOINTMENTS (continued)

PRES. SANTY: Has everyone voted? We are voting on the confirmation of Mrs. Carvalho. Mrs. Carvalho is confirmed by a vote of 18 Yes, 2 Negative, 2 Abstentions, and 12 Non-Voting. Mrs. Signore?

MRS. SIGNORE: Yes, Madam President, I would like to give an up-date on the meeting that we held on Sept. 1st with the Stamford Golf Authority. I am sure all of the members of the Board received a notification that the Appointments Committee had directed me to request the Sterling Farms Golf Authority to meet with us.

What came out of that meeting, I would like to share with you. The first item was that the Sterling Farms Golf Authority agreed to send us copies of all of their minutes of their meetings from this point forward.

The second thing that was accomplished was that the Sterling Farms Golf Authority agreed to meet with Ben Fraser, Pat Marra, Gabe DeLuca, the Chairman of the Sterling Farms Golf Authority, and the Chairmen of their Finance Committee of the Golf Authority to discuss the possibility of returning annually a fee from Sterling Farms' profits to the City. When this meeting is scheduled, you will be so notified. That concludes the Report.

ACTING PRES. BARBARA McINERNEY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore. A Charter Revision Committee report in the absence of both chairmen, I am going to ask Ms. Summer-ville to give the report, please.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Co-Chairmen John Roos & Jeremiah Livingston

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I have a brief report. We will be meeting on the 21st to start our planning as to how we will put the Charter proposals on the ballot. All of you received a letter from Mr. Cunningham tonight asking you to read it. If you have any questions or comments, please contact Co-Chairmen Livingston or Roos. Thank you.

ACTING PRES. BARBARA McINERNEY: Mr. Perillo.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE - Co-Chairman Alfred Perillo

MR. PERILLO: Yes, I move to waive our committee report. We have no report.

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

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. We met with Fiscal on Sept. 12, 1983, on items #1, 15, 19, and 20. That ends our report.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Annie Summerville & John Roos

- (1) THE MATTER OF PUBLIC TELEPHONES IN THE DOWNTOWN-URC AREA - submitted by Rep. James Dudley.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: URC has a brief report to up-date and give the Board on the status of the telephones downtown.

ACTING PRES. McINERNEY: Will Mr. Dudley be giving that report?

REP. DUDLEY: After nearly two years of frustration, aggravation, procrastination, you name it, I finally have a favorable report that I would like to give tonight. I received a letter today from the Southern New England Telephone Company, and I would like to read that letter:

"As you requested, we reviewed several areas in Stamford to determine the adequacy of public telephone service. We concur with your recommendation for additional service in those areas. As a result, we have taken the following action.

"Washington Blvd.: two new telephones were added at Boulevard Gulf, 692 Washington Blvd. (I would like to add these are outdoor phones. These are not inside phones.)

"Two new telephones were added at Mike's Service Center, 600 Washington Blvd.

"Two new outdoor telephones are scheduled to be installed 9/28/83 at the Greyhound Bus Terminal. (For those of you who don't know where that is, it is outside of St. John's Towers, an area well needed. This was dated 9/28, Anne. It is not 9/28 yet.)

Negotiations are in progress at Bloomingdale's for outdoor service at the Broad Street and Washington Boulevard entrances. A decision will be reached by 9/27/83.

Ferguson Library: two new outdoor telephones were installed at the Bedford St. entrance to the Library. Summer St.: our Engineering Dept. is investigating the feasibility of installing telephone service on a city sidewalk somewhere between Broad St. and the Dairy Queen. As soon as the location is approved, I will notify you. Very truly yours, Judith Kleist, Sales Rep. SNETCO."

This has been going on for some time, and while there are still some areas that have to be explored as they are not installed yet, we will leave this item in committee until they are installed. In addition to the areas listed, there are also phones in the downtown area in the vicinity of the Old Town Hall which have been up-dated. There are also phones installed in front of the Heritage Bldg. in downtown Stamford, and also in the area of the old Palace Theatre, phones have also been installed. So we have made progress; it may have taken us almost two years to do it, but we have made progress. This concludes my report.

