

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 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 TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 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 8:40 p.m. by PRESIDENT JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, after both political parties had met in caucus.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am honored this evening to ask Charles Magistro, Minister, The Unitarian Universalist Society in Stamford, to open our meeting with prayer. Please stand. You would like us sitting?

REV. MAGISTRO: Yes, I would.

PRESIDENT SANTY: From past experience, Mr. Magistro would like us sitting.

INVOCATION: Charles F. Magistro, Minister
The Unitarian Universalist Society in Stamford
20 Forest Street
Stamford, Connecticut

"Tomorrow will mark the 553 anniversary of the birth of Christopher Columbus. The historian, Samuel Elliott Morrison, has said of him that no other sailor had the persistence, the knowledge and the sheer guts to sail thousands of miles into the unknown ocean until he found land. But the truth is, that each of us, metaphorically speaking, is called to be a sailor. Why, because a sailor is one who is willing to risk security, to venture into the unknown, to search for something beyond what is given to us in day-to-day experience. To be a sailor, an explorer of uncharted regions of self and circumstance, is to allow courage to animate curiosity, to apply knowledge to an end that is not yet in sight, to be so alive to life so as to be always open to the new and unique, and what's true of our individual lives is also true of the life of the community.

"As elected leaders, I'm sure you must decide questions for long-term consequences of which are but dimly perceived as an element of risk is always involved in every decision, a modicum of courage is necessary to every decision. Hence, it is the government is more of an art than a science, but when its practitioners do their jobs well, they create a social climate in which individual self-realization is possible or expressed in the metaphorical terms associated with Columbus Day, an aim of government ought to be to help each and every member of the community to become a sailor for many worlds exist awaiting to be discovered, and not the least of them are within ourselves. It takes as much persistence, courage and curiosity to look into our own depths to come to

REV. MAGISTRO: (continuing) terms with the twin mysteries of being alive and having to die; to see ourselves in new and larger ways without being dishonest about our limitations as it did for Columbus to sail thousands of miles into the unknown ocean until he found land.

"It's sad but true that many people live and die in ignorance of their true selves and highest possibilities. Few things are more tragic and only by becoming a sailor can one avoid that fate. I trust that you agree that the end served is the individual and common good as I conclude with this prayer for you this evening.

"Enter into the spirit of this Assembly in love and charity with all men and women, drawn here with reverence, faith and thanksgiving and accept the fellowship of human souls to your comfort for the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith. Against such, there is no law. Amen."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Magistro.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Jeanne-Lois Santy led the assemblage.

ROLL CALL: CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 36 members present and 4 absent. Absent were Reps. Jachimczyk, Gaipa (excused), Livingston (ill), and Blais.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being 36 members present, the Chair declares 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 other than the fact that Ms. Summerville's yes and no vote records as an abstention. That will have to be corrected on our printout.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late Sgt. Joseph Pucci, who died suddenly last month. He was a member of the Police Department and received many commendations, citations, and awards. On January 8, 1979, the 15th Board of Representatives honored Sgt. Pucci with a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution - by Rep. Mary Jane Signore.

For the late Germaine Carignan, who was the mother of Paul Carignan, a member of the Republican Town Committee and a good friend of mine - by Rep. Marie Hawe.

For the late William D. White, father of Rep. W. Dennis White - by Rep. Marie Hawe.

For the late Cardinal Terence Cooke, a great leader of the United States and the Catholic Church - by Rep. Barbara McInerney.

For the late John Hogan, Sr., father of Rep. John J. Hogan, Jr. - by Reps. Barbara McInerney and John J. Boccuzzi.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This evening, I would like to say, "Happy Birthday" to our October birthdays; Mary Jane Signore, Mildred Perillo, Grace Guroian, John Hogan, Audrey Maihock, Bettie Gershman, and to Sandy Goldstein who tonight is celebrating her birthday with us at our meeting.

MR. DIXON: May I ask how old they are?

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's confidential information, Mr. Dixon. Later, we will enjoy our birthday cake. Grace said she is 58. Also, our best wishes to David Blum who retired this month. A happy, healthy retirement, David.

MR. DUDLEY: I'd like to welcome Mr. Conti back after very severe surgery, and I think everybody here would like to welcome him back.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are glad to have you back with us.

MR. CONTI: I'd like to thank everyone on the Board for their thoughts, their prayers, their cards and their flowers. I remember most of them. Some of them I don't remember when I was under, but it's a pleasure to be back. I had a battle with my wife because she didn't think it was soon enough for me to be here, but here I am and I am glad to be here. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Glad to have you, Mr. Conti.

MRS. MCINERNEY: As long as it is time for good news, I'd like to congratulate Mr. Roos and Mrs. Roos on their 50th wedding anniversary. Congratulation, John.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's a good thing that we have a giant cake tonight. We have many things to celebrate.

STANDING COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT - Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam Chairman, I waive the reading of the Steering Committee report. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: All in favor of waiving the reading of the Steering Committee report, please say aye. Opposed?

ak

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The STEERING COMMITTEE met on Monday, September 26, 1983, in the Democratic Caucus Room, in response to a CALL for 7:30 P.M. The meeting was Called to Order at 7:50 P.M., at which time a QUORUM was present.

In the absence of Steering Committee Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy, who was excused due to being out of the state, Republican Leader Barbara McInerney Chaired the meeting.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Barbara McInerney, Acting Chairwoman
John J. Boccuzzi
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca
Marie Jane Signore
Marie Hawe
Paul Dziezyc
Barbara DeGaetani
Audrey Maihock
Lathon Wider, Sr.
Elizabeth Gershman
John Zelinski
Len Gambino, WSTC/WYRS

(1) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven of the eleven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED Held in Committee was one item, being the publication of an ordinance concerning hazardous materials and substances. ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA were three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda: (a) a proposed ordinance concerning Commission on Aging; (b) a proposed ordinance amendment concerning loitering for the purposes of prostitution; (c) Rep. Ann King Saxe's request for cost analysis on tax exemptions, building permit fee waivers, etc.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were 18 of the 20 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED Held in Committee was the item for \$6,650 concerning the Division Street Tot Lot. ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA was the item for \$169,000 concerning a Special Assistant to the Finance Commissioner and related costs for the balance of the fiscal year, being part of a three-year budget and a contractual position to later become Deputy Commissioner of Finance.

(3) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

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

(4) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

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

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(5) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four of the items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, and by combining two of the items, three items were put on the Board's Agenda for Oct. 11, 1983. ORDERED moved to Education, Welfare and Government Committee was the item requesting an inquiry into how the Traffic Department plans to cope with burgeoning growth of the City regarding parking and traffic flow submitted by Reps. Gershman and Wiederlight.

(6) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five of the items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, plus another one, being permission to hold a Veterans' Day Parade. Ordered removed from the Agenda was the matter of the Stamford Downtown Council's request to hang banners to publicize their Mr. Pumpkin Head Contest since no dates were available to hang these banners.

(7) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five of the six names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED Held was the name of Mr. Richard Meno as Hearing Officer for Parking Appeals, which the Mayor subsequently withdrew.

(8) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was a Committee Report to be made.

(9) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a progress report on the Glen Ave., Rutz St., and DeLeo Drive storm sewers and black-topping project.

(10) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a Committee Report.

(11) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being the matter of public telephones in the Downtown-URC Area submitted by Rep. James Dudley.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(12) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five of the eight items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD in Steering was the request from RN Rita Hogan re buy-back retroactive pension time in order to enter Classified Pension Fund per labor contract. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were two items: (a) publication of proposed ordinance creating position of Special Assistant to the Commissioner of Finance and proposed employment contract; and (b) the matter of a Summons answerable in Superior Court against the City by 22 employees regarding their status, whether Civil Service Classified or not, benefits, pensions, etc.

(13) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA and under this Committee were two items appearing elsewhere on the Tentative Steering Agenda and transferred to this Committee. Transferred from the Tentative Agenda under Transportation, Item #5 was the inquiry re the handling of burgeoning growth of traffic problems; also from the Tentative Agenda under Health & Protection, and transferred to this Committee, was the matter of additional police protection submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney of the 20th District.

(14) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. One item was moved to EW&G, see Item #13 above, concerning additional police protection. ORDERED REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA were two items, being: (a) Rep. Gershman's submission concerning people who ride on motorcycles to be compelled to wear protective helmets; and (b) publication of proposed ordinance concerning retail markets.

(15) COLISEUM LIAISON MATTERS

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

(16) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of Committee Report.

(17) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the matter of changing the date of the November meeting and the Steering meeting pertaining thereto.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the STEERING COMMITTEE, upon Motion made, Seconded, and approved, the meeting was ADJOURNED at 9:00 P.M.

HMM:MS

BARBARA McINERNEY, Acting Chairwoman
Steering Committee

ak

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

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Legislative and Rules Committee met on the evening of Monday, October 3, at 7:30 in our Main room. Present at the meeting were myself, Co-Chairman John Zelinski, and Reps. Bonner, Maihock, Dudley, Donahue, and Owens. Also present were Reps. Hawe and White.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE - Letter 4/7/83 from Corporation Counsel HONOR BOXES being placed on public streets and sidewalks by newspaper vendors and publishers. Held 5/2, 6/6, 7/11 and 8/15/83. Rep. Zelinski's letter 5/18/83 requesting ordinance banning or mandating permit fees and other fees. Awaiting text from Corporation Counsel. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: At this present time, we have not received any ordinance from the Corporation Counsel's office, and inasmuch as we only have one more meeting after this, and it is impossible to vote for publication and final adoption, our Committee is not taking any action on this particular request; hopefully, that the new Board will be voting on this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

- (2) REQUEST FROM REP. ZELINSKI 3/24/83 - "RE-CODIFICATION OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD". Held in Committee from 5/2 to 9/14/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: Also because of the time-frame involved here and the enormous amount of work that must be done in codifying the ordinances, I'm withdrawing this and requesting that the new Board also take this up as one of their first items on their agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR TAX EXEMPTION FOR AID TO THE RETARDED, INC. FOR PROPERTY RECENTLY PURCHASED AT CORNER OF WEED HILL AVENUE AND (1131) 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, 7/26/83. A residence for 6 retarded and staff of 2. Held 8/15/83. Approved for publication 9/14/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: The amount involved is \$1,897.46. Unfortunately, our Committee did not take action. We wanted to have this amount clarified. We were to have a meeting this evening, but that did not come to pass so I would like to make a motion to take it out of Committee and vote for final adoption and I so move, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Seconded. There is a motion on the Floor to approve for final adoption, the proposed ordinance for tax exemption for the Aid to the Retarded for property purchased at the corner of Weed Hill and Newfield Avenue; total amount of \$1,897.46. Any discussion? No discussion, we will move right to a machine vote. Please use your machine. If you approve this ordinance, please vote yes. If not, vote no. Has everyone voted? This motion is on the Agenda. Mr. Zelinski made a motion to approve for final adoption and that's the motion on the Floor. Please use your machine. The ordinance is ADOPTED 28 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining, and 1 not-voting.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (4) REQUEST FOR WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE FROM PREISS/BREISMEISTER, ARCHITECTS, for renovation work at ST. FRANCIS EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 2810 Long Ridge Road; also for a second project, an addition to church at 503 Old Long Ridge Road. 7/18/83 letter from Jo Anne Cone, Project Arch. Held 8/1 and 9/14/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee felt that there are two separate requests here. We are recommending to the Board two separate waivers, if you will. 4a, will be the waiver for the Church located at 2810 Long Ridge Road in the amount of \$180.00 and our Committee voted 5 in favor with 1 abstention and I so move.

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

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I am opposed to giving any building fee waivers or any of the other give-away programs that are in low amounts of money because the costs to our staff costs, the costs to the taxpayers are generally doubled and tripled, and I think it is a foolish move. I asked at one point, that we find out what these costs are, did a cost evaluation. This wasn't done so I can't give you what the number is; what it costs to process this through the town. I think it's a very foolish move and I think the Board as a whole should set a policy on what the number should be before anybody could come before us for a waiver.

