

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1983

17TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A regular monthly meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1983, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: I am honored this evening to ask the Rev. Barry Furey, of Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Parish, to open our meeting with prayer.

INVOCATION: The Rev. J. Barry Furey, Sacred Heart Roman Catholic Parish  
37 Schuyler Avenue, Stamford, CT

"There will be just two thoughts: The first thought will be that of asking the Lord to bless you in your decisions, and the second thought will be in thanking Him expectedly that He will grace you and bless you for your time, your talent and your energy. So, in that fashion, let it just be this short song. (Accompanied by guitar) Just as I sing this portion, just think of some of the decisions that you have to make tonight and ask the Lord to bless you quietly to yourself.

"Take Lord, receive all my liberty, my memory, understanding, my entire will. Give me only Your love and Your grace. That's enough for me; Your love and Your grace are enough for me.

"If I might read from a portion of the psalms: Psalm 1:10, 'I will thank the Lord with all my heart in the meeting of the just and in their assembly. Great are the works of the Lord to be pondered by all who love them. Majestic and glorious is all of His work for his justice stands firm forever. He gives food to those who fear Him. He keeps his covenant ever in His mind. He is always faithful to His people,' and so with Thanksgiving upon us pretty soon, we were just to consider the blessings that you are each of you grateful for; your family, your friends, the people you represent; just for a second in silence.

"Thank you, Lord, for loving me. Thank you, Lord, for my eyes that see. Thank you for all the things You've done. Thank you, Lord, for everyone. Thank you for all the people gathered here today. As we've lifted up, our voices join to pray that we all realize the dignity that lies within our brotherhood to Thee. Thank you, Lord, for loving me. Thank you, Lord, for my eyes that see. Thank you for all the things You've done. Thank you, Lord, for everyone. God bless you all."

PRESIDENT SANTY: Amen. Thank you, Father Furey.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Santy let the assemblage.



ROLL CALL: CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 35 members present and 5 absent. Absent were Reps. Roos (excused, out-of-town), Tarzia, Blum (ill), Dziezyc (excused, on vacation), and Blais.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There being 35 members present, the Cahir 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 in good working order.

PAGES: Rachael Molgano, student at St. Gabriel's School.  
Kady Collier, student at St. Gabriel's School.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, girls, for being here.

On year ago, I started the practice of celebrating birthdays. We've come around to that time again; but, we have celebrated for one year. It wasn't just to add added calories to our diet, but a thank you from all of us to each other for the hours, and hours of devotion and work that you've given to the City. I would just like in passing, to say Happy Birthday to our November birthdays, although we celebrated them last November: David Blum who is in the hospital; Handy Dixon, Barbara McInerney and Jim Bonner. Happy Birthday.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late Cpr. Devon Sundar, Marine killed in Beirut; resident of Stamford and was 23 years old - by Rep. James Dudley.

For those who have given their lives in Beirut and Grenada - by Rep. James Dudley.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Along with that, David Blum had every intention this evening of asking for a Moment of Silence for Cpl. Sundar, so, I would like to read this; that he and Old Sarge Tony Pia composed:

"As we convene here this evening, let us pause to pay tribute and honor to Corporal Devon Sundar, United States Marine Corp of Stamford, who died in the terrorist bombing of Beirut, Lebanon. We offer our condolences to his widow, Doreen, and to his parents. Corporal Sundar gave his last full-measure of devotion, his life in the service of his country. Let us remember all of the men who made the supreme sacrifice at Beirut and Grenada.

"It is important at this time in our history, to salute and thank the many men and women who serve in America's armed forces. It is because of such men as Corporal Sundar and the other heros who have fallen before him, that America remains the land of the free and the home of the brave."

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, both the sentiments that were expressed by the letter and by Mr. Dudley are very appropriate. We are a land of opportunity; we are free and I think as a courtsey, I would like to suggest to you, Madam President, that as a final duty of this Board, you send a letter to Corporal Sundar's family indicating our condolences from the Board and the appreciation he's given to our City and our country as well.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. It will be done.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE (continued)

For the late Mrs. Cathy Brandi, wife of Connie Brandi, who is part of the Republican Town Committee - submitted by Reps. Anthony Conti and Barbara McInerney.

For the late Mrs. Beatrice Tamburri, who gave many, many years of her life to the Republican Town Committee - submitted by Reps. Anthony Conti and Barbara McInerney.

For the late mother of Irwin Silver, who is a member of the Stamford Republican Party, as well as former State Central Committee man, and former Town Chairman - submitted by Rep. McInerney.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, would you like to be recognized?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I would like to have about a 15-minute recess.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made for a 15-minute recess. Is there a Second to that Motion? All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? We will recess for 15 minutes.

RECESS: 8:50 P.M. - 9:25 P.M.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Will the Representatives please take their seats? It's now 9:25. We have a lengthy Agenda. I would ask anyone that is not a member of this Board to please leave the area except those with permission.

While we are taking our seats, in my lapel this evening, is the seal of the City of Stamford which I am ordering for every member of the 17th Board, and whether you're on the next Board or not, I'll make sure that you all get one. It is going to take five or six weeks to get here, so it will be another few weeks. This is what they look like if you want to come up and look at my lapel. This was given to me as a gift and I researched it and we are all going to get one. It's a nice keepsake for those that are leaving.

STANDING COMMITTEES

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam Chairman, I'd like to waive the reading of the Steering Committee report, please.



STEERING COMMITTEE (continued)

PRESIDENT SANTY: A Motion has been made and Seconded to waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report. All in favor, please say AYE. Opposed? We'll waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report.

AK

---

HMM

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on Tuesday, November 1, 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 <sup>time</sup> a Quorum was present, by Chairwoman Jeanne-Lois Santy.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING

Jeanne-Lois Santy, Chairwoman  
Barbara McInerney  
John J. Boccuzzi  
Annie M. Summerville  
Robert "Gabe" DeLuca  
Mary Jane Signore  
Anthony Conti  
Philip Stork  
James Bonner  
Paul Dziezyc  
Audrey Maihock  
Helen M. McEvoy

Gerald Rybnick  
Lathon Wider, Sr.  
Sandra Goldstein  
Mary Lou Rinaldi  
Betty Gershman  
Jeremiah Livingston  
John Zelinski  
Frank Fedeli, ADVOCATE  
Len Gambino, WSTC-WYRS  
Mrs. Paul Dziezyc  
John J. Hogan

(1) PLANNING AND ZONING MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the four items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, plus one other item transferred from Public Housing and Community Development, being a proposed resolution to establish a street line for a portion of Greenwich Avenue for New Neighborhoods, Inc.