ACTING PRES. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley, for your report, and thank you for your perseverance.

MR. BLUM: Being that Mr. Dudley has pursued this item, is it possible that we can have some outdoor telephones installed in other parts of the City?

MR. DUDLEY: If I may answer that directly, I've done my dealings through a number of departments. I've gone through the Mayor with no satisfaction whatsoever. I have found that the best route, from what I understand, the Public Works Department has been coordinating this; some of this with the Downtown Streetscaping Program. This should have been included as part of the Downtown Revitalization, and the Downtown Streetscaping Program. It was overlooked by the Urban Renewal people and should have been put in as part of the downtown area. The studies, when they are done, Mr. Blum, are done regardless of where you want them. They send an engineer out to the field who would look into the feasibility if a phone were needed in whatever area of town you want one for. After the study has determined if there is a definite need, they will in fact install through the efforts of the Public Works Department. I would be glad to give you the number of Miss Kleist, the representative of SNETCO. She has been very helpful. I would also like to add Mr. John Condlin of URC, has also been very helpful. And he was involved in this from the very beginning, and part of the study would include the amount of traffic that would be involved, if it is feasible to use it.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would just like to compliment Mr. Dudley for his efforts on this matter, because I notice as I am downtown that a lot of people are using these telephones.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Chairman Philip Stork

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee did not meet because our meeting was scheduled for the eve of Rosh Hashanah. However, I would like to bring to the Chair's attention that Item #2 on our agenda....

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I do not think we have a Quorum. I Move for Adjournment. Seconded by several.

ACTING PRES. B. McINERNEY: The Motion before us this evening on the floor is for Adjournment. It is ten of one o'clock in the morning. We have Personnel Committee and the L&R items left on the Agenda. All those in favor of Adjournment, please indicate by using your machines.

Mr. Zelinski, please, you are out of order. The maker of the Motion has withdrawn...Mr. Zelinski, please, this is not a time comments. If you... Mr. Zelinski, you are out-of-order, please! Ms. Summerville withdrew her Motion. (Rep. Guroian made some comments but her microphone was not on and they were inaudible)...Mrs. Guroian, you are also out-of-order. You didn't ask for a Point of Information. The vote has indicated that there is no Adjournment vote at the present time. Thank you. Mr. Stork, please continue.

MRS. GUROIAN: I object. It is out-of-order to call...to recall a motion after you called for a vote.

ACTING PRES. B. McINERNEY: I indicated, Mrs. Guroian, that the vote had failed, but I will ask, has everybody voted on this item, and I will get the machine vote. Has everybody who wanted to vote, voted? Thank you. The Motion to ADJOURN, has been DEFEATED: 4 in Favor, 18 No, No Abstentions, and 12 Non-Voting people.

REP. McINERNEY (continuing): Mr. Stork, will you please continue with your Personnel Committee Report?

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. STORK: I have already indicated why we did not meet. I would like to continue by drawing to the Chair's attention that we still have not received from the legal opinion from Corporation Counsel's office concerning Item #2 on our Agenda. I have also learned earlier tonight in caucus that there are a number of other legal opinion requests outstanding. Now, Madam President, up to this point of time, I've had nothing by praise for the work the Law Dept. has been doing, but it seems as the current Administration's term draws to a conclusion, the quality has been decreasing steadily. I'd like to know what steps the Chair intends to take to rectify the situation, and ask for your help immediately.

PRESIDENT SANTI: As I mentioned to you in caucus, Mr. Stork, the Mayor's Aide was there and she is going to relay the message, and a letter will go out tomorrow with a personal telephone call to the Mayor directing him to direct his appointed Corporation Counsel to come out with those opinions this month. I want them by the Steering Committee meeting on the 26th. That is the absolute deadline.