We also have things such as the Tax Review Board that should be looking at these things and send us down their comments on it before we ever have it come to the Board. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe. Any other discussion? No other discussion, we are going right to a machine vote on the motion of waiving the building permit fee for addition and renovation to St. Francis Episcopal Church on Long Ridge Road. The building permit fee is \$180.00. Has everyone voted?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would like the record to show that I have abstained, conflict of interest.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are you going to put your abstention button down? Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 25 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 6 not-voting, and the record will so state because of a conflict, Mrs. Maihock has abstained.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, again, Madam Chairman. Again, 4b on that same request, this would be for the second project in addition to the Church, located at 503 Old Long Ridge Road. That amount is \$96.00, and our Committee, again, voted 5 in favor and 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Any discussion? We'll move right to a machine vote. Please use your machine if you approve this motion. The motion on the Floor is waiving the building permit fee for the renovation of St. Francis Episcopal Church on Long Ridge Road, the amount of \$96.00. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 27 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 4 not-voting.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - re-submission of item defeated at September 14, 1983 Meeting, per phone call 9/21/83 from Rep. Zelinski who received request from Carl Nehring - Amending Chapter 10, Section 13 of Code, and Ord. 246 setting a maximum fine for persons violating provisions of Chapter 10. Public Hearing to be held.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee after quite a bit of discussion, requested that I write to the Corporation Counsel asking for an opinion on this inasmuch as in the past, this Board has voted to waive publication and vote for final adoption on previous proposed ordinances that have been published and have had a public hearing and that have been defeated, and then again resubmitted.

I believe on our desks this evening, we have the opinion from Corporation Counsel's office. I did also talk over the telephone to Mr. Fraser, the Corporation Counsel, and he reiterated the bottom line is simply this; that once a proposed ordinance has been defeated providing there has not been any dramatic or controversial change in the item and there has been a public hearing, which in this case there has been; it has been published; there are no changes whatsoever, and our Committee is recommending to vote for waiving publication, and voting for final adoption on this item and that vote was 5 in favor with 1 abstention, and I so move. Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, I don't think you have...

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is that what the point is on the publication?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You do not have to waive publication. We are going to accept Mr. Fraser's ruling and you can make the motion for final adoption. Why don't you make a motion for final adoption.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The motion would be that I move that we vote this item for final adoption.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded. Discussion?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, last month I asked if there was a place where one could go to get all the rules and regulations? I think the Committee was supposed to find out if there is such a place, and if so, where?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you like an answer to that question, Mr. Boccuzzi?

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Through you to Rep. Boccuzzi. I'd like to answer the question. Also, I forgot to mention that the Committee asked me to write Mr. Carl Nehring, the Director of the Housing Code Enforcement of the Health Department which drafted the proposed ordinance. Several questions regarding, one of them that Rep. Boccuzzi has raised, and on our desks this evening, there is a letter from Mr. Nehring addressing all the questions that I asked; in particular, the one that Rep. Boccuzzi has addressed. As far as where the landlords can go, if he wants me to, I will be more than happy to go through it unless he wants to read the letter over; I can quote from the letter.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, what is your pleasure? Mr. Boccuzzi said as long as they are available...

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, they are available at the Health Department, plus the Health Department mails each and every November any changes that have been made in the Connecticut State law, so this way, landlords are kept abreast of the latest changes by the state legislature and this Board also. Do you have that letter, Mr. Boccuzzi, it's dated October 11th? I'm sure it is in your packet. Fine. Any other discussion?

MRS. CONTI: Yes, thank you. I would like to know if this ordinance pertains at all to one-family houses; whether or not they are rented?

MR. ZELINSKI: If I may, Madam Chairman, through you?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Continue, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ZELINSKI: In answer to Rep. Conti's question, the answer is no.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Any other discussion?

MR. TARZIA: I oppose the ordinance and I would hope that everybody on this Board would vote against it for the simple fact, that what we are doing is that we are putting landlords, not only in this City, but throughout this country; it seems that if you go out and kill somebody, your sentence is likely to be a lot less than if you go out and rent an apartment in a three or four family house, and you commit such a major crime as not repairing whatever supposedly, the Health Department alleges that you have done within two weeks or three weeks and so forth, and I think that some of these fines and some of the powers the Health Department is asking for is getting a little bit out of hand.

If we need housing in the City, and we claim we need it and we want landlords to not feel to be afraid of all of these laws that are being imposed. Now, I'm sure you say the argument is, "Well, obviously, if you follow the Codes and so forth, you have no problem." But, the point is that when you have arbitrarily, you have people that arbitrarily using the laws to harass people, you are going to have a big problem. When you legislate such heavy ordinances, and you legislate such authority, I think you better be very careful of what you are doing. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Tarzia.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I would like to read from a letter which was sent to the Board, and your attention, regarding the increasing of criminal penalties for violation of the Stamford Housing Code and this paragraph, "At the open house which was held for Fairfield County Housing Court, the prosecutor assigned to that Court, described to the audience the different levels of penalties which existed for housing violations throughout Fairfield County. Many of us were surprised and dismayed to find that Stamford's penalties were far less severe than those of many surrounding cities and towns when the maximum penalty a court is premitted to access, are so low as those currently in effect in Stamford, landlords can consider violating the City's housing laws as merely as the cost of doing business. The City, unfortunately, has found their hands tied in the past."

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. McInerney: I have sat on this Board long enough to see legislation go through to control inspection of boilers, inspection or raising the levels of heat in apartment buildings. I've read the paper, as everybody else has, and watched for three weeks while people in Bracewood Lane went in the severest time of our year without heat and/or hot water. I think that it's incumbent upon this Board to pass this legislation. If the landlords of their own accord, would be and do everything that they could to make life comfortable for all of us, there would be no need for this legislation. However, knowing the track record of the past, I think that it's time that this ordinance was passed this evening. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. DIXON: Thank you. I am a landlord; admittedly so, in a small kind of way, of course. Nevertheless, I am a landlord and I just simply cannot agree with some of the things that I've heard here tonight. We are law makers in the sense that we pass ordinances, and if we cannot place confidence and trust in such organizations, boards or commissions, departments such as the Health Department, for them to carry out the enforcement of this particular ordinance, then the ordinance should not be on the books. The worst thing that we could have is a watered-down ordinance. It's not worth the paper it is written on if it doesn't have enough teeth or strength, if you will, to be forceful.

I think what the Health Department is asking for is enough power to enforce the ordinance to a point where the people will at least have respect for it. I just don't think that we should waste our time passing ordinances which we intend to be in the best interest of the people of the City of Stamford, and simply turn right around and water them down or don't give them enough strength in the beginning to be of any meaning whatsoever. I would love, very much in spite of the fact that I'm a landlord and may suffer the consequences of it, I would love to see this ordinance pass. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dixon.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I, too, am a landlord, and I live among some of the most rent guiding people in the country. I am tired of having to call people all the time of the night to try to get garbage cleaned-up, try to get heat brought up to standard, trying to get windows fixed when they can go down to court and pay a fine less than they can have the window put in for. So, it is causing people that's paying \$450, 500, 600 for a cold water flat, to have to suffer while the man comes in every first of the month or the Welfare sends him his money every first of the month, and still he does nothing.

We do have to have an ordinance that says to the man, "Either you fix it or you pay." I would like to see this ordinance put on the books even though some of it may be against me. I still would like to see the people get what they are paying for. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. In the letter that Mr. Nehring wrote to us, and, unfortunately, it just appeared on our desks this evening, I think it's important that I just read very briefly the second paragraph. Rep. Tarzia brought out a question which I think is a good one. Certainly, this ordinance was not intended to harass law-abiding landlords. Now, I am going to quote from the letter, "Our procedure following receipt of a complaint is to first investigate it to determine that the alleged condition does exist,

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) and if it does, a Director of Health order is issued setting forth the violations and the time within corrective action is required. A reinspection is made at the conclusion of the order to determine if the situation was corrected. If it wasn't a second order or a prosecutor's summons is issued or an actual repair of the situation is made. If the situation is not corrected at that time, the offending party may be arrested. If arrested and found guilty, the judge sets the fine which now cannot exceed \$100.00."

I really would ask and implore my colleagues to pass this ordinance this evening. In my particular district, in the past, numerous occasions since I've been on this Board which goes back to 1977, in large apartment complexes in my district, there have been numerous occasions where several tenants, I'm talking about 25, 30, 40, even 50 at a time, have not received the services for which they are paying rent; that is, primarily, heat and hot water. And, right now, it is almost a joke because what happens, is if 50 people do complain to the Health Department for lack of a service that by the way, they are paying a very good dollar for, they do not receive, then, the bottom line is if the landlord is found guilty now, all those complaints are joined together and there is then one complaint with a fine of only \$100.00. It encourages those landlords, those very few landlords in the City of Stamford, because most landlords are law-abiding, but just a very few, encourages them not to provide and still get fined a lousy \$100.00. They are still way ahead in saving money. I really implore you; this is to protect the tenants for the services that they are paying for and they are not getting. Please, I ask my colleagues, to consider these arguments and vote in favor of this. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. BURKE: I'd like to speak in favor of the ordinance. I have spent some time on the Health Commission, and while on that Commission, I have seen some very peculiar things. As Mr. Zelinski said, it doesn't cost very much to just go around the complaints that are made.

The object of the Health Department is not to collect money; not to levy fines, but to make sure that the tenants and the people who are paying for services are getting them, and I would just hate to see the baby thrown out with the wash water. I do urge that we do vote favorable on this ordinance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Burke.

MR. DZIEZYC: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to ask Zelinski a question. On the Bracewood Lane apartments that were without heat for many days, who finally provided the heat and what was the outcome of the fine?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, can you answer that?

MR. ZELINSKI: If I can through you, Madam Chairman, first of all, I did not mention any particular apartments. There are several. As Rep. Dziezyk mentioned, there have been numerous complaints regarding Bracewood Lane. That is under the jurisdiction of the Health Department, and as far as the question, what was the eventual outcome, the Health Department did go out and make inspections and did request the landlord to provide the services of heat and hot water, and eventually, after a time, after the Health Department had filed numerous complaints with the Court, the last occasion that I could recall was that eventually, after a couple of weeks, they did receive the heat and hot water, but after that length of time, two weeks.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dziezyc and Mr. Zelinski.

MR. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to add a little bit of weight to what Mr. Zelinski and what Mr. Burke have said about the different districts. In the 11th District, we do have problem in our district, and the problems should be taken care of and should be taken care of as soon as possible. We have had many, many, constituents call us and let us know about the problems, but they have begged us not to let their names be known because of the fear of extradition or eviction, and I believe this ordinance is aimed, sad to say, it's aimed more at one person than any other landlord in this town, and if something isn't done, he is going to keep getting away with everything that he has done for the past many, many, years, and he has been a thorn in the side of the Health Department. I believe that the Health Department needs all the help that we can possibly give them and you have heard two landlords tonight who want the ordinance enacted even though it maybe a little bit against them, but actually, the main thrust of this argument tonight, I think, is against one person and I am 100% for it, and I believe every constituent of mine who has called me in the past, is thanking the dear Lord that we are discussing this tonight and hoping and praying that we will do our best. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Conti.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to also echo those who spoke in favor of this ordinance this evening. I think to provide adequate and safe housing is a necessity. It's a necessity that falls in the lap of the City of Stamford and the Health Department, not only the cost of providing decent housing, but the cost of providing the inspectors, the clerical work that goes along with this, all of the ancillary services that have to be paid for, and a \$50.00 fine certainly isn't sufficient.