(2) FISCAL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the first 28 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Item #29 was ordered off the agenda and held until receipt of Corporation Counsel's opinion regarding State Constitution and HJR#46 adopted 11/24/82 concerning legality of salary increases for Registrars of Voters approved at 10/11/83 Board meeting for \$13,290.00; submitted by Reps. Betty Conti and Ann King Saxe 10/21/83.

(3) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MATTERS

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



STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

(4) TRANSPORTATION MATTERS

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being requests from Reps. Dziezyc, Wiederlight, and Gershman for status and progress reports on ticket collection agency, past-due collections, etc.

(5) CHARTER REVISION MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one matter appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being a progress report on the ballot questions.

(6) PARKS AND RECREATION MATTERS

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

(7) APPOINTMENTS MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the five names appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, plus the name of Mark Marseglia for Patriotic and Special Events Commission.

(8) PUBLIC WORKS MATTERS

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

(9) PUBLIC HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, being the report. Ordered off the Agenda was Rep. Saxe's request for a review of the Community Development Program Report for Year 7-8 dated 8/31/83. Ordered moved to Planning and Zoning was the proposed resolution to establish a street line for a portion of Greenwich Avenue for New Neighborhoods, Inc.

(10) URBAN RENEWAL MATTERS

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

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)(11) PERSONNEL MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four of the items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered off the Agenda were five items appearing thereon, being: (a) Publication of proposed ordinance Sec. 16-14 Annuity/Pension Plan; (b) Request from Rita Hogan, R.N. to buy-back retroactive pension time; (c) request for review and approval of salary increases, catch-up adjustments, and cost-of-living adjustments for 19 Community Development and SNPP personnel; (d) matter of Personnel Board of Appeals hearing on Non-Union Administrators whose fiscal request was denied by this Board 10/11/83 meeting; (e) Superior Court Summons re AFSCME representing Comm. on Aging Director and 2 Deputy Registrars of Voters (MAA members) for classified civil service status and pension plan participation.

(12) EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT MATTERS

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda concerning police matters.

(13) HEALTH AND PROTECTION MATTERS

ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda: (a) publication of proposed ordinance re hazards of satellite transmissions; (b) discussion re Ord. 206 and fire departments.

(14) LEGISLATIVE AND RULES MATTERS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda concerning lease between City and former West Main Community Center. Ordered off the Agenda were the two remaining items: (a) public of proposed ordinance re hazardous materials and substances; (b) publication of proposed amendment to Sec. 6-16 adding Tax Collector to Tax Abatement Committee.

(15) HOUSE COMMITTEE MATTERS

ORDERED PUT ON THE AGENDA was the matter of renovation of second floor, alcove for refrigerator, extermination of bldg., repair holes in carpet, etc.

(16) COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON MATTERS

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

(17) LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON MATTERS

ORDERED ON AGENDA was the matter of a report.

(18) RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED ON AGENDA was one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED off the agenda were the two resolutions commending Debra Logan and Jennifer McKay for outstanding scholastic achievements.

(19) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two items: (a) CTE about workshop; and (b) letter from Governor O'Neill - both submitted by Rep. Annie M. Summerville.

ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business to come before the Steering Committee, upon Motion made, Seconded, and Approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 P.M.; everyone leaving by 9:00 p.m. after discussing committee meeting dates, etc.

JLS:HMM

JEANNE-LOIS SANTY, Chairwoman  
Steering Committee



AK

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: Co-Chairpersons Annie Summerville and John Roos

PRESIDENT SANTY: This Committee is Co-Chaired by Ann Summerville and John Roos, and John is away also on a much deserved vacation, so Ms. Summerville will give the report.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The Urban Renewal Committee met on November 15, in the Democratic Caucus Room. Present were Ann Summerville and Jim Dudley. All other members were not present: Mr. Tarzia, Mrs. Saxe, Mrs. Gershman asked to be excused. We did have representation for items 2 and 3. Before I give the report on that, we do have a brief report that will be given by Mr. Dudley on item 1.

- (1) THE MATTER OF PUBLIC TELEPHONES IN THE DOWNTOWN-URC AREA - submitted by Rep. James Dudley. Interim reports have been made, including 9/14/83.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. Just very briefly, I am pleased to announce that we can finally put this thing to rest. The last of the phones was installed...

PRESIDENT SANTY: Excuse me, please give Mr. Dudley your attention. He's been working long and hard on this Agenda item.

MR. DUDLEY: About a year and a half to be exact. While I was discouraged along the way and I took out my frustrations many times on many people, it paid off. Persistence does pay off. One thing I would like to mention as a footnote, is on speaking to the phone company in the last couple of days and finalizing the last few phones that were installed, they did bring up to me at the time that there is going to be similar problems at the Stamford Railroad station due to the construction. They are currently working on relocating some of the phones that do have to be taken out due to the construction and they hope they will lose no time period inbetween. Should there be a lapse in time to lose the phone, they assured me it would be only a day or two before they would install the rest of the phones. This concludes my report. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Dudley and thank you for your concern in this one item.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam Chairman, due to a lack of a quorum at our Urban Renewal Committee meeting, I would like to make a motion to bring items 2 and 3 out of Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Summerville, we'll act on one first. There's a motion made to take item 2 out of the Urban Renewal Committee. A motion has been made and seconded. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed? How many no votes? Mrs. Conti, Mrs. McInerney, Mrs. Maihock are no votes; all the rest unanimous.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I would like to make a motion to move for adoption, I was informed that even though on our Agenda on item 2, it really should be voted upon last, but the way we have it lasted on the Agenda is that item 2 should be the last one we vote on. Item 3 should be the first one. According to proper procedure, I would ask you, Madam Chairman, would I be in order taken up item 3 first because the numbers on the Agenda are incorrectly documented.



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Since it's on the and you've already moved it on to the Floor, Ms. Summerville, why don't we move for adoption of item #2. Go right with the Agenda.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: At our Urban Renewal Committee meeting, we had present members of the Commission, mostly all of them were there. We had five Commission members that were there, staff of the Urban Renewal and members from the developer were there, and also Douglas Theuner from St. John's Episcopal Church.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION "CONCERNING APPROVAL OF A CONTRACT FOR REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANT REUSE PARCEL #2 IN THE S.E. QUADRANT (EXT.) (Note: Parcel #1) URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT WITH ST. JOHN'S PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH -  
submitted by URC, John Condlin, Exec. Dir. letter 10/21 and 10/28/83.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: This particular item is the contract which I think all of us got a copy of. There were some minor changes in it but the contract you have before you tonight is the correct contract which the Urban Renewal has approved, and this will be the contract that we will be voting on. I move for it's adoption.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to approve for adoption the proposed resolution concerning the approval of a contract for removal of restrictive covenant reuse parcel #1 in the S.E. Quadrant Urban Renewal Project with St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church. Discussion? We're voting on #2 on the Agenda.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like to ask what is the restrictive covenant that they wish to remove?