MR. STORK: Thank you, I just wanted to get that on the record. That concludes our report.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION: PROPOSED ORDINANCE TO CREATE POSITION OF "SAFETY AND TRAINING OFFICER" - submitted by DPW Comm. Spaulding 3/21 and 7/6/83. Also 5/5 Rep. Wiederlight's letter to Risk Manager Center. Held in Committee 6/6/83 and 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE "SEC. 16-14 ANNUITY/PENSION PLAN" - Replacing request from Rep. Gershman for: ("Investigation into the feasibility of freezing the entrance of all employees currently employed in any capacity by the City into the City Pension Fund and medical benefits, unless such employees are new employees and qualify for entrance.") Held in Committee 5/23, 6/6 and 7/11/83. This ordinance submitted by Personnel Committee Chairman Philip Stork 6/6/83. Held 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REQUEST FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF SALARY INCREASES, CATCH-UP ADJUSTMENTS, COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS, for 19 employees of the Stamford Community Development Program and the Stamford Neighborhood Preservation Program for increases averaging 11.26% (ranging from 9.0% to 20.6%); also asking if SCDP employees are under jurisdiction of Ordinance 510. Mayor's letter 6/14/83; Sim Bernstein and Nancy Mitchell's joint letter of 11/12/82; Nancy Mitchell's letter to Mayor 6/13/83 with proposed new salaries for 19; also salary schedules for Administrative as well as professional and support staff. (This request addressed both to Bd. of Reps. and Personnel Commission by Mayor.)

This item appeared on Steering Agenda of June 27, 1983 and was rejected. Re-submitted August 29, 1983.

Above also referred to LABOR LIAISON COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MS. RINALDI: No Report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before we go to L&R and Mr. Zelinski, any Motions to Adjourn, consider the fact that we have that we have to change our October meeting because it was recommended at the Steering Committee, and the recommendation was to change it to Tuesday, October 11, 1983, and because we met so late this month, and there are five Mondays in October, and the 10th is a legal holiday and the building will be closed.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI: L&R Committee met on the evening of Tuesday, Sept. 6th, in the Main Room. Present were Co-Chairman Zelinski, Reps. Bonner, McInerney, Dudley, Donahue, Maihock. Also present were Atty. Jack Boesen of Conn. Legal Services, Carl Nehring of the Health Dept., Atty. Ed Kweskin, Pastor Mayberry, and Mr. Glover from the Human Rights Commission, also Mr. Pia; and Mr. Ruskowski from the Commission on Aging. Regarding Item #1, that is being HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - HONOR BOXES - Letter 4/7/83 from Corporation Counsel concerning Honor Boxes being placed on public streets and sidewalks by newspaper vendors and publishers. Held 5/2, 6/6, and 7/11. Rep. Zelinski's letter 5/18/83 requesting ordinance banning or mandating permits. Held 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 10, SECTION 13 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, and Ord. #246 concerning setting a maximum fine for persons who violate the provisions of Chapter 10. Text to be furnished by the Health Dept. Submitted by Rep. Zelinski 2/2283. Held in Committee 3/21, 5/2, 6/6 and 7/11/83. Publication approved 8/15/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: We did have a public hearing at 7:30 at the beginning of our meeting. The Committee's recommendation on #2 for final adoption, is 5 in favor, with 1 abstention, and I so Move. Several Seconds.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you, to Mr. Zelinski, where is it possible for an owner for a building that is considered under Chapter 10, where can they get the rules and regulations that they have to abide by? I understand that some of the larger owners are trying to get a copy, or copies, of the regulations, but there is no place in town they know of that they can get them. They are willing to pay for them, just to have them on hand, so they know what they have to do.