I am very impressed with the other legislators on this Board who are landlords and who have also spoke in favor of this ordinance. I think that says a lot for all of us. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I believe the ordinance should be passed to insure that it has overall applicability to the City and its problems. I don't think we should pass it on the scope that it might just affect one situation. I believe it should be an overall situation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and many seconds to move the question, All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? No votes, please raise your hands. Not sufficient. We will move the question. Please use your machine. A motion has been made for a Roll Call vote. All in favor of a Roll Call vote, please say aye. Raise your hands so that I can see. We moved the question already. The question has been moved. Now we are on the question, Mr. DeLuca. All in favor of a Roll Call vote, let me see some hands. Not sufficient, Mr. Zelinski. We will use our machine. We are now voting on the final adoption of #5 under Legislative and Rules Committee, amending Chapter 10 Section 13 of Code, and Ordinance 246 setting a maximum fine for persons violating provisions of Chapter 10. Has everyone voted?

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) Mr. Jachimczyk is now present and there are 37 members present. The motion has PASSED 30 yes, 1 no, 6 abstaining.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairman and I'd like to thank my colleagues.

- (6) REQUEST 9/21/83 from Rep. Barbara McInerney TO CLARIFY THE LEASE BETWEEN THE CITY AND THE FORMER WEST MAIN COMMUNITY CENTER.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI: I forgot to add in my opening remarks, that Rep. McInerney and Rep. Saxe were excused; they called they could not be at our meeting, and also, Rep. Tony Conti, my Co-Chairman.

Being Rep. McInerney could not be present, the Committee voted to hold this 6 in favor and none against.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

- (7) REQUEST FOR A REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE #61636 FOR \$240.00 PAID by Gary Pierce Brown, Minister of the First Congregational Church (United Church of Christ), Walton Place, Stamford (323-0200). They are converting an apartment for custodian, letter 9/8/83.

MR. ZELINSKI: Our Committee voted 5 in favor, 1 abstention and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded for the refund of building permit fee for the First Congregational Church. Any discussion? (change of tape) Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 27 affirmative, 4 negative, 2 abstaining, and 4 not-voting.

MR. ZELINSKI: Madam Chairman, that concludes my report. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Chairpersons Marie Hawe and John Hogan

MRS. HAWE: Madam President, I would like to make a motion to take an item out of order and to take up now item 5 under Fiscal which is \$1,500,000 - Amendment to the Capital Projects budget, the Sewer Commission, Section 16-2 Vine-Club Road area sewers.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Several seconds. A motion has been made to Suspend the Rules to take an item out-of-order, item #5, amendment to Capital Projects budget, Sewer Commission. We are now voting to Suspend the Rules to take an item out-of-order, and Mrs. Hawe, you have made the motion because of the members present in the area. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? The Rules are Suspended, Mrs. Hawe, continue.

- (5) \$1,500,000 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - SEWER COMMISSION - Amend the Capital Projects Budget by adding a new project to be known as #112.293 SECTION 16-2 VINE-CLUB ROAD AREA SEWERS. Board of Finance approved 9/15/83. To be funded by bonding.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, do you want to continue with the report?

MR. HOGAN: The Committee met on the 5th of the month, and present were Mr. Rybnick, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Franchina, Co-Chair Hawe and myself. There were numerous other Representatives and interested parties.

The Committee discussed item #5 at length. We heard from people in the area affected in the Vine Road and Club Road area, and the Committee voted to put this on the Consent Agenda by 5 yes and none against and no abstentions, Madam Chairman, and it's been moved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: So, you are moving for approval of \$1,500,000.00...

MR. HOGAN: \$1,500,000.000, amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for the Sewer Commission, Section 16-2 Vine Road, Club area sewers.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and several seconds. Discussion?

MRS. CONTI: I wish to speak in favor of this appropriation. This is for sanitary sewers for an area that sorely needs it. They have all kinds of septic problems there and I would remind the members of this Board, that this will be done by bonding, and no other district will be assessed for this. The Debt Service is assessed to the area where the capital money is spent. Therefore, it will not cost the other districts for this service. It will be strictly allocated to the area where the service is being given. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Since this item was supposed to be on Consent, do we have to have any discussion at all?

PRESIDENT SANTY: We really don't except everyone raised their hands to speak. The motion was made to approve the amount and I asked, any discussion? I can call on someone to move the question.

MRS. SIGNORE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Who is opposed to moving the question? (? responded, "I am." This item is now on the Consent Agenda. All in favor of approving \$1,500,000.00 Capital Project, Vine Road - Club Road area sewers, please say aye. Opposed? PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

MR. WIDER: Would you ask the gallery to refrain from response?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I have to ask the gallery to refrain from any emotional display. We have a great deal of business to transact. They're leaving now, Mr. Wider.

MRS. McInerney: Madam President, as a point of information, it is nice to know that are votes are appreciated sometimes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think it is evident tonight.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, would you like to go down and give us the Consent Agenda? Why don't we do that?

MR. HOGAN: I'll read the Consent Agenda. The following items are on the Consent Agenda. Item 5, \$1,500,000.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Which we just did.

MR. HOGAN: Item 6.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm sorry, item 6 is off.

MR. HOGAN: Item 8.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item 8 is on Consent.

MR. HOGAN: Item 9 I might mention in passing, was mistakenly put on our Agenda. It doesn't belong there. There was no action on it.

Item #10.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #10 on Consent.

MR. HOGAN: #11 on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #11 on Consent.

MR. HOGAN: #15 on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #15 is off.

MR. HOGAN: #18 on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 18 on Consent. Mr. Hogan, do you want to go back now starting with #1?

Excuse me, Mrs. McInerney, do you want #18 off Consent? #18 is off Consent.

MRS. SAXE: #8.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe want #8 off Consent. 8 is off Consent and 18 is off Consent. We will now start with #1.

- (1) \$ 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. Held in Committee 9/14/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

Mr. Hogan: Our Committee voted 4 in favor, 1 against, no abstentions in favor of this item.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: This is for the removal, Madam Chairman, of equipment, communications equipment which has been in use for many years up on St. Joseph's Hospital; the large sound dishes that they have been using; the reflector dishes, the switches, the cables, etc. all have to be removed and it would be at a cost of \$2,400.00. The Superintendent of Communications assured us that this is a one-time charge; a one-time shot, \$2,400.00 to remove that equipment, and I so move, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a second to that motion. We had a Secondary Committee on that, Personnel. I wish someone would ask Mr. Stork. It should have been on there. It was inadvertently left off the Agenda.

MRS. MCINERNEY: #1 was referred to E, W, & G last month.

PRESIDENT SANTY: E, W, & G; whatever the Secondary Committee was.

MS. DeGAETANI: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? The motion on the Floor is for \$2,400.00 Chief Executive Communications miscellaneous. Discussion?

MS. DeGAETANI: Through you, Madam Chairman to the Chairman of Fiscal.. Last month when we discussed this, it appeared that there was a possibility that one of the junkyards might be able to take this equipment away at no cost to the City. I'd like to know if that was pursued?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, do you have the answer to that question?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, Madam Chairman. We discussed this in Committee. I think I would properly address this question to a member of the Committee who was very interested in this, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, actually, we received no firm commitment as to what is going to happen to all this equipment once it's removed from the roof. As far as I'm concerned, I received no satisfactory answer. There wasn't a point that it wouldn't cost us anything. The point was that we didn't want to see the stuff hauled up to Haig Avenue, and then a month, two months, six months, a year from now, have another request before us to haul it away from Haig Avenue and back down to some junkyard. As far as I'm concerned, we received no firm commitment that that will not happen, and I, therefore, oppose the appropriation and I will oppose it on the Floor.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Hogan.

MR. HOGAN: Madam Chairman, responding to Mrs. Conti's remarks, the Superintendent of Communications did reassure the Committee that the equipment would be taken to Haig Avenue and those parts of the equipment that could be salvaged would be salvaged and reused wherever possible; the rest would be sold off as junk.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Mr. Hogan, I questioned this last month, and I have to question it again. It was an out-of-town corporation that was to handle the hauling of this.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DUDLEY: (continuing) It was first specified that Rubino would be doing it and then through research, we found out it was now; it was an out-of-town organization. Is this an out-of-town organization or a local organization doing the hauling, and if so, were there bids taken and was this the lowest bid?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, do you have the answer to those questions?

MR. HOGAN: Those questions did not arise at the Committee hearing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Dudley, there is no answer to those questions.

MR. DUDLEY: I'd like to continue, if I may? I did raise these questions at our last Board meeting. This amount may be in excess being that it is an out-of-town corporation that we are using, and I think that it should be explored with a local corporation to do the hauling. It is quite possible that an out-of-town corporation is going to cost more being that they have to bring their equipment down here to haul this merchandise. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you to the Chairman of Fiscal. Is it a fact that these particular dishes have not been used in quite a few years?

MR. HOGAN: According to the Superintendent of Communications, these dishes are obsolete and have not, as Mr. Boccuzzi says, have not been used for a great number of years.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Also, that the people who put them up are no longer in business?

MR. HOGAN: The concern that did install them are now defunct.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Wasn't it also stated that there is a safety hazard with these dishes at the top of, I believe, St. Joseph's Hospital, isn't it?

MR. HOGAN: That's right, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: There is a safety hazard?

MR. HOGAN: That's right, sir.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MRS. CONTI: I just wanted to address Mr. Dudley's question with regard to the bid process. I believe the bid limit is \$3,000.00, and that's probably why it didn't go to bid.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Having sat through that Committee hearing and having heard the questions asked, I'm sure that I heard that this money would cover the total distruction of the disks and the disks have become hazards. It is something that we can't continue to wait unless we want something on our hands that I don't think we should have; that is why I feel that we must let Mr. Oefinger take care of this for us since it's in his hands. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you to Mr. Hogan, Madam Chairperson, I would like to know how did the City become involved in this originally? Why was the City selected for removing these?

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

MR. HOGAN: Yes, I can, Madam Chairman. The equipment belongs, as I understand it, to the City of Stamford. It was mounted on St. Joseph's Hospital because of its altitude and because of its location; at the time, it was the best place to mount these dishes and this equipment, but the equipment itself does not belong to St. Joseph's; it belongs to the City of Stamford.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan, and Mrs. Maihock.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam President. This equipment, undoubtedly, is obsolete as has been stated, and will not be used and more than likely there will be no parts that we'll be able to be salvaged. Apparently, this is junk. By moving it to Haig Avenue, it will remain there and eventually, we'll have to move it out which will be another charge. I think we have to recognize that and face it. However, it does seem to be a problem; it's hung with us for two months, I don't think we should continue to carry the problem. I think we should approve the money, but I think we should go back; I suggest we go back and have this group that is taking it down, try to get a local company to do it, and they have a maximum of \$2,400.00 to spend. They shouldn't spend it unless they have to but they should get rid of it; not take it to Haig Avenue but get rid of it and we should allow them this \$2,400.00 to do that, hoping they won't spend it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner. That's a good theory. Any other discussion? We'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of \$2,400.00 Communications miscellaneous. Has everyone voted? There are 37 members present. Two-thirds is 25. The motion has PASSED 27 affirmative, 7 negative, 1 abstaining and 2 not-voting.

(2) \$ 50,828.00 - NON-UNION MANAGEMENT SALARY INCREASES - additional appropriation requested to:

- (a) provide funding for salary increases retroactive to July 1, 1983;
- (b) correct underpayment and overpayment errors detected in audit of salary increases to Non-Union Administrators for 81/82 F/Y, to be allocated as follows:

230.1110 Law Department salaries	\$ 5,226.
243.1110 Purchasing Department salaries	5,660.
270.1110 Personnel Dept. (corrected from \$8,450.)	10,080.
271.1110 Labor Negotiator salary	894.
BG#30 Public Works - Administration (Ref. 301)	2,660.
BG#41 Police Department (Ref. 410) salaries	11,000.
BG#45 Fire Department (Ref. 450) salaries	4,000.
BG#52 Welfare Dept., Smith House SNF (Ref. 521)	4,382.
550.1110 Health Department salaries	4,172.
610.1110 Parks Department salaries	2,754.
	<u>\$50,828.</u>

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: I move for the salary increases, Madam Chairman.