PRESIDENT SANTY: For clarification, that parcel in case I said 2 is #1; for the record.

MRS. CONTI: What is the restrictive covenant that they wish to remove?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: If I understand the question and I understand the presentation, it was that the property was initially for institutional proposes only, and the Urban Renewal released those restrictions on the property so it could become commercial and residential property.

MR. WHITE: Thank you, Madam President. I understand that the Church in putting together this project, has taken very real care to make it as esthetic as possible. I understand that they, at least believe, that they have serious financial problems, but I really do wish the Church would leave an open space and perhaps, landscape it further because I think with all the urbanization that's taking place in Stamford, 30 or 40 years down the pike, if, in fact, this is a piece of green open space, the financial problems the Church has will look very pale, indeed. The present problems they have 30, 40 years from now look very pale, indeed, if, in fact, we have this priceless heritage of open space in the center of town capped. And, I really do believe that the restrictions ought to remain; whether they can or not, and I really do believe that this ought to remain as a piece of open space. I understand, I'm not trying to be self-righteous about (inaudible) church but this whole business of church properties and so on. The whole scheme of things in this country really disturbs me for a lot of reasons and I really wish the Church would see its way clear, and I really wish that the City would insist that this area remain open, remain green and remain for institutional purposes because we have to look down the road 30, 40, 50 years



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) from how. I know it's a temptation for any institution indulged in the philanthropic work and good work and so on, to try to look to its financial needs; to fulfill its ministry and so on, but after all, I happen to believe that priorities lie to try to keep this area as open space, and I think it should remain as an institutional parcel of land and I don't think we should approve it, frankly. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. White.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm indeed grateful to St. John's Church for coming up with that mixture of housing and commercial building in the City of Stamford. It's quite an improvement to what we have in the City of Stamford, and we could have said that we wanted all of Stamford to be green, and we wanted to leave it all vacant, but what would we have as a tax base? I'm indeed grateful that I've had the opportunity to work with this and I would like to see it become a reality because I think it would add some beauty to the City of Stamford instead of some of the ugly things that we have, and the criticism that has been made is that all we have here is office space and no place for anyone to live. This will be a place for people to live, and live in downtown Stamford, and I think that's what we need right now. I would like for this Board to approve this. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. DUDLEY: Thank you, Madam President. Just to shed a little light. I'd like to say that first of all, that part of this area which is now parking lot will become green space. It will become a park. Included in that park will be a fountain. It is currently all concrete and it is parking area. The current parking areas will be removed. All parking for this complex will be underground, and there will be retail space, green space, there will be office space and more importantly, there will be housing.

I only wish that before we started building in the 6th District throughout the town, that more corporations and so forth had more consideration and allowed for retail as well as offices as well as housing and as accommodating everything. It's a little bit of all the worlds, and I think that's what we need downtown at this point.

The other thing I would like to add, I don't know if Ms. Summerville would like to make it a matter of record or not, there are letters in support of this project, and I yield to Ms. Summerville if she would like to read those letters or make them a matter of record.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Summerville, would you like to make it a matter of record at this point?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'll yield to the next speaker, Mr. DeLuca, and in my summary, I had planned to do those things.

MR. DeLUCA: What really impresses me about this item this evening is the fact that non-taxable property will now go on the tax rolls #1. #2, it is one of the first projects in recent years that comes before our Board where someone is willing to put up affordable housing in the downtown area without requesting any tax abatements or deferrals or government subsidies of any kind which seems to be the trend. It isn't a bad trend as long as it's affordable housing, I don't mind giving



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DeLUCA: (continuing) some form of tax abatement. Here is a project with where no tax abatements or deferrals are being requested. We will have some open space and hopefully, as they say, it's going to be affordable housing; not like some of the other projects that are downtown which they claim are affordable housing provided you are making about a \$1,000 a week and you can afford an \$800 a month apartment which I don't think this project here will be. Therefore, I hope that the rest of the members of this Board will vote for this project this evening.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I know of the financial problems that St. John's Episcopal Church and many other of our other churches in this City have in maintaining old, beautiful structures. I think through the years I've been told of some lovely churches that were right in the center of Stamford that before our building bloom began, were literally leveled, and we lost what would today be beautiful structures in the middle of our very modern landscape.

I think if St. John's Episcopal Church can do this to make their financial burden lessened, and to contribute to the needy in the community and maintain their lovely church that we should look with favor upon this, and not risk 20 years from now having a building being destroyed because they just were not able to maintain it properly. I think that would be a detriment to the City. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore.

MR. BURKE: Thank you. As I understand it, the only thing we have now is a restrictive covenant saying that this must be institutional. That was the question as to what was the restrictive covenant that we want removed, and the answer was that it was limited to institutional use.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Do you want to continue and then Ms. Summerville can clarify that question, Mr. Burke?

MR. BURKE: What I'm going to say would depend an awful lot on what Ms. Summerville says.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Summerville, would you like to comment on that?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: At the present time, there is a part, a portion of this particular land, a little small portion of it that is restrictive for institutional purposes only. Not the entire project, alright? The Urban Renewal has lifted those restrictions which we receive \$200 and something thousand for. So we got money. I have a map here showing a little small portion. It's not the entire parking area; the area where the development is going to go. That is what the Urban Renewal has asked that those restrictions be taken off that one little particular section that says that that particular section should be used for institutional purposes. I don't want you to get confused and think the whole thing had restrictions on it that said for institutional purposes only; it did not.

MR. BURKE: That doesn't change what I'm going to say. Institutions, there are institutions and there are institutions; some are pretty; some are block-like, and some I wouldn't want to be caught next to. However, if, in fact, the model that is over there on the table, is what is proposed for this particular area, I think the City of Stamford could do an awful lot worst than having something like that



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BURKE: (continuing) downtown, and I would be in favor of lifting the restriction, if, in fact, it results in that type of architecture.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Burke.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President to Ms. Summerville. Ms. Summerville, do you have a traffic report on this to see what kind of an impact this would create?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I don't think that we're sophisticated enough to have a traffic report from the sophisticated Traffic Department, but we do have a letter of recommendation coming from Mr. Ford who is the Director of the Traffic Department, saying that he endorses this particular project. I have it before me and I plan to make that a part of the records. They have endorsed it and the developer and the church have worked with them to confirm and whatever the Traffic Department they must do or however it should be constructed, they have applied themselves to making sure that Mr. Ford and the Traffic Department is happy with what they have right now. I have the letter before me to make it a part of the record and I'll share it with you, Mrs. Maihock.