Their objection is that when somebody comes in to inspect, if they find a violation, and they have it repaired, then come back to inspect, and sometimes a different inspector comes, or the same inspector comes, and he finds another violation that could have been mentioned in the first inspection. And sometimes it means bringing back the same type of labor to repair the second or third violation that they find, and they object to the fact that they have to keep bringing in the labor to repair, when they would rather have some sort of list or a pamphlet or something, brochure, that lists the regulations that they can keep on hand, and would not have to keep bringing back labor. They don't even mind if they have to go out and pay for it, you know, if it has to be reproduced, but it is just that they really don't know where to go to get these regulations. When they go to try to get them, they are not available.

MR. ZELINSKI: If I may answer Mr. Boccuzzi, Madam President, these are all dealing with the Housing Code violations which are under the jurisdiction of the Stamford Health Department and I would believe that the Health Department would have all those ordinances dealing with the Housing Code and thereby I presume that the landlords can get copies of them there.

MR. BOCCUZZI: They are not in one place, or one section; that is their problem. They can't go down and say "Can I have a copy of the Regulations"; they are not there, as a group of regulations in one place. Evidently they must be in different places or different sections, or what. I don't know what the problem is myself, but there is a problem.

MR. ZELINSKI: This particular Section we are dealing with is in Chapter 10, so they are all one particular Chapter. They are not scattered over different parts of our ordinance code. This particular one has been published, as all of them have, in the local newspapers, and I would believe that we have all the ordinances that have been published in the past right here in our office.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, on July 11, 1983, we received a packet from Corporation Counsel's Office. There are a lot of things in here that might help you, and I'll pass this over to you. It might help you a little bit.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER: Is this Chapter 10 under our Charter, our ordinances, or Health Department regulations? What is it?

MR. ZELINSKI: Both.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, you should have received this. How long has this been going on, Mr. Zelinski? March, I think.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, by the Health Department, March 21st.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, I just gave one of my packets but all of this is very clearly explained. The ordinance was spelled out, and so forth, and even the State Statutes are attached to this one of July 11th.

MR. WIDER: What I am concerned with is that I have about 4 kinds of Chapter 10's, so I was just wondering if this is part of our Charter, or was it part of the Code of Ordinances, because I have them all.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, it is in our Code of Ordinances and in the Health Department's Code of Ordinances. It is not in the Stamford Charter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There are no further speakers. We will move right to a vote on the Final Adoption of this ordinance. We need 21 votes, and there are 27 people present at this time if we all hold out.

Has everyone voted on Item #2? Please use your machine. We don't have 27 people voting. Is everyone on the floor. We must have 21 for passage. The Motion has been DEFEATED: 15 Yes, 1 No, 6 Abstaining, and 12 Not Voting.

- (3) REQUEST FROM REP. ZELINSKI 3/24/83 - "RE-CODIFICATION OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD". Held in Committee 5/2, 6/6, and 7/11/83. Held 8/15/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #3, our Committee is holding.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR AID TO THE RETARDED, INC. FOR PROPERTY RECENTLY PURCHASED AT CORNER OF WEED HILL AVENUE AND NEWFIELD AVENUE, FOR \$295,000; pursuant to Sec. 12-81(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes. Letter from Atty. Ed Kveskin of Wofsey, Rosen, Kveskin & Kuriansky, 777 Summer St., dated 7/26/83. Held 8/15/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #4, I did send out dated Sept. 1st, a new proposed ordinance that was drafted by Atty. Kveskin on this particular item, and our Committee voted 6 in favor, and I so Move. Seconded.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, will you just explain that is only for a residence there. It is an exemption for a residence, not for a...will you explain what it is.

MR. ZELINSKI: It is property situated at 1131 Newfield Ave., and it owned by the Aid to the Retarded, and that's what they're asking for. The exemption in the amount of \$1,897.46, and I so Move.

MRS. CONTI: Could Mr. Zelinski tell us what use they will make of this property? Please.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, it will be used to house retarded people that are also housed on another, I believe, it is Second Street in Stamford.