MRS. McINERNEY: There was a motion to approve item #2, \$50,828.00 for Non-union management salary increases. Is there a second? Seconded. Is there any discussion? Keep your hands up for a minute.

MRS. GUROIAN: Point of order, Madam Chairman, is there a Secondary Committee report?

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, thank you very much Mrs. Guroian. Personnel Committee.

MR. STORK: The Personnel Committee concurs unanimously 4 in favor and none opposed.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I wish to speak against this appropriation. This group of non-union administrators has been receiving both merit increases and parity with the union for a number of years. As of 1981, they received an increase which was between 33 and 34%. I just don't feel that we can afford this kind of increases and I think it's nonsense that we have to keep up with both merit increases and union parity for any group of people, and I oppose and I urge others to do the same.

MRS. McINERNEY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I would also like to speak out against approval of these raises. There are many reasons why we shouldn't be voting on this item this evening. First, and foremost, which I am thoroughly surprised is the fact that the two Committees involved and listened to the meetings on this here, overlook the fact that the increases being requested for on this item, primarily the Police Department or the Fire Department, also appear as item 5 under Personnel.

Primarily, in the case of the Police Department, we received a letter from Audrey Cosentinti, the Chairperson of the Police Commission, stating that if these raises were approved for the Police Department, making the Police Chief's salary \$50,000.00, and the deputies \$45,000.00, no new monies will be required because there are sufficient funds in the salary account. Yet, both the Fiscal Committee and the Personnel Committee recommends approval for an additional \$15,000.00 which we are tolled for in item 5 under Personnel; especially, in the case of the Police Department, that no new funds are required.

Also, how can we possibly approve funds for the Welfare Department. A person who was hired on March 10, 1982, for \$34,500.00. March 1983, he receives an increase of \$9,315.00; now we are going to increase the salary again.

The Personnel Department is looking for additional funds. We have an Assistant Personnel Director hired on August 3, 1981 for \$23,756.00. March 1982, this person got an 11% increase of \$2,807.00, and then received another increase of \$6,030.00 in March of '83 for 22%.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) This past Friday, I attended a wake. As I was waiting in line to view the casket, people behind me and in front of me, municipal employees approached me and wanted to know, "How can I possibly vote for any increases that appear on our Agenda, especially, when the present Administration and our Labor Negotiator insisted on a zero percent increase for all union personnel?" Approval tonight of this item would be an injustice; we would lose our credibility. I would, therefore, strongly recommend denial of this here, with the strong recommendation that we don't even want to look at it in the future.

We even have an increase for the Labor Negotiator. This is a person that was preaching zero increase, but yet he approves a 5% increase over here for these people. No, I would urge that this is not passed this evening or in the future. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. BONNER: I support Mr. DeLuca's position. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BLUM: I would like to ask a few questions through you to the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, on whose salary are we talking about as Mr. DeLuca had ably discussed. Later on, we are going to be talking about the Deputy Chief of Police and the Chief, and the Deputy Fire. I'd like to know in the Fire Department and the Police Department, what raises these are and the Law Department, who are we talking about?

#2, I can't see why these non-union administrators who are management, entitled to retroactive pay. I never hear it before; they might get bonuses or something like that, but I never heard of these people asking for retroactive pays, therefore, I ask who are we talking about? I'd like to ask in the Law Department, what jobs are we talking about? In the Purchasing Department, whose job are we talking about and so on? If you can give me this information, then I would know how to vote.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information to Mr. Blum.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, can you answer his question?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think if you look at the letter dated September 9, 1983, it tells you, Law Department, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Assistant Corporation Counsel; it tells you everybody who is listed in this appropriation. In the Police Department, it's the Police Chief, two Deputy Police Chiefs; Fire Department is Fire Chief; Welfare Department, it's the Director; the Health Department, it's the Director. It tell you each one of them if you pull that letter of September 9, 1983.

MR. BLUM: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, do you have it?

MR. BLUM: No, I do not.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Maybe we can get you a copy of it. Mr. Boccuzzi, would you pass Mr. Blum your copy? I think we all should have it. It is dated 9/9/83.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm looking through the material here and my original question to Betty was, "What part of the appropriation is for (a) and what part is for (b), and what do they mean correct underpayment and overpayment errors?" What kind of errors were they? Can anybody answer that for me?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you have the complete attachment, Mrs. Guroian? There's a big packet here.

MRS. GUROIAN: Right, I'm looking here. Betty gave it to me, and I see a workpaper here listing the underpayments and overpayments by departments totals up to \$49,198. What kind of errors were these made? It doesn't say anything on the workpaper as to what... but it doesn't say why it is owed to them. Why? How did the error come about? I don't understand it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Guroian, you are asking a question of Mr. Hogan. I don't think Mr. Hogan has the answer to that; how the error was made. Did they discuss this at the meeting, Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: No, maam.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, it was not discussed at the meeting, Mrs. Guroian.

MRS. GUROIAN: What I'm driving at, is it an error because, by what standards are they determining that an error was made; to comply with what?

PRESIDENT SANTY: I don't know if anyone has the answer. Mr. Boccuzzi, do you have the answer to that?

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think what happened, when the original raises were given out, and they figured out what the raises should be per person, at that point, that's when they made mistakes. Some people were given more than they were suppose to get. Some people did not get what they were suppose to get. What they are trying to do in this appropriation is to, if a person received more than he was suppose to, then the increase was less. I think this is what Commissioner Marra said. In other words, what they are trying to do is to justify and correct the mistakes made at a previous increase. Why they were made, Grace, you got me.

MRS. GUROIAN: The point he makes, were the over-payments actually made to the recipients, and how are they going to get these over-payments back?

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. The errors go back several years; actually, to '81/82, and part of this appropriation, there are two parts to this appropriation; one is to provide funding for current fiscal year and last fiscal year for the raises, and the second is to correct this error which was discovered in an audit that was done, and I believe, it was the audit that this Board had requested of the Personnel Department.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) The error was made because, I can't tell you the exact reason, but apparently in '81/82 in an effort to give these people the raises that were intended plus their merit raises and all this and to do it fairly, the formula that was worked up was so complex, this is what we heard at the meeting anyway, the formula was so complex that errors were made.

Now, the people who are underpaid, their raises are being corrected, and their are being brought up to what they should be. Those that were overpaid, their salaries are being frozen and when they are due for their next step increase or whatever, they will not get it. Their raises will be frozen until their salaries reach that point, then they will get an increase at that point that they are due, but they are going to red-line those salaries and freeze it until their steps catch up with to it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. CONTI: Yes, the error was one of computation. In 1981, these people were compensated. They were brought out to parity with the unions, and some, I assume it was all with the MAA union, and then there were also merit increases, and it was in the computation of the various percentages. I believe they were working with 3 percentages, I think it was 11, 8, and 11, and this is where the errors were made, and these people have definitely been overpaid. I think someone asked that question. They have been receiving the erroneous salaries that were computed. Those that were computed under, they have also been underpaid, and that's where we stand.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you to Chairperson Hogan, is it true that the Law Department is in a union now? Are they unionized?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, they are, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Why are they in this particular category if they are in a union?

MR. HOGAN: Those Law Department salaries?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Correct.

MR. HOGAN: I have no idea why they are included in here anymore than the other ones are included in here except to say that possibly at that time this retro-activity, they were not union employees.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Marie, did you have something to add to this?

MRS. HAWE: No, not really. They are in the processes of unionizing now, I believe, but I think he's right.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Are they in a union or what?

MRS. HAWE: I'm not sure whether at this point, they are or not. I think they are in the process of forming a union and becoming unionized, but as to whether actually...

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, they are not actually in a union at this point.

MR. HOGAN: They are affiliated with AFSCME.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment, Corporation Counsel is here. Maybe Mrs. Hawe, Co-Chairperson of Fiscal can communicate with him, and come back with that answer.

MRS. MCINERNEY: I can give you an answer according to the Labor Negotiator.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, do you want to go see Mr. Fraser, and Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: They are affiliated with AFSCME; the American Federation of State, County, Municipal Employees.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Can you find out why, if they are, why is it before us in this manner?

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam Chairman, can I clarify her?

PRESIDENT SANTY: No, because we have several speakers and we are going to go on to them next. Ms. Summerville, Mr. Tarzia is the next speaker.

MR. TARZIA: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Before I make my general comments, I'd like to ask through the Chair of Mr. Hogan, I also have a copy of the September 9th letter we received or memo, and I see on the 4th page here the worksheet that we have; I have a few problems understanding the worksheet, but I have some specific comments. First of all, for Fire Chief and Police Chief, I see salaries of \$42,800. Now, that's the salary as of now, am I correct?

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

MR. HOGAN: I don't have the documents in front of me, Madam Chairman, that my colleague is referring to.

MR. TARZIA: Mr. Boccuzzi referred to that earlier.

MR. HOGAN: I assume, Mr. Tarzia, it is correct.

MR. TARZIA: If I'm correct then, are we establishing a new salary of \$50,000 then retroactive to July 1, for both positions? There seems to be a confusion as to figures here. They talk about a \$5,000, whatever increase. Is there a jump from \$42,800 to \$50,000? That's really what I'm asking.

MR. HOGAN: Yes, there would be a jump of....

MR. TARZIA: You're talking what; \$7,200?

MR. HOGAN: Approximately \$7,200.

MR. TARZIA: O.K., which I guess is what; 16 to 18% or somewhere around there? I'm not a mathematician. My general comment is this and I hate to pick on two positions, but I think if you look at the Welfare Director, you see a gentleman who came into the City about a year and a half ago in the low 30's, \$34,000, somewhere around there. Right now, we are talking about \$46,000. That what; 33, 35% increase? That's not bad for a year and half coming into the City of Stamford.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. TARZIA: (continuing) My general comment is this, if the Administration, if the Mayor of this Town told the people working for the City and the taxpayers, that all the City could afford was a zero percent increase and it stuck with that throughout the negotiation process, and it would not budge with that for a long time, I think we ought to stick with that. I think we could only afford zero percent and I would hope that every members on this Board says the same thing to the Mayor; zero percent. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Tarzia. Mrs. Hawe, do you have some answers to Ms. Summerville's questions, the previous speaker?

MRS. HAWE: About the Law Department. They are members of a union. They were certified in January of '82, I believe, Mr. Fraser said. However, there has been no agreement in terms of contract or salary or anything like that. They are still negotiating and probably any agreement of that sort which would be agreed upon, would take effect next July 1. So, this does not have anything to do with that. They don't have any salary agreement yet.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. MAIHOCK: My question is similar to Mr. Tarzia's. Mr. DeLuca cited percentages received at other periods as late as March 1983. Does Mr. Hogan, through you Madam Chairman, have figures to inform us what percentages the amounts listed under item 2 represent?

MR. HOGAN: On the answer to that question, Madam Chairman, no. I do not have the percentages that Mrs. Maihock is referring to.

PRESIDENT SANTY: What is it, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: 5% increases.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 5% increases.

MR. HOGAN: For each one.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question, Mrs. Maihock?

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Because there are so many "I don't knows" in this item, I'm going to move this item back to Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to return this item back to Committee. Several seconds. Any discussion? No discussion. We're going to go right to a machine vote.

MRS. HAWE: I'd like to talk about sending it back. Whether you decide to vote for or against it is up to you, but I really would urge that the members vote one way or the other on this. I think these people have been waiting, and I think they would like to see it voted yes or no rather than sent back, and I think we can do that; it's been hanging around awhile.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to concur with Mrs. Hawe. This has been on our Agenda for at least two to three months at this point. We've all had the opportunity to review all the back up on this, and we should not be sending this back to Committee and vacillating, but we should vote on it either up or down and move on from there.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Widerlight. We're speaking on returning this to Committee. You are the last speaker.