MRS. CONTI: I have this letter of Jim Ford's before me, and I just wonder, have they received the permit under Section 14311 of the statutes that's referred to in Mr. Ford's letter?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: No, we have not because they are waiting for the approval from this Board because they expect the Board of Representatives to be the last say so, and to make the decision. Mr. Ford has worked with them all along on the project, Mrs. Conti, but to answer your question, it has not but they have his blessings.

I would like to say that out of all the years that I have served on this Board, I have never seen anyone in this City, especially a developer and an institution of this nature, which is a church, come before us with a beautiful project like we have. I would have loved to have seen many more of these come before us to show the kind of City that we all would like to live in. I think that once you see this you will be happy, and I hope we all are still around.

I would like to make a part of the record some of the endorsements that came from other different commissions and boards. Patrick Grosso of the Planning Board, highly endorses this project. Mr. Thomas Brock Saxe of Tom Brock Corporation, which I think is the White Tower, a neighbor of this particular project, highly endorses it. Leo P. Gallagher which is the funeral home on Suburban Avenue highly endorses this particular project. George Robotti whom we all know that makes the famous ice cream downtown here, neighbor to Macy's and Sak's and has survived them all, highly endorses this. We also have the blessings of the Fire Chief, Mr. Joseph Vitti, and we have the blessings of Mr. Jim Ford and the Downtown Council, and I can go on and on and this particular project has the blessings of the two district representatives, Mr. Dudley and myself and I hope that you will consider voting in favor of it. Thank you.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? Two no votes: Mrs. Saxe and Mrs. Conti, all the rest yes. We will use our machine and proceed



URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) right to a vote. We are voting on item #2 on our Agenda under Urban Renewal Committee, page 2, for final adoption proposed resolution concerning approval of a contract for removal of restrictive covenant reuse parcel #1 in the S.E. Quadrant Urban Renewal Project with St. John's Protestant Episcopal Church. A majority vote is all that is necessary. A simple majority. Has everyone voted? The resolution has been ADOPTED 29 affirmative, 2 negative, 1 abstaining, and 3 not-voting.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION "CONCERNING APPROVAL OF URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR S.E. QUADRANT (EXT) URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT CONN., R-43, As amended - submitted by URC, John Condlin, Exec. Dir. letter 10/21 and 10/28/83.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: And, I so move, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second? Several seconds. Any discussion? No discussion, we will move right to a machine vote on the adoption of the proposed resolution concerning approval of Urban Renewal Plan for S.E. Quadrant Urban Renewal Project Conn. R-43, as amended. Has everyone voted? The resolution is ADOPTED 29 affirmative, 3 negative, 1 abstaining and 2 not-voting.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Madam President, that concludes my report.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to ask for a Suspension of the Rules to bring an item out of order.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Gershman, would you please tell us what the item is?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Yes, it's item #1 and 2 under the Coliseum Authority.

PRESIDENT SANTY: You want to bring out two items? We'll take one at a time. You are moving for Suspension of the Rules for clarification to take item 1 under the Coliseum Authority Liaison Committee, page 13. There has been a second to that. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to have to use the machine vote because we need two-thirds. If you are in favor of Suspending the Rules to consider item 1 under Coliseum Authority Committee, please vote yes. If you're opposed, vote no. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? 24 votes are necessary. The motion to Suspend the Rules has PASSED 27 affirmative, 1 negative, 2 abstaining and 5 not-voting. Please turn to page 13 of your Agenda.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE - Chairwoman Elizabeth Gershman

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ORD. 480 CONCERNING COLISEUM AUTHORITY - to extend its life by 15 years to 1998, per request from Mayor Louis A. Clapes and Finance Comm. Marra 9/19/83. Approved for publication 10/11/83 after being brought out on floor as no Committee meeting.



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: I don't have page 13 on my Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There is a possibility that someothers may not have page 13. If you don't have page 13, we have it here. Please raise your hand. Apparently, when they were sent out in the printing office, some of the last pages of the Agenda were left off. Mr. Stork needs page 13. Mr. Jachimczyk. The Pages will bring it to you. Mrs. Gershman, you can go on with your report while the Pages give out page 13.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. Item #1 is for final adoption proposed amendment to ordinance 480 concerning the Coliseum Authority to extend its life by 15 years to 1998.

The Coliseum Authority Liaison Committee met on October 26, with a quorum present consisting of David Blum, Betty Conti, Elizabeth Gershman, John Hogan, and John Zelinski. Robert DeLuca was excused. Also present were guests Randy Brion, Stamford Center for the Arts, and Commissioner Pat Marra.

The first item on the Agenda was for final approval of this amendment. This amendment really is necessary to conform with the contract which the Stamford Center for the Arts and the City, the so-called four-party contract, signed. That contract calls for the Coliseum Authority to be extended to 15 years. The Stamford Center for the Arts' building is the progress of being designed and costed out and I must say that it is an exceptionally elegant, beautiful building which is a little bit over budget; couple of million dollars, and the private sector has very graciously said that they would put forth their best efforts to met the short-fall between what has been appropriated and what the building is cost so that it can be put together all at once, and we can have a beautiful Center. They will not come back to the City for anymore money, but contingent upon that is that we fulfill our part and vote this 15 year amendment to their contract, and it gives them the security that the Coliseum Authority will continue for the life of the contract. This does not mean that we cannot at some future date, rewrite the ordinance or amend it further or keep looking at it. This is just the amendment to Section 1e, and I so move that we adopt it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's been a motion made and seconded for the final adoption proposed amendment to ordinance 480 concerning the Coliseum Authority. You all received this in the mail on September 19, for you that have it in front of you.

MR. WIDER: I'll second it just to get it on the Floor, Madam Chairman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: It's been seconded, Lathon.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. There are several things about this item that we should all think about. I question whether this is properly before us for final adoption since at the last meeting when it went to publication, there had been no vote to remove the item from Committee because the Committee had no quorum, and we would have had to have a vote to Suspend the Rules to put it to publication which we never had. I don't think the item is properly before us.

Secondly, if we go along and amend the ordinance to 15 years, we are losing every bit of control. We virtually lost all our control with that four-party contract, but if we go along for another 15 years with this, we will have absolutely no



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. CONTI: (continuing) control. Certainly, they'll send us their budgets; we can look at everything, but we have no amendment power, no control of any kind. I think actually the cart is before the horse. The four-party contract was negotiated before you had an ordinance to conform to the four-party contract that they negotiated, and I'm not about to now be railroaded into making this a 15 year ordinance. I oppose it and I hope all thinking people will do the same.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. My first question would be is this just for the life of the Authority or does this mean the people, too?

MRS. GERSHMAN: This is only the life of the Authority. The people will be reappointed; now the Authority reads, I believe, every two years. This is not for the people. This is just for the Coliseum Authority and just this one section.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Mrs. Gershman, I believe you said that it stated 15 years in the contract. Why is 15 years the magic number, so to speak? That's my first question because it does sound excessive to me, and secondly, can that time-frame be shortened? Can we shorten it?