MS. DeGAETANI: This is in my district. It will be a group home for mildly retarded citizens. They will have full-time supervision, but they are people who are capable of working, capable of taking a bus by themselves, functioning on their own. There will be six people there, plus two supervisors. There is a similar set-up also operated by the Aid for the Retarded on Third Street that has been there since 1978. I have also been down to the Springdale Fire Department and talked with Chief Payne about it. The place has been inspected. There are fire alarms, smoke alarms in every room. Everything is in full compliance as far as that is concerned, and I would support this ordinance.

MRS. CONTI: Isn't this somewhat of a precedence to abate property taxes that is used for residence for working people?

MR. ZELINSKI: Under State Statute, Section 12-81(7), the State clearly gives local municipalities to exempt property such as this that is used for charitable purposes, which this is, for a non-profit group. They do qualify.

MRS. CONTI: But it is basically used as a residence, and these people are working people. They have an income, from what you say, and it seems to me that this is somewhat of a precedent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This Motion is for publication, so these things you could bring out at a public hearing also.

MR. ZELINSKI: This is not the first time they did it. The first time was on the other residence on Second St. on which, I believe, we did exempt the taxes, approximately two-and-a-half or three years ago, so this is the second one they are asking for. It is a charitable organization, and consequently by State Statute, they do qualify for this exemption.

MRS. McINERNEY: The home is owned by a non-profit organization, and the people who will live there are mildly retarded. They do not have jobs that command a large salary. They are people who have been trained with vocational training and can go out and work, and most of their work is done, really, in the Aid for Retarded Training Center. The only other alternative for most of these people, as they get older, is an institution. The State law clearly indicates under 12-81(7), a community may give a tax exemption to organizations of this nature. And, personally, I think it is a good choice. These are productive people within the community, and certainly the neighborhood has no objection from what I can understand to this home being situated there.

IX. MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING - WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 14, 1983

IX.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. PERILLO: I would like to maybe clear this up. These are people who have no families, that are taken into these homes; they go out to work but do not make \$200 and \$300 a week. Some work for 75¢ an hours, and they do the chores in the house. They all are assigned chores. They don't just live there and eat; they have to do a lot of chores in these homes.

MRS. MAIHOCK: At our meeting, one of our Representatives was present, and I believe, Mr. Zelinski, that he asked for a breakdown, because I think it was mentioned that they are funded with about \$1,000,000.00 funding, he wondered about how it was distributed. And the lady who came to be interviewed was really unable to give him a complete picture and I understood that we were to get some further informat on on this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Remember this item is just for publication. There is going to be a public hearing. These questions can be brought up them.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the Question. Seconded.

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

We will vote on the Main Motion, for publication. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The Motion is APPROVED: 20 Affirmative, 3 Negative, and 11 Non-Voting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #5, our Committee is holding. We will be allowing the two groups: the Commission on Aging and the Human Rights Commission, to resolve this situation. We will report back on their progress.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, do you concur with L&R, you are holding this?

MR. WIDER: Yes, I concur.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REPEALING ORD. #302 and Sec. 11-9 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES and substituting new ordinance entitled "Commission on Aging - Powers and Duties" - to include all handicapped persons, as well as elderly and elderly/handicapped. June 27th letter from Anita Sanborn, Dir., Comm. on Aging. Held in Committee 6/27 and 8/15/83. Also see letter 8/23/83 from Human Rights Comm. Exec. Dir. Woodrow Glover delineating their jurisdiction and activities concerning handicapped.

Above also referred to PUBLIC HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ZELINSKI: On Item #6, is also being held by our committee, but I believe we received something in our packet tonight from the Corporation Counsel's Office saying there is a State law, so maybe that can be taken off the Agenda for next month because it is already passed....the Committee is holding it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Let's hold it.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - Request 1/6/83 from Rep. B. McInerney that "All industries and businesses located within the City of Stamford be required to file a list of hazardous materials and substances used within their operations, on a daily basis, or stored within their premises with the local Fire Department." Also submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock. Held in Committee from 1/24/83 through 8/1/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #6 is also being held in committee.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. ZELINSKI: Item #7 is also being held in committee, Madam President. That concludes my report.