MR. BLUM: As far as returning it to Committee, there are some things that I really question. If we pass this one way or another, we will again have in another Committee, a vote of another increase for two departments. I really don't know why we're taking up; is this something retroactive to many years ago or one year ago? How many years are we talking about here?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, we are speaking about returning this back to Committee. That's the motion on the Floor. We're not discussing the main motion; it's returning this to Committee. A motion has been made and seconded to return this item to Committee. That's the item. No further speakers, we are going to move right to a machine vote on returning this item to Committee. Only a majority vote is necessary. We are voting now on returning this item to Committee. Has everyone voted? We're voting on sending this item to Committee. If you want this to go back to Committee for further study, vote yes. If you want to decide the question tonight, vote no. Has everyone voted? The motion to return to Committee has been DEFEATED 4 affirmative, 29 negative, and 4 not-voting.

We are now back to the main motion.

MRS. GUROIAN: I'm still back to this workpaper which I think is one of the worst workpapers I've ever looked at. So confusing that even a Philadelphia accountant couldn't figure it out, and I'm not so certain that it wasn't done on purpose. There are no totals on the bottoms of the columns so that you have no way of knowing how much the retroactive due the employee is, and the retroactive owed is. There is no way to determine actually how much in salary increases we will be approving since in some instances, there's a salary increase but no funding asked because they have enough money in the salary account to cover it.

I would like to know before I vote on this exactly how much in salary increases we will be approving inadvertently even though we're approving only \$50,000.00. Does anybody know to answer that question for me?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan or Mrs. Hawe, can either of you answer that question? No one can answer that question, Mrs. Guroian. Do you have anything further to state?

MRS. GUROIAN: I can't approve salary increases when I don't even know how much they total to, so I am definitely going to vote no on this, and I hope to God nobody ever makes up a workpaper like this again and hands it to anybody who is sitting here because if I can't understand it, I don't expect anybody who doesn't have that much knowledge about workpapers to understand it either.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to speak in favor of approval of this appropriation because as, I believe, it was pointed out earlier, most of the raises work out to about a 5% increase annually which I think is an adequate and fair increase and also, I would like to point out that it wasn't this Board that went into the Labor Negotiations with the zero percent attitude. I think most of the Municipal Employees know that. In fact, there were a lot of us who were in favor of fully funding the 8% raises that were eventually came out of binding arbitration.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. JACHIMCZYK: (continuing) I'd also like to point out that I know it is that time of year where everybody is suppose to be speaking about saving money, but we also have to look at the future of Stamford. Do we want to pay meager salaries to our management people and have do-do brains running the City, or do we want to pay somewhat competitive salaries so that we can attract qualified people and have a well run City? That is why I'm in favor of supporting this appropriation. (end of tape)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Those in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We are moving the question. The question is on the approval of \$50,828.00 Non-Union Management Salary Increases. Please use your machine. We are voting on the approval of the Non-Union Management Salary Increases, \$50,828.00. Has everyone voted? The motion has been LOST 9 affirmative, 19 negative, 7 abstaining, and 2 not-voting. The motion has LOST.

MRS. SIGNORE: My abstention is because of a possible conflict of interest.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The record will so note, Mrs. Signore.

- (3) \$700,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - 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. Planning Board has sent advisory opinion approving this item. Held in Committee 9/14/83. Board of Finance approved 9/15/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. HOGAN: Item #3 is being held because the Committee felt that we needed more information on this. We requested more information prior to tonight's meeting. No information, as far as I know to this time, has been received, therefore, the Committee recommends holding.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Hogan, before you go any further, Ms. Summerville would like to make an announcement and I think it is appropriate at this time.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Brace yourself. In the 6th inning of the World Series, Baltimore 1, Phillies 1, and on the way to 2. It's a tie, 1 to 1 in the 6th inning.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I thought that would be a break since we are considering all kinds of money here.

- (4) \$ 45,268.00 - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - ASSESSOR'S OFFICE AND LUIS-MAPPING PROJECT - to add to the existing LUIS-MAPPING PROJECT the sum of \$90,000 to be financed as follows:
Board of Finance approved 9/15/83.

Transfer from:

#250.801 Grand List Evaluation (Assessor's Office) \$45,268.
(and close-out Project #250.801)

Transfer to:

#135.998 Luis-Mapping Project	\$45,268.
Plus additional appropriation (by taxation funding)	
#135.998 Luis-Mapping Project	44,732.
	<u>\$90,000.</u>

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

Item #4 also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. HOGAN: Item #4 is also being held for the same reason; lack of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #3 is held and #4 is held.

- (5) \$1,500,000. - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - SEWER COMMISSION -
Amend the Capital Projects Budget by adding a new project
to be known as #112,293 SECTION 16-2 VINE-CLUB ROAD AREA
SEWERS. Board of Finance approved 9/15/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

Item #5 taken up under Suspension of the Rules - See page 15 of Minutes.
Approved unanimously by voice vote.

- (6) \$ 6,735.00 - SOUTHFIELD COMMUNITY CENTER - additional appropriation -
Code 745.4393 - to cover a 1982/83 DEFICIT caused by utility
rate increase, per Mayor's request. Approved by Board of
Finance 9/15/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: #6 is on Consent.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 6 is off Consent.

MR. HOGAN: 6 is off Consent. The vote in Committee was 4 in favor and none against with one abstention. \$6,735 for Southfield Community Center. As you all can see, it is self-explanatory. It's caused by an increase in the rates in the electricity and the gas utility accounts, and it's moved by the Committee, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion was made to approve \$6,735.00 Southfield Community Center. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Secondary Committee, E, W, & G, Ms. DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: I move to waive the Secondary Committee report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Seconded. There's a motion made and seconded to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? None opposed. We'll waive the Secondary Committee report. Any discussion on #6 under Fiscal?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I would just like to know has there been an effort to have an energy audit to determine where savings could be effected?

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

MR. HOGAN: I am unaware at this time, of any audit of that nature having been made. I think this request was based simply on the fact that the percentage increase from the utility company is reflected in this \$6,735.00.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, point of information.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Through you to the Chairman, isn't it true that they paid last year's utility bill?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, we did pay last year's utility bill.

MR. BOCCUZZI: They had to take some money from this year's budget to pay last year's and this is to replace this year's budget?

MR. HOGAN: That's right. This is to replenish, I'm sorry, you're right. This is to replenish the budget.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MRS. HAWE: First of all as many of you know I think, that the Public Works Department has working for them a Mr. Sam Khoodary who works in the capacity of utility office who works with the various departments to try to effectuate savings in utilities, and actually over this past year, the Public Works Department has saved a lot of money on utilities; way in excess of his salary.

Mr. Boccuzzi is right. This was a bill for the last fiscal year which came in to the Southfield Community organization in July, but it was for June. It was for the last fiscal year, and they were told by Mr. Khoodary, by Commissioner Marra, Frank Harrison, and Tom Canino, who were at this meeting, that they should utilize funds from the current fiscal year to pay that bill. I have a copy of the bill. I believe Northeast Utilities was threatening to shut off the service, and that then an additional appropriation would be put through for this fiscal year.

Really, what caused the problem to begin with was that in their budget for '82/83, they neglected to include the projected rate increase which was included in all the other departments for the increase in electricity. For the last fiscal year, it was not included in their budget so, therefore, they had this shortfall at the end of the year. But my point was that the utility officer does work with people throughout the City in an effort to save money on energy costs, Mrs. Maihock.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. DIXON: I believe the points that I was going to try to make, have been made. I would just simply urge that this appropriation be approved because they are in dire need of it, and to offset or divert other shortfall of the same amount, then I think we should approve it now. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dixon.

MR. DeLUCA: Just a couple of questions. The fact that they used the '83/84 budget money to pay off a bill for '82/83, and we still have approximately 8 months left in the fiscal year, why is there the immediate rush to have this money now? It's a question to one of the Co-Chairpersons of Fiscal.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: That question was not asked, Mr. DeLuca, at the Committee meeting, and I have no answer for that. There should be money in the '83/84 account to pay the present utility rates.

MR. DeLUCA: Another question. I presume these people receive funds from the United Way or am I wrong? Is there any way we can just delay this here until we see...maybe they can approach United Way to get a higher percentage that in the past years to maybe cover this here, or has the Southfield Community organization made any attempts to try to come up on any fund-raising campaigns or any cost cutting programs whereby they can accumulate a portion of these funds, rather than us appropriating \$6,735.00 at this time?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Only one speaker at a time. Mr. DeLuca has asked a question, and Mr. Hogan has answered it. Please Ladies and Gentlemen, it's twenty after ten. We have a long Agenda to go. If you give the speakers your attention, if someone has asked a question and made a remark that you agree with, when I call on you, just agree with him. We're are going to lose our members, I'm afraid, in a little while, and we have a long Agenda to go. Mr. Hogan, would you answer Mr. DeLuca's question, please?

MR. HOGAN: To the best of my ability, Madam Chairman. I don't know of any fund-raising activities which are slated or have been held in order to offset this deficit. If my memory serves me correctly, the City does own the building, and has a commitment to the maintenance of that building, and whether you would consider this as part of the maintenance or not, I think it would be open to question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. DeLuca, you still have a question?

MR. DeLUCA: I was always under the impression this...the Southfield Community Center we're talking about?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: We own the building there? No, I didn't think we did. So, why would we have a commitment to pay the maintenance? I thought we made one flat fee going back years ago and that was suppose to be the end of it, and every year, we've been appropriating possibly \$34 to \$35,000.00. I hate to belabor the point, but I doubt it very much that we have a commitment to provide for the maintenance.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think we've asked many, many questions. There are several speakers. I see your hands. You are all down.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to somebody in Fiscal, I have a bill here from August 1, and it shows an increase use of kilowatt hours from 1982 to 1983; the increase being 314 to 531. Does anybody have any idea as to why there was such an increase in service?

MR. HOGAN: Answering for myself, Mrs. Saxe, I do not have any knowledge of that.

MRS. SAXE: I find a big problem here with budgetary controls within that organization and I question what we're going. I also question how we accept their budgets? I don't know how to get out of this, but I also think that at this particular time, somebody should be brought forward such as the manager of the building and ask these questions. If they are going to have more equipment, if they are going to use more services that that, they should know that the kilowatt hours are going up and budget for it. If they can't do that, then somebody should replace them because they don't know how to handle their business. Thank you.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Saxe. There are many, many speakers.

MR. DIXON: Madam President, would you just permit me to shed a little more light on this if I possibly can?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Except that there are two other speakers before you, Mr. Dixon. You are third. We'll get to you.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I just want to clarify something that Mr. Hogan said. It is my understanding that the Southfield Community Center is owned by the Housing Authority; not the City of Stamford. Am I correct, Mr. Hogan?

MR. HOGAN: Correct, Betty.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That was clarified down front. Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I think what you have here is an appropriation to make up for funds that were used for last year; last fiscal year, they took this fiscal year's money and they used it. Now, the amount that they took out of this year's budget, they are trying to replace. There was a question of increased kilowatt hours used by the Center, I think if you look back into some of the reports that you got out of the Center, you will find out that the Southfield Community Center has brought in a lot of services to the Center for the area right there in Southfield; dentist, health, and all these services that they bring in means new equipment that was given to them to use by the dental or the hospital or whatever it was. It could very well be that the kilowatt hours you are talking about, Mrs. Saxe, is due to new equipment being used and more services given to the area by Southfield.