MRS. GERSHMAN: May I answer? It's 15 years because the four-party contract which was between the City, the Stamford Center for the Arts, the Trustees and the State so stated. That's the way that the contract was drawn up, and we voted on it. We accepted that. Can it be shortened, I should think that at any point, if we can lengthen the life of the Coliseum Authority, we could also go back and shorten it. Mrs. Conti just said, "we couldn't amend the contract." I rather imagine that if a Board wanted to amend the contract, they could. But, we are right now dealing with what we have and what we have is a four-party contract that says that the Coliseum Authority will fund so much percentage each year to the Stamford Center for the Arts for 15 years. Now, if the Coliseum Authority goes out of business, we're in breach of that contract. This is almost a housecleaning thing to do to extend the Coliseum to conform with the four-party contract which I believe we voted on in July. Does that answer your question? It's a complicated issue. Thank you.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Signore. Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mrs. Signore asked my question and it was answered. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Thank you, Madam President. If I'm correct, the people we're talking about, will they stay in place as Mr. Wider was inquiring about? The people would only be one person who I think would be the Commissioner of Finance if I'm correct. The Advisory Panel is just that; an advisory panel. I would like to know through you, Madam President from Mrs. Gershman, what was the breakdown of her Committee's vote on this? I don't recall her giving one.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I'm sorry. Our Committee voted 4 yes and 2 were absent, Mrs. Conti and Mr. DeLuca. Mrs. Conti had left when the vote was taken.



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. LIVINGSTON: Personally, I think that this should be held so that it could be looked at a little bit closer. To tie ourselves down to 15 years and I'm not sure the way this Coliseum Authority is set-up, we only have an Advisory Panel; we have an Authority that consists of just one particular person. I feel dissatisfied with the entire thing.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Livingston.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, when the contract was drawn, it was a document that was negotiated and executed by the executive branch of government; not the legislative. The latter had jurisdiction in this instance to either approve it or reject it, but not amend it. All parties to the partnership between private, non-profit and municipal entities here involved, have agreed by their signatures to be bound by its terms. Many of those terms and conditions are directly contingent upon the Board's approval of the proposed amendment to Ordinance 480S, but the remaining portions will survive notwithstanding. I'm reading from a letter which was directed to Mrs. Maihock, dated November 16, today, in response to her question whether or not the Board could amend the ordinance and require biennial review of the entire operating and capital expenses of the Authority? And, in the letter, Mr. Fraser has indicated that there is far more monitoring and public disclosure mechanisms within the contract than what there are in a biennial review.

1. Release expenditure and accounting for public monies must be in accordance with the Charter and Code of Ordinances.
2. Each year, the Stamford Center for the Arts must submit a requisition to the Commissioner of Finance for operating funds estimated to be available from the Authority in the next succeeding fiscal year.
3. As the Center's operating instrumentally, SCA must provide to the City, Commissioner of Finance, a detailed certified financial statement covering assets, liabilities, receipts and expenditures not later than 90 days following the close of SCA's fiscal year. The above annual financial statement is expressly decreed to be a public document which shall be available for public inspection.
4. Additionally, SCA is required in the contract to file a quarterly itemization of all financial data with the Commissioner of Finance. In sum, not only will the Board of Representatives have immediate access to all these financial records on a quarterly basis, but any member of the general public will as well.

I would accordingly suggest that any proposed amendments to the contract seeking biennial review would be a less effective redundancy than those safeguard referred and already in place. It's obvious that this Board should act. It needn't, but it should act since the 17th Board is the Board that is thoroughly familiar with the project. For the 18th Board to consider anything, would be to retrace and lose ground that has already been gained. The City has put and promised to put significant amount of money into the project. The State has promised to put significant amount of money into the project, and I feel that the answers which were addressed by Mr. Fraser have satisfied my quams about the contract and about the ordinance, and, certainly, I would go forward with it at this point.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. Mrs. Gershman, do you have anything further to add? You had your hand up before.

MRS. GERSHMAN: I don't really think so. I would just like to urge this Board who has acted on the ordinance and the contract, I think it behooves them now to act upon this amendment instead of putting it off to another Board. Thank you.



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Are there still further speakers?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. May I ask Mrs. Gershman, could it be possible for us to amend the 15 years to 1 year?

MRS. GERSHMAN: I imagine anything is possible, but I don't think that its going.... the 15 years in the contract cannot be amended; that stands, and so, we could do the ordinance year by year but it's not going to change the amount of money that the Coliseum Authority gives to the Stamford Center for the Arts. This is simply to assure them that the Coliseum Authority will remain in existence. After all, this is tax rebated money from the State. It's not money that we are having a direct appropriation from our tax dollars from the City.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. SAXE: Excuse me, I don't believe she answered my question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Well maybe she doesn't have the answer, Mrs. Saxe. I think she answered it to the best of her knowledge and we all received the letters.

MRS. SAXE: I would like to move that we reduce this to a 1-year proposition.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you put that in the form of a motion to amend the contract; hange it from 15 years to 1 year? Would you phrase that, Mrs. Saxe, in your motion?

MRS. SAXE: Yes, Madam President, I would like very much to move to amend the contract to be for 1 year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Saxe has made a motion to amend the proposed amendment to change it from 15 years to 1 year. Correct, Mrs. Saxe?

MRS. SAXE: That is correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a second to that motion? Mrs. Conti has seconded it. We are now discussing the amendment to the amendment.

MR. DeLUCA: I would recommend voting against this amendment. It just doesn't make sense. We approve a contract for 15 years. We set up an Advisory Panel who recommends that we extend our ordinance to read 15 years. We have all sorts of controls that we need to monitor and control the expenditures. This 17th Board is the one that initiated the ordinance; we know what's behind it. We know what's ahead for us, and to reduce this here to one year just doesn't make sense at all. I urge that this amendment is rejected and we go back to the original request and vote for the 15 year extension.

PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now speaking to the amendment to reduce the term of the contract from 15 to 1 year. I'm sorry, Mrs. Guroian, did you want to speak on the amendment?

MRS. GUROIAN: I hear constant reference to the fact that even if we reduce the term from 15 years to 1 year, we will have remaining control. I would like you to explain to me, what control there remains to the Board?



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Gershman, can you answer that?

MRS. GERSHMAN: If I thoroughly understand the question, I believe Mrs. McInerney answered that in Mr. Fraser's letter, and to recap it, we have access to the Stamford Center for the Arts books. They give us an audit two months after the close of their fiscal year. I would like to say we are not amending the contract so we are amending the length of the ordinance. Mrs. McInerney, perhaps you could go over those because I don't have that letter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: One moment. Mr. Franchina, you raised your hand. Could you clarify the question Mrs. Guroian has raised? No. You just wanted to speak.