- (7) REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FROM PREISS /BREISMEISTER, ARCHITECTS, 1111 Summer St. for renovation work to be done at ST. FRANCIS EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 2810 Long Ridge Road; also for a SECOND PROJECT: an addition to St. Francis Episcopal Church at 503 Old Long Ridge Road. July 18, 1983 letter from Jo Anne Cone, Project Architect. Held 8/1/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Gerald Rybnick, Chairman

MR. RYBNICK has left.

COLISEUM LIAISON COMMITTEE - Chairperson Elizabeth Gershman

- (1) REPORT.

MRS. GERSHMAN: No Report.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE - Co-Chairpersons Boccuzzi & McInerney

MRS. MCINERNEY: No Report.

PETITIONS

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think we all have the petitions which will go on record, but they will also be given to the Governor and our State Legislators.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD TO BE TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1983.

XI. MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING - WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 14, 1983

XI.

RESOLUTIONS (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to approve for our next regular Board meeting for Tuesday, October 11, 1983, which would make Steering Monday, Sept. 26, 1983.

MR. ZELINSKI: Before we take a vote on that, I think that even tonight we see that being that it is not a Monday evening, that there may be other commitments that the other Representatives have, if we could keep to Mondays. I think most of us know that Mondays are Board meetings and Steering, and arbitrarily, could we move to whatever the next Monday is in October?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, we are under a time frame, and it was discussed at Steering at length about the date; and because this meeting is so late, and because of the Election, and the next meeting we have a holiday (Oct. 10th), and there are five Mondays, it was decided at Steering to suggest Tuesday, October 11th, and there was no disagreement in Steering. It is just for these two months which makes it difficult with all the things going on. May I have a Motion? So Moved. Seconded.

All in favor of changing our next Regular Meeting to Tuesday, October 11, 1983, please say Aye. Opposed? CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES

PRESIDENT SANTY: Now we have May 10th and 11th, and those Minutes have been returned to us. The tapes have been returned from Corporation Counsel. They will be here by the next meeting.

June 6, 1983 is being done now.

We must approve June 14, 1983 which we did receive on July 11, 1983. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? CARRIED.

Next is June 17, 1983 with no additions or corrections. Please say Aye. CARRIED.

Next is July 11, 1983.

MR. DUDLEY: A correction on Page 38, Paragraph 4, the line reads "I can't express the sentiments that," and it should read "more than that".

MRS. MAIHOCK: Page 27, sixth paragraph from bottom, second to last line of that paragraph, please correct typographical error and put "er" on the word "commission" where it speaks of Commissioner Marra, making it commissioner.

PRESIDENT SANTY: May I have a Motion to accept July 11, 1983 Minutes? Moved. Seconded. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? APPROVED.

On July 13, 1983, may I have a Motion Moved. Seconded. All in favor, please say Aye. Opposed? APPROVED.

July 13, 1983 is being done now.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES (continued)

MRS. SANTY: We received Aug. 15, 1983 in our mail three or four days ago. May I have a Motion? So Moved. Seconded. All in favor of accepting Aug. 15, 1983, please say Aye. Opposed? APPROVED.

There are some Committee changes, so please listen carefully, regarding Mr. Burke:

Barbara McInerney is now off EW&G and on the Fiscal Committee.

Barbara DeGaetani is now replacing Mr. Flounders on the Charter Revision Committee.

James Bonner has been made Co-Chairman of Public Works with Mr. Perillo.

And Mr. Burke is now a member of the Public Works Committee, and EW&G Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - None.

NEW BUSINESS - None.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board this evening, upon Motion duly made, seconded, and approved unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 1:15 A.M., with everyone leaving by 1:30 A.M.

MRS. SANTY: Good night, thank you very much for staying, and thank you, the clean-up squad for your help.

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:AK:HM
Encs.