We went over this electric bill a few years back. I don't know if Mr. Dixon was with us or not, but I was down there talking to Rufus Whitmore, and they did try to cut down on the lights. They put smaller wattage bulbs in and things of this nature, but the problem there is that the Southfield Community Center is used from like 6 o'clock in the morning until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, and that is why the use of the wattage is so high. If you want to postpone giving them the money, that is one thing, but eventually, they are going to come back and they are still going to need this amount of money to finish this fiscal year. If you want to put the problem for a couple of month, 6 months, that's one thing. If you want to settle it and solve it right now, I would suggest that we replace the money that used and approve the appropriation.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. DIXON: I thank Mr. Boccuzzi. He covered it very well, but just let me say that I had a talk with the director of that center this afternoon, and he assured me that this \$6,735.00 represents a deficit from last year, and if that deficit had not been paid out of this year's budget, if it is not replaced, then they are going to be deficit spending everytime they pay a utility bill. Utilities here goes just a little bit further than paying light bills. I think utility includes also, heating, hot water and etc. The City took on a responsibility for that center after its completion. The City was partly responsibly for the construction and the completion of that center in the very beginning. It was not, as I recall, originally intended for the City to pick up the responsibility in the expenses of the operation of the center, but since immediately after the center was opened, then utilities sky-rocketed; that is when all prices began to increase very rapidly to the point where the Southfield Center along with Yerwood Center and many other centers just simply could not sustain themselves without some help and

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DIXON: (continuing) that's when the City came in, being they were partly responsible for building the center in the first place, they came in and picked up a portion of the utilities, and that goes way back to the time when the center was first opened. The City has been budgeting that amount or amounts of money for the center to offset the cost of utilities every year since then. It is just that last year they had a unexpected deficit. They paid it, and if they can't replace that money back into this year's budget, then they are going to be deficit spending for the rest of this year and at the end of the year, they are going to be coming back with a deficit that in all likelihood, we will be paying. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dixon.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I'd like to comment on Mrs. Saxe's comment about the August bill in that, my personal July, August, and September electric were extraordinarily high, higher than the previous year, and I think it was probably due to the hot weather. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is one of our community centers that works with young people and provides counseling and programs for an inner-city community and I don't see why we are even debating whether we are going to pay their electric bill. What these small amounts that we are going to pay in electricity to keep them open now or next June when they really do go into deficit, certainly pays off in positive programs for these people and I suggest that we, please, let's just pass it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I have to voice my opinion in favor of passing this appropriation, however, with a reservation. I think we should vote to pass this, however, I think that look-see should be given to the financial management of this center. It seems to be that it is against all good financial principles to be spending this year's money for next year. Their budgetary process, possibly, might need some review. Rep. Saxe brought up a good point. Their electrical consumption has increased percentage-wise, roughly speaking, about 40%, and I stress, "roughly speaking." I didn't compute it out exactly. I didn't have the benefit of the bill that she did. There may be something awry here. However, our first obligation is to support the center; is to support the people that work within the center, and on the other hand, I think possibly, if Rep. Saxe or some of the other representatives feel that there might be something worth pursuing that it might be put on the Agenda for next month, and the officials that handle the management of this center, brought in to substantiate the \$6,735 that is needed, but I think our first obligation is to the people in the our community to support this center, and then to proceed further. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.

MR. DUDLEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to move the question. Is there a second. Several seconds. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. We are now voting on \$6,735.00 Southfield Community Center deficit caused by utility rate increase. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 26 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining, and 4 not-voting. 25 were needed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (7) \$ 5,000.00 - STAMFORD FESTIVAL OF THE ARTS - CULTURAL EVENTS - additional appropriation Code 730.3395 - required to cover partial expenses for the Art Festival, per Mayor Clapes' request. Approved by Board of Finance 9/15/83.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: On #7 Madam President, Mrs. Conti has reminded me, I think when I read the Consent Agenda, I inadvertently left that off. #7, \$5,000.00 for the Festival of Arts was on the Consent Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You mentioned it, Mr. Hogan, but it was taken off Consent.

MRS. CONTI: It never should have been on Consent, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti. It is off Consent either way.

MR. HOGAN: \$5,000.00 Festival of the Arts, this is to make up a deficit to cover the partial expenses of the Pink Tent Festival that was held in Mill River Park during the summer, and I so move, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a motion made and seconded to approve \$5,000.00 - Stamford Festival of the Arts. Parks and Rec Secondary Committee.

MR. DeLUCA: We overlooked this item during our Committee meeting.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you want to waive the Secondary Committee report?

MR. DeLUCA: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to waive the Secondary Committee report. Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. It's with great regret that I vote against this appropriation, not because of its worthiness, but because this is the type of appropriation that should have been funded by the Coliseum Authority funds rather than 90% going to one entity, and it is not fair that all that money is going one place and we cannot fund things like this, but out of principal, I cannot vote for additional local funds for this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I must say, out of principal, I must also vote against this item for several reasons. Each and everyone one of us we have a budget that we set up for ourselves at the beginning of each year, and come hell or high water we have to live within that budget. The Stamford Festival of the Arts appeared before us on two occasions looking for funds to support their project. No doubt we will hear speakers talking how great this Festival of the Arts was; what good it does for the Community. Grant it, it did a lot of good for the Community. You have a budget, you must live by it and if you can't, then it is your tough luck; you should find ways of getting elsewhere. We cannot be the bottle in this pocket over here that allows community oriented projects to take place and spend what they wish and then come back for more money.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) If you recall, we did approve \$4,350.00 from the Coliseum Authority to help with their budget. Now, they are back before us for another \$5,000.00. I would recommend denial of this request. If they can't get the money from the Coliseum Authority, then they have to go elsewhere to the private sector. I think it's time we took a stand and said that you have a budget, live by it, the City will not fund any deficits in the future. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. Many speakers.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. Well, I must speak in favor of it. Some of the background of it, as I understand, is that the Festival did want to come before the Coliseum Authority and were urged to do so by Commissioner Marra, and given to believe that they probably would be considered for some of the Coliseum Authority funds. This did not happen. The funds as we all know, were allocated 90% to the Stamford Center for the Arts, and 10% for the administrative costs, and it is true that they did get a small portion of the interest money from the Coliseum Authority funds, but this urging by the Commissioner, I believe, precluded them from doing private fund raising at the proper time. They are going to do fund raising now for next year, and they probably will come before the Coliseum Authority and see if there is some money there for them, but I think that this is the first year that it has been started for a long time; it was down, I believe if I remember, for seven years, and I think they were quite courageous in starting, and yes, Mr. DeLuca, I am going to say that it was a successful and very exciting festival for the City and I think that we must give them every opportunity to continue it as they plan to do. This was not a one year shot. They're getting started this year, and, therefore, I recommend that we do give them this one boost, and I really feel that they won't be coming back to the City year after year as so many organizations do for extra funding. They'll do it on their own. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. HAWE: Thank you. I just want to point out that the Stamford Festival for the Arts raised \$42,553.00 on their own; they raised that on their own after they were turned down for the Coliseum Authority funds, and that is no small fee to have done in that short amount of time. I think that there is a place here to mention the fact that it was a festival reached a lot of people. I went. I enjoyed it thoroughly, and it was something that anyone could walk in and enjoy. It was really terrific, and I feel that the City has an obligation to, certainly not a legal obligation, but a moral obligation to improve the quality of life of their citizens, and a small grant as this is one way to do it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I certainly must speak in favor of this appropriation. When I hear that about 45,000 people were served by this Festival, I think it's a small amount to contribute to them for the fine job that they did for the City of Stamford, and for the citizens of Stamford. As a taxpayer, I am proud to share a little part of my money with some of the people who enjoyed it. I would like to see this money paid and see the Art Festival continue to grow. I think it is a good thing that we have a chance to go out and see a festival once a year. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: Sorry, Madam President, I didn't ask to speak.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I agree with Mrs. Hawe. I feel that when an organization makes such a great effort to fund such a worthy event and it is such a positive event for our City, that we should certainly help defray some very minor amount of money such as this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Thank you, Madam President. A previous speaker referred to the quality of life and the Pink Tent improving the quality of life for all Stamford residents. The previous appropriation that we made to the community center, technically, Southfield Community Center, has improved the quality of life for a neighborhood. The money that is being requested this evening, \$5,000.00 for Cultural Events, is going out for all the residents of Stamford, and it is going out to residents of communities close by.

We have, in the past, spent millions of dollars to build up downtown Stamford. We have a beautiful City; we have a thriving City. According to statistics, we are living in the best City in the United States. Certainly, we should support this program because, one thing that we must do, is to bring people into Stamford for enjoyment and I think if we can spend \$5,000.00 this year and see this boom and become the success that it was in the previous years, we will have done the residents of this City and the taxpayers a great service.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. BLUM: This is one time I agree with Mrs. McInerney, but I believe that the City of Stamford has an obligation in a sense, to its citizens that if they enjoy a festival in this City such as the Pink Tent Festival, then we as legislators owe something to the citizens of Stamford. I think that \$5,000.00 isn't an awful lot of money to give toward arts or a festival for arts. Therefore, I'm going to be voting for this Pink Tent Festival. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Blum.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would just like to add my voice to those who have already spoke, to vote in favor of this. It's worthwhile. It's something that the community enjoyed and it is a very small price for us to pay to make the citizens of our community share a little of our cultural enjoyment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MR. ROOS: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. We are now voting on \$5,000.00 Stamford Festival of the Arts. Please use your machine. Item 7 under Fiscal. There are 37 members present. We need 25 affirmative votes. The motion has PASSED 28 affirmative, 8 negative, and 1 not-voting.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (8) \$ 1,200.00 - SHELLFISH COMMISSION - Code 590 (see below) - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes. Approved by Board of Finance 9/15/83:

590.2740 Telephone.....	\$ 100.00
590.2921 Printing.....	225.00
590.2922 Postage.....	250.00
590.2930 Stationery.....	300.00
590.2942 Travel.....	175.00
590.2911 Secretarial Services.....	150.00
	<u>\$1,200.00</u>

MR. HOGAN: We were told that this was inadvertently omitted from the budget. This is the budget for the Shellfish Commission for the year.

MRS. HAWE: Madam Chairman, wasn't this on Consent?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, there were not too many on Consent. They were taken off Consent. This is not on Consent.

MR. HOGAN: And I so move, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion. Seconded. A motion has been made for \$1,200.00 for the Shellfish Commission. Any discussion? No discussion.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. We've had a big discussion tonight about budgets and how people handle budgets. I would like to know how come the Shellfish Commission neglected to put a budget forward?

MR. HOGAN: I would yield to Mrs. Hawe. Mrs. Hawe had the explanation at the meeting on this.

MRS. HAWE: As Mrs. Saxe knows, the City is run by a lot of small commissions and boards made up of voluntary citizens and this is one of them. It's made up of three people who really work very hard in what they do. When it came time to put in their budget, apparently a form letter is sent out by the Finance Department. The Chairman of the Shellfish Commission was under the impression that this did not have to be sent back in for whatever reason, I don't know. I really think that, and I've told this to the Budget Director, that it was up to the Finance Department when they saw that there was no request coming in from the Shellfish Commission, that they should have either put it in or approached the Chairman of the Shellfish Commission. They did not. It really was a matter of the citizens who had not been through their budgetary process before and didn't really know what to expect, and we're really not helped along by people who work for the City of not sending in their request.

This is exactly what they got last year. It covers just minor telephone bills, printing and things like that. They have correspondence. They travel up state to Hartford for various meetings. They have permits and maps of the harbor printed up that you get when you apply for your shellfishing license. It's what they've gotten last year, the year before and I really would urge you to approve this. People laugh and say, "What does the Shellfish Commission do?" They really do very good work and before we had this Commission, the clams in the Cove, Westcott Cove, in the harbor, were practically depleted and for years there was no clamming allowed. Within the past 5 years or so, the harbor has become much cleaner and shellfishing has been permitted again.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWES: (continuing) The Shellfish Commission has gotten on two occasions, free of charge, they've arranged to have thousands of bushels of clams transplanted into the harbor. They've had clams seeded into the harbor last year, and if you ever went down and watch at low tide and saw the many, many people, especially senior citizens who go down there and take out their bushel that they are allowed, it really is a good thing to see. I really urge you to approve this. It was something that just slipped through the cracks as they say, and was not put in the budget book this year. I urge approval of this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Next to speak is Mr. Wiederlight.

MRS. SAXE: Madam President, that was answered for me and I still have another question. On our papers, the department head has not signed this particular item. What department is it in?