MRS. GUROIAN: I want to make it clear that I understood what Mrs. McInerney said that access to reports does not equate itself to control if I understand the English language. I would like to know, besides what the amendment is proposing, the change in years; what control remains to us?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Perhaps, I cannot answer that question. We do not have control over a private entity's budget which is the Stamford Center for the Arts. We do have control over the Coliseum Authority budget where they grant an appropriation by contract to the Stamford Center for the Arts, and we certainly have control by looking at their records to be sure that they have employed good accounting procedures and that they have kept proper records.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman. Are you finished, Mrs. Guroian?

MRS. GUROIAN: No, because I am thoroughly confused. If it is in fact, an enterprise that gets subsidies from the City, then of course, their budget is going to be given to us. Does that mean we can change their budget in any way?

MRS. GERSHMAN: It does not get money directly from the City.

MRS. GUROIAN: Then we have no control over them whatsoever, that's what you're telling me.

PRESIDENT SANTY: No cross dialogue here. Mrs. Guroian, are you finished with your questioning?

MRS. MAIHOCK: I can understand Mrs. Guroian's concern because this was precisely what I was concerned about. I've been very reluctant for the Board of Representatives to lose judicial review over the Coliseum Authority. In this very lengthy discussion with the Corporation Counsel, he pointed out to me that there were safeguards as enumerated by Mrs. McInerney. However, we will have a succession of Commissioners of Finance and although there will be opportunities for the public and the representatives to inspect the record, public opinion will be the final judge if it should continue, and I think that this is probably the only thing we can really rely on.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Maihock.

MR. FRANCHINA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. The question is on Mrs. Saxe's motion to reduce the term of the contract from 15 years to 1 year. That is what you're voting on now.



COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: (continuing) The change of 15 years to 1 year. Has everyone voted? We're voting on Mrs. Saxe's amendment. The motion has FAILED 4 affirmative, 30 negative, 1 abstaining.

Mrs. Gershman, we now have your motion on the Floor and I have only one speaker. Mrs. Guroian, did you want to speak to the main motion?

MRS. GUROIAN: My question was answered. As far as I'm concerned, we are giving up every vested, even vestige of control we have. We can read the documents in the public library without even being on the Board of Representatives, and as far as I'm concerned, it's a lost cause. And as far as the budget appropriations are concerned, they're tied up in contractual obligations; 90% has to be paid by us. We approved the contract. So, if we want to go whole-hog and give them carte blanche for 15 years, so be it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Guroian. Any other speakers on the main motion? We'll proceed right to a machine vote on the final adoption, proposed amendment to ordinance 480 concerning the Coliseum Authority. Has everyone voted? You can change it, Gerry. Change it yourself. The motion PASSED 27 affirmative, 6 negative, 1 abstaining and 1 not-voting.

Mrs. Gershman, did you want to move for Suspension of the Rules to consider #2 on your Agenda?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Yes, I would like to so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made to Suspend the Rules to consider #2 on the Coliseum Authority Liaison Committee. Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. All in favor of Suspending the Rules, please say aye. Opposed? Suspend the Rules. Now you can bring your Agenda item out on the Floor.

- (2) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF COLISEUM AUTHORITY BUDGET FOR F/Y 1983-1984  
per telephone request 9/19/83 from Comm. Marra. Held in Committee 10/11/83  
for complete breakdown, itemized detail of budget.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Approval of the Coliseum Authority budget which passed our Committee 3 yes, 1 abstention and 2 absent, Mrs. Conti and Mr. DeLuca. This was passed contingent to being approved by the Coliseum Authority on November 7th. Subsequently, this Body approved the budget 7 yes, 1 no, and I so move that we approve this budget which the Coliseum Authority has adopted. I believe you have been given the budget.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, we all have that budget. There's a second to the motion. Any discussion: No discussion, we will move right to a machine vote on the approval of the Coliseum Authority budget for 1983-84. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 26 affirmative, 5 negative, and 4 not-voting.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: That completes your report?

MRS. GERSHMAN: Yes, it does.



PRESIDENT SANTY: We are now going to turn back to page 2 on our Agenda.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - Chairman Donald Donahue

MR. DONAHUE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The Planning and Zoning Committee of the Board of Representatives met this evening, November 16. Mr. White, Mr. Stork, Mr. Jachimczyk, Ms. Rinaldi, Mr. Donahue, and Mrs. Guroian in attendance.

- (1) PETITION TO ACCEPT ELM COURT AS A CITY-ACCEPTED STREET - Letter 9/7/83 from Norman Liu, City Engineer. Elm Court - extending easterly from Elm St. approx. 302 ft. to a dead end) Held in Committee 10/11/83. (No-petition for-road-acceptance-form-received)

MR. DONAHUE: Please note in here that no petition for road acceptance form received. This is part of a State project and as such, we do not need a petition. It's very similar to the case of the case of the Courtland Avenue bridge acceptance and the adjacent roadways. The street has been accepted and by a vote of 4 in favor and 1 opposed, I move that we accept Elm Court as city-accepted street.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Did your Committee vote, Mr. Donahue? Did I miss the vote?

MR. DONAHUE: 4 in favor, 1 opposed.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to accept Elm Court as a city-accepted street. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. Has everyone voted? We are voting on item 1 under Planning and Zoning, the petition to accept Elm Court as city-accepted street. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 29 affirmative, 1 negative, 0 abstaining and 5 not-voting.

- (2) ACCEPTANCE OF LeROY PLACE AS A CITY STREET - submitted by Rep. Donald Donahue 8/24/83. Pursuant to Chapter 64. Held in Committee 9/14 and 10/11/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: This involves some very complicated easements, Madam President They have not completed their work on this item so the Committee is holding this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item 2 will be held and probably referred to the 18th Board, Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: Yes, it will.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING AUCTION SALE OF PROPERTY ON HALLOWEEN BLVD. Planning Board approved, per Mayor Clapes' letter 9/6/83. Located on east side of Halloween Blvd. Price not less than \$27,000. Approved for publication 10/11/83.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE: The Planning and Zoning Committee had some mixed emotions on this sale, but we held a public hearing on November 9, in this room, and no area residents attended that public hearing. The area has been known for its participation in former public hearings and the Committee rather than vote against this, or rather than vote for it at this point, would like to have the opportunity or for the next Board to have the opportunity to gain more information about this parcel from area residents, and therefore, we are recommending that this be held.

PRESIDENT SANTY: #3 is being held.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (4) REFERRAL FROM ZONING BOARD ON APPL. #83-022 - Atty. Wm. Ivler on Friday, October 3, 1983, presented 78 pages of petitions to the Zoning Board of Stamford propertyowners; Zoning Board presented same with their documents to this Board Friday, October 7, 1983. Board met 10/11, making 11/16 the second meeting after Zoning Board submittal, which is this Board's time-frame for action.

MR. DONAHUE: Item #4 is a referral from the Zoning Board on application #83-022 which affects the R-MF and new RH zoning classification. The Planning and Zoning Committee held a public hearing and meeting on November 9, and a second meeting this evening.

A number of years ago, this Board approved an application of the Zoning Board to decrease the height and density possible in the R-MF zone. We were impressed by the concerns of residents of the South End, West Side, and other areas who feared the impact of high-rise development on stable, residential areas; areas which they want to spare and areas which they want to survive. The concept is to encourage housing development in such a way that density steps downward from the center of town where it is more desirable; close to mass transit, jobs, city services, etc., and as such, it would step down toward the surrounding collar area and we approach the City's traditional single-family neighborhoods.

The proposed regulations address both the quality of life in areas zoned R-MF as well as the number of dwelling units allowed per acre. Provisions have been made within the regulations for decreased density per acre while guaranteeing increased open space and approving the quality of life as such.

The amending of the R-MF regulations and the creation of a new RH classification is a step towards the completion of comprehensive rezoning. The RH classification is not in place on the zoning map at this time, however, any property owner may apply to have any area designated as RH.

Of all the questions raised about the propriety of these changes, the most significant was the issue of the Planning Board's recommendation to deny the original application. Since this occurred, the Zoning Board has modified in a substantial way, it's original regulations. As a result of the Planning Board's letter, and from input of the original public hearing, groups that once disagreed with the proposal appeared before the Planning and Zoning Committee and felt their concerns were address and now support the modified proposal. With that, I move that the application #83-022 by the Zoning Board is modified regarding amendments to the R-MF residential district and the creation of the RH residential district be approved.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded.

MR. DONAHUE: That comes to you with a recommendation of 5 in favor and 1 opposed, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: 5 in favor and 1 opposed. Mr. Donahue, would you explain that vote again; what we are voting for so they understand exactly, exactly what we're voting on.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. DONAHUE: The motion is made in a positive sense to approve the application of the Zoning Board. Voting yes will agree with the Zoning Board's recommendation. Voting no will vote to, ineffect, overturn that application.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Right, and you received...were there petitions from people, Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: There was a petition approved, Madam President. I'm glad you reminded me. The petition had over 560 signatures. The Planning and Zoning Committee has looked at that, and there are some questions concerning the validity of that petition, and those questions will have to be answered if this should ever go to a court of law. As some of you may recall when the ML-MG referral came before this Board. It was decided after a lot of research, that there were not a sufficient number of signatures, valid signatures on that petition. The same may be the case here. The thing that we have to remember is that the Board does not have sufficient staff to do a step by step analysis of each signature on the petition. Just to remind you again, that in order for a signature to be valid on a petition of this type, all property owners of each property listed, must sign the petition. There is cause to believe that that is not the case. Again, this would have to be solved or decided at a latter time should this ever go to a court of law.

PRESIDENT SANTY: For everyone's clarification before we go into the speakers, a yes vote would be in favor of the Zoning Board's approval and the Planning and Zoning Committee of this Board. A no vote, you would be going with the petitioners who appeal to this Board through the Planning and Zoning Committee. We will go one with the first speaker.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I have a copy of the plan in front of me so I'm well aware of it. I've talked with a lot of those people who signed the petition and they are business and citizens. I also represent the South End which they talk more about, and I'm speaking for the people. On August 18, we had a meeting and the Zoning Board had a hearing at Stillmeadow School, and there was a number of South End residents there. We had Mr. Noah Dorius at our meeting to discuss this item. The people from the South End are against it and as I represent them, I am more against it because it affects me directly because I have worked to try to bring the South End around, and now I find myself living in a non-conforming zone if this is passed. So, I am asking that it be defeated and turned back to the Zoning Board for further study because we really stopped the development of housing anymore but for the big property owners in this City. And, I think this is unfair to the people who have put their life savings into these small properties. I'm asking this Board to defeat it and send it back to the Zoning Board. Thank you so much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine, Mr. Wider. You're asking people to vote no? To overturn the Zoning Board's approval?

MR. WIDER: Yes, maam, so that they may correct their mistake. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Mr. Wider answered my questions. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. JACHIMCZYK: Thank you, Madam President. I agree with what Mr. Wider said. I think that we should send this back to the Zoning Board. We should vote no on this matter. I think that a lot of us will agree there are some very good proposals in this new zoning regulation, however, there are still some problems particularly, as relates to the small landowners, and as we discussed in our caucus, that there are certain problems with the zoning. Somebody mentioned even though this regulation has some good ideas, let's approve it now and then you can take care of your certain problem later. I think that that's the wrong approach. I think that we have to send this back to the Zoning Board and let them take care of the small problems, in particular, those that relate to the smaller homeowners who have less than that 50 foot frontage. I think to approve this resolution, we would be doing a great disservice to the small homeowner in this town because they, then, would have to go to the Zoning Board and get certain variances and have to spend the money which would be an undue burden and an unnecessary burden on them.

Furthermore, I think that this zoning regulation does not take into account, the need for more housing in Stamford, and I think that on that basis, we also need to send this back to the Zoning Board so that they will do further work on this and try and provide for both "neighborhood preservation" and more housing for the people. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.

MRS. GUROIAN: I fail to see how a change in zoning regulations makes a piece of property non-conforming. I thought that only happens in the case of zoning changes. However, that may be the case because I admit, I don't know everything about zoning, but this is a new one for me.

Insofar as the South End is concerned, I had thought that this particular application would be of tremendous benefit to the South End. Especially, since, if, in fact, parts of the South End were to be rezoned multi-family, it would control the growth, the density of that construction which would take place. If, in fact, without this zoning regulation, that construction takes place under present zoning laws, that construction will be of maximum density as compared to what is being proposed now. So that I would think that the South End people should better have been represented if the representatives in that area explained more fully the impact that these zoning regulations would have.

As far as these zoning regulations are concerned, my 7th District is not directly involved because we do not have any R-MF in the 7th District. However, contingent to the 7th District is Glenbrook Road. If, infact, Glenbrook Road got developed under present zoning R-MF regulations, it would look double the mess it looks right now. I would welcome any effort made by the Zoning Board to change regulations in order to see that that growth would be somewhat limited because it has an impact upon my area. Especially affected would be the pockets in the West Side. The Wide Side in particular under present R-MF zoning regulations would be hard hit if they would develop as such, and these zoning regulations would give them some recourse.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GUROIAN: (continuing) This change in zoning regulations does not stop R-MF development because it allows the development on those parcels that are one acre and more, and why one acre. Even under present zoning, a small piece of land cannot be developed under R-MF because even if it met part of the requirements, other open space requirements and such; side yard requirements, front yard requirements and such, would make it impossible to build on that small parcel of land.