MRS. HAWES: The department is the Shellfish Commission; that's the department. They have their own. It's like the Chairman of the Health Commission would sign it. They have a separate page in the budget book. That's the department, the Shellfish Commission.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Does that answer your question, Mrs. Saxe?

MRS. SAXE: Now I would like to know why the previous year they spent \$247.00, and they need a \$1,200 this year?

MRS. HAWES: That's not correct. I know they spent the whole amount. I don't know what that means, but I know that the whole amount was spent. In fact, I know the Chairman of the Shellfish Commission used a lot of her own money in telephone callings but yet they still ask for the same amount this year. I don't know really what that is but I know that's wrong. They spent the whole entire amount.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We are going to vote now on \$1,200 for the Shellfish Commission. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 35 affirmative, and 2 abstaining.

- (9) \$ 1,550.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - W.I.C. PROGRAM - Request to transfer as
(transfer) below, per request of Mayor Clapes. Board of Finance approved
(Ord. 510) 9/15/83.

Transfer to:

573.2921 Printing \$1,550.00

Transfer from:

573.1330 Medical Life (Ord. 510) ..\$1,000.00

573.2922 Postage..... 150.00

573.2935 Films-Audio visual..... 400.00

\$1,550.00

TAKEN OFF AGENDA (Dr. Gofstein withdrew at Committee meeting)

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (10) \$ 3,500.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - Code 410.3452 HARBOR PATROL -
additional appropriation for previously-authorized expenditure
by Messr. Pollard and Marra under powers granted to them by
Section 619.1 of Charter for emergency, 8/15/83; as requested
by Mayor Clapes. Approved by Board of Finance 9/15/83.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (11) \$ 72,227.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BY
(Transfer) ADDING TO PROJECT KNOWN AS #810.190 STAMFORD HIGH SCHOOL
ADDITION AND MODERNIZATION, THE SUM OF \$72,227.00 to be
financed by TRANSFER FROM #810.793 BURDICK RENOVATION,
which is then closed-out. Requested by Mayor Clapes.
Approved by Board of Finance 9/15/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

- (12) \$ 3,383.00 - TOWN AND CITY CLERK - CODE 210.1110 SALARIES - additional
appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes for salary increase
EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 1983 from \$32,700 to \$38,500 per annum.
Ord. 510 applies. (\$5,800 increase, 14.7%). \$3,383
represents 7-month period. Board of Finance approved
9/15/83.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: The Committee by a vote of 4 in favor, 1 against, no abstentions,
so moved, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to approve \$3,383.00
Town and City Clerk salaries. Personnel Committee report.

MR. STORK: Yes, Madam President, Personnel concurs unanimously, 4 in favor
and none opposed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. Personnel Committee concurs unanimously.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Pertaining to this appropriation,
I did take the time to call up the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities
today, to find out for myself and for the benefit of my colleagues, what the
Town and City clerks of the 6 largest municipalities in our state receive as
far as their salary, and I'd like to convey this information to my colleagues.

Hartford, the Town and City Clerk makes \$33,826.00. In New Haven, the salary
is \$17,500.00; Waterbury, \$19,500.00; Bridgeport, there are two separate
positions; one for the City Clerk whose salary is \$15,000 and one for the Town
Clerk whose salary is also \$15,000, and for the City of Norwalk, the Town Clerk
in that municipality makes \$26,216.00. These are the five largest cities in the
State of Connecticut, and based on that information, I must, in all good conscience,
vote against any increase in salary for the Town Clerk of our City. At the present
time, the Town Clerk makes \$32,700.00 which is well and above all of the other
municipalities, and I feel that as a rule of thumb, we have to go by what other

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. ZELINSKI: (continuing) cities and towns are paying their either appointed or elected officials. And so, in this regard, I, in all good conscience, have to vote against it. That's all I have to say, thank you.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you very much. I would like to point out that we are talking here about an elected position. We don't seem to lack for candidates for the position regardless of the salary. I feel, therefore, that the salary must be adequate especially in light of what Mr. Zelinski just brought forth, and I have opposed this in Committee and I will oppose it here. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you. I was going to say pretty much what Mrs. Conti said. Thank you very much.

MR. BURKE: I just have a question. I've heard about Hartford, New Haven, Waterbury, using title "Town Clerk." I'd like to know if it's possible to know, are the duties the same? They are.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Zelinski, can you answer that question? ^{ARE} ~~Our~~ the duties comparable to our Town and City Clerk?

MR. ZELINSKI: Through you, Madam Chairman, to Rep. Burke, I unfortunately did not ask what the responsibilities are; just what the salary enumeration was for the positions in those other cities and towns.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski. Anything further, Mr. Burke?

MR. BURKE: No.

MR. CONTI: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Are we in the habit of raising salaries during an administration? We have on our Agenda later on, different figures that we're talking about raising before the next generation of city people come in. Our City Clerk has been being paid a certain amount ever since she did come into office last year. Doing this, by increasing the salary right now, I think we're going against all tradition of making sure that there will be no conflict; there would be no problem; there would be no question as to what the position pays before the bi-annual election, and I think this is when it should be done for the next election; not retroactively. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Conti.

MRS. HAWES: I just wanted to say that this salary increase is effective December 1, 1983, which is when the new Town Clerk comes in.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote.

MR. BLUM: Thank you. I would like to make an amendment to the Town Clerk's salary increase. I do not have the figures.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Blum, before you make the motion, I have to have the figures. I will give you a moment if you would like. There are no further speakers if you want to gather your thoughts.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BLUM: I would like to cut this increase from 14.7% to 10%, \$3,270 per year for a total salary of \$35,940; 7 months equals \$1,807.50. (There was no Second to this motion.)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Bringing the total figure to what, Mr. Blum? When we make amendments to the motion, it's very important that we give the percentage. (end of tape)...5.25. That is the motion on the Floor. We are going to move to a machine vote. There are 37 members present. We need 25 votes.

MR. TARZIA: Madam Chairman, would you repeat that figure? I'm sorry.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The 7-month figure? \$1,335.25.

MR. TARZIA: No, I have a new figure. I'm sorry. That was 6 months. That was an error in there.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's what I'm trying to get to.

MR. TARZIA: It's \$1,557.79.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That's what we are looking for is a 7-month figure.

MR. TARZIA: The 7-month figure is \$1,557.79.

MR. DeLUCA: Can I explain how we get the \$1,335.25, please?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Alright. There is no discussion because we're going right to vote on the question. Mr. DeLuca, that is the figure we're waiting for; that 7-month figure.

MR. DeLUCA: The 7-month figure, if you get 7% of \$32,700.00, would be a total of \$2,289. If you divide 2289 by 12, you get \$190.75 per month times that by 7, you'll get \$1,335.25 for a 7-month period.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Tarzia's figure is correct. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now on item 12 under the Fiscal Committee. The motion has been made and this is the last time I am going to repeat it. We are going to vote on it immediately. For a 7% increase for the Town and City Clerk, which is a total of \$2,670.50.

MR. DeLUCA: It's \$1,335.25 for 7-months. That is all we are approving the funds for.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Tarzia did not make that in his motion, Mr. DeLuca. The original motion was for those figures I just gave. Mr. Tarzia, do you want to repeat your motion?

MR. TARZIA: Well, apparently, the first figure that I gave you for the increase, for the 7% was incorrect, perhaps. I have a new figure. May I read that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes. Just repeat your motion.

MR. TARZIA: The motion is that we increase the salary by 7% which would be an increase of \$2,289.00. For 7 months, that appropriation would come to \$1,335.25. I'll repeat that; \$1,335.25. That's for a 7-month appropriation which is what item 12 is amended to.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I want the total salary, too. You are moving 7% which is \$2,289.00 which brings the salary to what figure, Mr. Tarzia?

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. TARZIA: It brings it to \$34,989.00. \$34,989. Mr. Burke concurs with me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? That was seconded before. It was just the figures that were incorrect with the 7%. I will repeat this motion. The motion has been made for a 7% increase for the Town & City Clerk, \$2,289.00 bringing the total salary for that position to \$34,989.00, which brings that to a 7-month projected raise of \$1,335.25. Do we all concur with those figures? We are going to use the machine vote at this time. If you agree with this, vote yes. 25 votes are required. Has everyone voted? The amendment to the motion has been DEFEATED; 13 affirmative, 21 negative, and 2 not-voting.

We are going back to the original motion for the approval of \$3,383.00 for Town and City Clerk for increase from \$32,700 to \$38,500.

MR. ZELINSKI: I'd like to move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We are going to move the question. We're going right to a machine vote. If you approve this raise in the salary, vote yes. If not, vote no. 25 votes are required. Has everyone voted? The motion is DEFEATED 14 affirmative, 22 negative, and 1 not-voting. The motion is DEFEATED.

- (13) \$ 13,290.00 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - CODE 101.1110 SALARIES - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes for salary increases RETROACTIVE TO JANUARY 1, 1983 for each of the two Registrars from \$18,070.00 to \$22,500.00 per annum (increase of \$4,430.00, 24.5%). Approved by Board of Finance 9/15/83. Ord. 510 applies.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: And I so move, Madam Chairman. The Committee moved 4 in favor, 1 against and no abstentions.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a second to that motion. A motion has been made to approve \$13,290.00 Registrars of Voters salaries. Personnel Committee Secondary report.

MR. STORK: Yes, Madam President, Personnel unanimously concurs, 4 in favor and none opposed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. It will make it very simple and to the point. I believe the Registrars of Voters are entitled to the increase. The Deputy Registrars are currently making more than both Registrars are making at this time. Without this increase, there will be a substantial difference between the salaries, and I believe the Registrars should be getting more than the Deputy Registrars, and I hope that the Board considers this, and I hope the Board approves this tonight. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to bring it to the attention of this Board that under the State Statutes, Registrars of Voters are not entitled

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: (continuing) to an increase until they have served two years in office. Unfortunately in violation of the Statutes, the Registrars received an increase 11 months after they were in office. They took office on December 1, and in November of the same year, they received an increase. So, therefore, I don't think that we should give another increase and leave ourselves in violation of the Statutes. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MRS. McINERNEY: Yes, I would agree with Mr. Dudley. The present salary of one of the deputies is in excess of both Registrars of Voters, and the next step would bring that up to well over \$19,000.00. Regarding the State Statute that Mrs. Conti is talking about, it is my understanding that one of the referendum questions that was passed last year had to do with raises for employees that were elected officials, and as I recollect, I think that law has been updated and changed as of last year's election. However, certainly, the two ladies in office presently, do a great deal for the City of Stamford, and upholding our rights as voters in this Town and I agree with everything that Jim said. I think this is a question that is entirely different than any others in that they're very deserving and should be rewarded with this raise.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I think the increase in this instances is certainly in order, and the increase that Rep. Betty Conti spoke of earlier about the Registrars receiving after 11 months in office, I believe it was an increase awarded them in error, and if anybody from the Fiscal Co-Chairmen could reaffirm about what I'm about to say, I would appreciate it. It is my understanding that Corporation Counsel's office has ruled that that should not be held against them for consideration of this raise. Is that true?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Both Chairpersons agree with you.

MR. STORK: Thank you, that's all I have to say.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to speak in favor of this because very few cities have the kind of conscientious Registrars that we have in the City of Stamford, and I certainly appreciate the kind of work that they are doing in keeping our voter registration up to date and I think they are entitled to it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MRS. SIGNORE: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to vote on the main question which is the approval of \$13,290.00 for the Registrars of Voters. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 31 affirmative, 1 negative, 3 abstaining, and 2 not-voting. Mr. Hogan, do you want to continue with your report. The motion has PASSED.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (14) \$ 5,833.00 - OFFICE OF THE MAYOR - CODE 20.1110 SALARIES - additional appropriation requested by Mayor Clapes for salary increase EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 1, 1983 from \$45,000.00 per annum to \$55,000.00 per annum (increase of \$10,000, 22.2%).
Approved by Board of Finance 9/15. Ord. 510 applies.
(\$5,833 for 7-month period. This is for Mayor's salary.)

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: The Committee recommends adoption of this by a vote of 3 in favor, 1 abstention, and 1 against, and we're moving it for adoption.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to that motion. Secondary Committee, Personnel.

MR. STORK: Yes, Madam President. The Personnel Committee denies recommending approval of this appropriation by a tie vote of 2 in favor, 2 opposed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork. The Fiscal Committee has approved the appropriation. The Personnel Committee, the Secondary Committee has not approved it by a tie vote. We'll now go into discussion on this.

MR. DUDLEY: I'll be brief again. I'm appalled that the Mayor has the audacity to propose this after offering zero to the unions. If the City was in such financial shape that we could not afford to give the unions a proper increase, regardless of who the incoming mayor will be, I don't think it's proper at this point, to give any mayor an increase, and I think the whole financial status of the City should be evaluated, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. As I mentioned earlier, I did want to be fair about this appropriation as I did with the Town Clerk and I also asked for guidance from the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities to find out what the salaries of the other mayors of the six largest cities in the state, and I'd like to share this with my colleagues.

First of all, Bridgeport, the state's largest city, the mayor receives a salary of \$42,000.00. Second, Hartford, the mayor receives \$17,000, however, there is a city manager that receives \$55,686.00. The third largest city, New Haven, the mayor receives \$42,500.00. Waterbury, the fourth largest city, the mayor receives \$45,500 and Norwalk, the 6th largest city in the state, the mayor receives a salary of \$47,129.00.

Based on this information and also I would remind my colleagues, that our Mayor, in addition to his salary, also receives the use of city car and all free gasoline. And, finally, I believe that it is a high honor and a privilege to be elected the mayor of our City, and it should not be one that is strived for because of its monetary gain but because the person who is running is sincerely dedicated and wants to serve the people of Stamford, and I hope that this appropriation is defeated. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I'll try to be as brief as possible. The Personnel Committee and other members of this Board, have put organizations such as the MEA through the wringer in the past year or two, really making them sweat out their raise of about 8%, and I just want to make really one more sentence about this item and that is that it is embarrassing to me as a member of this Board, to have to even sit here and consider this appropriation tonight. I would just like to see it defeated and defeated unanimously.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Stork.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to vote on the motion which is the approve of \$5,833.00 Office of the Mayor salaries. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? 25 affirmative votes are necessary. The motion is DEFEATED 6 affirmative, 28 negative, 2 abstaining and 1 not-voting. Mr. Hogan, continue. That motion has been DEFEATED.

- (15) \$598,480.00 - SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY - WELFARE DEPARTMENT -
(consolidation request from Mayor Clapes to CONSOLIDATE 4 Capital Projects
of 4 into one) into one to be known as #520.391 SMITH HOUSE SNF MODERNIZATION.
This amendment to the Capital Projects budget will close out
the four projects listed below, to effect savings and allow
flexibility in bidding. Board of Finance approved 9/15/83.
- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| #520.183 Air-conditioning..... | \$319,600. |
| #520.177 Sprinkler system..... | 143,500. |
| #520.178 Hot water system..... | 55,000. |
| #520.185 Floor tile replacement..... | 80,380. |
| | <u>\$598,480.</u> |

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: It's to consolidate the four items; the air conditioning, the sprinkler system, hot water system, and floor tile replacement, into one account so that they can get one contractor to do the work; to sublet it. They feel that the work will be done rapidly and that the work will be done properly under the direction of one contractor and they have asked to consolidate these. They have also said that if the money becomes available in one lump sum, that the bids will go out as they put it, "tomorrow" for the work to be done. The Committee had moved it as 5 in favor. It was on the Consent Agenda. It was asked to be taken off. The vote is still 5 in favor and none against.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. There's a motion made to approve \$598,480.00 Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility for the modernization project. Secondary Committee, Ms. DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: I move to waive Secondary, please.

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? We're waiving the Secondary Committee report.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, I will speak in favor of this expenditure. If anyone has been to the Smith House Skilled Nursing Home, it is in really dire need of air conditioning. It is so hot in the summer. Most of the people, the patients, are very uncomfortable obviously. They are very old. They can't move. These things have been needed for a long time. It's about time that the City will finally put this money together in a method to help pay for it. And, certainly, I hope that by just putting the money together in one spot, doesn't mean that the project will be forgotten. Certainly, it would be up to us to make sure that the Welfare Department keeps up with their end of the bargain and does the work prior to next summer. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to make it very clear from the beginning here that I am certainly in favor of consolidating these accounts into one amount, but I have some very real problems with what's going on at Smith House concerning these projects or at least, part of these projects. It begins at when we first started out with appropriating the money for the air conditioning system. Mr. Hogan tells me that we did that back in the summer of 1982, and to this date, the project hasn't been done. The reason given, "Well, we can't put in the air conditioning system until we get the hot water system funded." Okay? They got the money for the hot water system. To this date, still, no air conditioning installed.

Tonight we have been asked to do another step towards completing these projects, and that is to consolidate the accounts. What's it going to be next month? What's it going to be next year? Are they going to have to come back for appropriations to put in a new pane of glass to complete these projects, or to buy some new waste papers baskets? I think Smith House has been sitting on this. I don't like it. I've been up to Smith House several times during the summer on complaints of heat, and I've been up there in the evenings when it was horrible conditions. They shouldn't be under those conditions. It's almost criminal. I've taken this off the Consent Agenda for the purpose of amending the motion. I would like to amend the motion to include that in addition to the consolidation of the four accounts into one, a requirement that the management of Smith House regularly report the progress of the completion of these projects to this Board that could be monitored by the Fiscal Committee or it could be monitored by the Health and Protection Committee. I'm not really concerned which one would do it. What I am concerned about is that we see to it that these projects are started and completed so that they have their air conditioning by next summer. I would heck like heck to see them go through another summer like they just did. That's my motion, Madam President, and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, you are going to have to go a little bit slower with that motion. Is it in writing?

MR. STORK: No, it is not. I apologize.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's an amendment to the main motion. Repeat it slowly.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. STORK: My amendment to the main motion is that in addition to consolidating these four accounts into one, that the management of Smith House be required to regularly report to this Board, the progress of the completion, or the beginning to completion of these four projects.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You heard the amendment to the motion. There is a second to that. Any discussion on that amendment?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Yes, I am in favor of Rep. Stork's amendment, and I would like to further suggest to his amendment that he might want to put a time-frame that they've got to report, possibly a written report on a monthly basis to the Board of Representatives. You're leaving an open end on that, Rep. Stork. You may want to reconsider your amendment to put some sort of time-frame there.

MR. STORK: May I do that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: You certainly may, Mr. Stork.

MR. STORK: I recommend that the reporting period be bi-monthly.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Bi-monthly. Add to that bi-monthly. We are very fortunate, Mrs. Maihock is taking shorthand up here and she is writing it all down.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Seconded.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you. Mr. Boccuzzi, would you like to speak to this amendment.

MR. BOCCUZZI: You took care of what I was going to ask.

MR. BURKE: I'd like to ask a question. It is very fine to report and get nice reams of paper, but what action will be taken and what type of a report? You'll always get a report, "We've done nothing;" that's a report. If the report comes in, "We have done nothing," then what?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Stork, do you have any reaction to that?

MR. STORK: Well, we wouldn't know how to react unless we know that's going on there in the first place. We would have to take action based on what the report is; seeing no work is being done, or nothing is being done to accomplish these projects, we can take it from there. On the other hand, if we see work is being accomplished, we can be satisfied with that.

MRS. McINERNEY: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We're moving the question which is the amendment to the main motion. Is there a second to that? Seconded. All in favor of moving the question which is the amendment, please say aye. Opposed? We are now going to vote on Mr. Stork's amendment to the motion. The amendment that we are voting on right now is to recommend that the reporting period be bi-monthly. The amendment to consolidate accounts into one and a requirement that the management of Smith House bi-monthly report the progress of this project. Does everybody understand it? To the Board of Representatives; to this Board of Representatives; to the Board of Representatives.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: It is very confusing if we don't have these amendments in writing, Ladies and Gentlemen. We've been trying for almost two years now. If you have an amendment to make it is a lot easier if you put it in writing. Does everybody understand what we're voting on. Use your machine. We've voting on the amendment. Has everyone voted? The amendment has been APPROVED 27 affirmative, 1 negative, 1 abstaining and 8 not-voting.

We are now approving the main motion. There being no speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote. We are approving \$598,480.00 Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, modernization project. There is listed air conditioning, sprinkler system, hot water system, and floor tile replacement. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 29 affirmative, 0 abstaining, 0 negative, and 8 not-voting.

MRS. HAWES: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mrs. Hawes.

MRS. HAWES: Will the President or the Administrative Assistant or somebody send a letter or something to Smith House so that they know they have to give us this report every other month?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, on the Action Report, it should state with the amendment. The amendment should be written down there.

MRS. HAWES: Perhaps, it should be sent separately.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Usually, they're sent separately, too. Thank you.

- (16) \$ 41,240.00 - COMMUNITY SERVICES - EMERGENCY SHELTER - CODE 725.5503
Contract - Council of Churches and Synagogues - which
amount has been received by the City from SOCIAL SERVICES
BLOCK GRANT to be used over a two-year period for the
City's emergency shelter program. Requested by Mayor
Clapes. Approved by the Board of Finance 9/15/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. HOGAN: The Committee moves in favor of this by a vote of 4 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a second to that motion.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Theoretically, aren't we suppose to do 17 before we do 16?

MR. HOGAN: Mr. Boccuzzi is correct. You get authorization for participation in the Social Service Block Grant.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well, either way, Mr. Boccuzzi.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: It really doesn't matter. No, it doesn't. We'll do that next. We're on 16 now. A motion has been made. \$41,240.00 Community Services. He does raise a point but that will be next. Secondary Committee, E, W, & G, Ms. DeGaetani.

MS. DeGAETANI: I make a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to waive the Secondary Committee report. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? Secondary Committee report is waived. Any discussion?

MRS. McINERNEY: Mr. Hogan, I would like to ask you where is the emergency shelter presently being housed, and is this for money that will be used for the next two years or is this money that has been spent and will be used for previous expenditures? Could you tell me that?

MR. HOGAN: Yes, Mrs. McInerney. The present shelter is at 66 Main Street, and it is my understanding unless I stand corrected, that it will be used over the two-year period; over this two-year period.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Point of information.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The present shelter is at 66 West Main Street.

PRESIDENT SANTY: At 66 West Main Street.

MR. HOGAN: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MRS. McINERNEY: Madam President, I had inquired about the West Main Street Community Center lease with the City and with the prior leasees, and apparently, the Mayor signed a letter lease agreement with the Council of Churches and Synagogues from April 6, 1983 to be expiring on September 30, 1983. Now, that license granted short-term use of the premises, and it was an understanding that if long-term use of that building would be required, that a written lease would have to be drawn up and approved by all the Boards. Now, we have passed that September 30th date. To my knowledge, we don't have any lease pending before this Board, and I wonder whether action on 16 and 17 is in order at the time without having a present lease and knowing the terms of agreement at that lease. So, I would make a motion to return this to Committee until such time as there is a written lease between the City of Stamford and the Council of Churches and Synagogues for use of 66 West Main Street.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. McInerney, I understand. Is there a second to that motion? There is a second to that motion. I would like to explain that I think this emergency shelter, whether it's there or in another building, that's the appropriation for that. I don't think it has anything to do with the lease, but that's the motion on the Floor at this time. A motion has been made to return this to Committee. Any discussion on returning this to Committee?

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, I would agree for returning this to Committee for clarification, but the time-frame around is money. So we do have to pass this now or lose it. We do need the shelter in the City of Stamford as it has been proven. I think to delay this may be a foolish idea, really. Thank you.