Insofar as I heard somebody make an argument about I have 49 feet and I will need 50 feet, one foot, if you meet every requirement and all you need is one foot, it has never been an obstacle to go before the ZBA and get a land use variance for that one foot as long as you meet every other requirement. But, if you go in for six different variances, of course, you're not going to get it. You're not going to get it under this; you're not going to get it under the present zoning regulations. It seems to me a lot of red herrings have been thrown out to the public. Some by people who know differently and are still throwing red herrings out for whatever reasons, I don't know, and some by people who really misunderstand the changes in the zoning regulations. If, in effect, we deny this application, it will set back comprehensive rezoning any number of months until this is the first step that has to be taken because all the rest of the development, all the rest of the changes, all the rest of the rezoning depend on this first step being taken.

I hear all kinds of remarks being made as to this thing should have been settled months, years ago and yet, some of you seemed willing to postpone it even further. To what end? To allow the continuation of unbridle growth in Stamford? I really don't think the majority of us are in a position to say that unbridle growth can be sustained for any length of time in the City of Stamford. I really think that for the best good, especially the South End, and especially the West Side, this approval should be made by this Board. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Guroian.

MR. PERILLO: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? We're going to move the question. Before we move the question, Mr. Donahue, I want you to state the motion again so that everyone understands what we're voting on and what a no vote will mean and what a yes vote will mean. 21 votes are necessary either way.

MR. DONAHUE: I move that application 83-022 by the Zoning Board is modified regarding amendments to the R-MF residential district and a creation of the RH residential district be approved. This is the form we've been using for four years. An affirmative vote, you are voting to allow the Zoning Board decision to stand. A negative vote, a no vote, you will be agreeing with the petitioners. I would add also that 21 votes will be necessary to approve the Zoning Board application. 21 votes would be necessary to overturn the Zoning Board application. If we fail to get 21 votes either way, this Board will have taken no action and the Zoning Board decision will stand.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Does everyone understand that? Does everyone understand their vote now? We'll proceed right to a machine vote. Has everyone voted? Take your time.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion has LOST 15 affirmative, 17 negative, 1 abstaining, and 2 not-voting. The motion has LOST. That means the decision of the Zoning Board stands. We actually took no action. We took no action. There was no action taken by this Board, Mrs. Guroian. Please raise your hand. There was no action taken by this Board by a vote of 15 affirmative, 17 negative, 1 abstaining, and 2 not-voting.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: What about #5 on your Agenda, Mr. Donahue?

MR. DONAHUE: I turned the page. I'm very sorry.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A STREET LINE FOR A PORTION OF GREENWICH AVENUE AND ABANDONING A PORTION OF THE ROAD BED FORMERLY KNOWN AS STILLWATER AVENUE LOCATED APPROX. 107 FEET SOUTHERLY FROM THE INTERSECTION OF WEST MAIN STREET AND GREENWICH AVENUE - to be annexed to abutting property owner, New Neighborhoods, Inc., for development of housing - submitted by Mayor Louis A. Clapes, letters 10/14/83 and 10/24/83.

MR. DONAHUE: This is really a matter of some housekeeping, Madam President. A number of months ago, we were asked to approve a resolution abandoning a portion of Stillwater Road, and turning over City owned property to New Neighborhoods for the construction of some thirty five townhouses. When they originally came down here with this, this resolution should have been part of that package. The approval of this tonight will allow them to proceed and to begin construction of those townhouses so I move by a vote of 6 in favor and none opposed that this Board adopt this resolution.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of the proposed resolution establishing a street line for a portion of Greenwich Avenue and abandoning a portion of the road bed formerly known as Stillwater Avenue located approximately 107 feet southerly from the intersection of West Main Street and Greenwich Avenue. Please use your machine. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 30 affirmative, 1 negative, 2 abstaining and 2 not-voting.

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

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue.

MR. STORK: Thank you, Madam President. I have personally thanked Mr. Donahue, but I'd like to do it publicly. For the last two terms on this Board, I've been proud to serve as his Vice-Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee, and I must say that each month was new learning process; what a terrific education this has been on Planning and Zoning, and I want to thank Mr. Donahue for his fine leadership.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. Thank you, Mr. Stork, and I, too, echo the sentiments.

MR. DONAHUE: The credit belongs to the Committee members, really, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Donahue. Mrs. Guroian, don't spoil it.



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GUROIAN: It's not necessarily true that it belongs to the Committee members. I think it belongs, by rights, to the Chairman of the Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: More laurels for you, Mr. Donahue.

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

MRS. HAWE: The Fiscal Committee met on Thursday, November 10. Present were Committee members Jerry Rybnick, Barbara McInerney, Sandra Goldstein, Betty Conti, Jerry Livingston, Co-Chairperson John Hogan and myself.

I would like to place the following items on the Consent Agenda. Item #1.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #1 is off.

MRS. HAWE: Item #5.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #5 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #6.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #6 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #7.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #7 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #10.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #10 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #11.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #11 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #13.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #13 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #14.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #14 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #15.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #15 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #16.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #16 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #17.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #17 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWE: Item #21.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #21 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #23.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #23 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #24.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #24 is on Consent.

MRS. HAWES: Item #24.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #26 is on Consent.

MR. PERILLO: Item #26 is off.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #26 off. Is that all, Mrs. Hawes, on Consent?

MRS. HAWES: That's all.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item #17 is also off per request of Mrs. Maihock. 17 is off.

MR. GAIPA: I'm sorry, 24, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Item 24 is off. Please try, even if you have to stand up and yell and scream at the time we mention it. Item #24 is off Consent.

- (1) \$100,000.00 - TRAFFIC AND PARKING DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - TO ADD A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #281.692 REVENUE CONTROL SYSTEM - BELL STREET GARAGE - to be financed by bonds, per Mayor Clapes' request 9/26/83; advisory opinion from Planning Board 10/5/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Transportation Committee.

MRS. HAWES: This is to replace the revenue control system at the Bell Street Garage. The original system is the one that originally put in when the garage was built. The company that installed it is no longer in business. This system that's in there now is virtually unrepairable, and it's at a point where it has just about broken down. Fiscal voted 6 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Seconded. Transportation Committee. (end of tape)

PRESIDENT SANTY: \$100,000.00 Traffic and Parking Department amendment to Capital Projects budget to add a project to be known as 281.692 revenue control system, Bell Street garage. I would remind the members in the caucus rooms, to please come out and vote on this item. Has everyone voted? We're voting on approval of item 1 under Fiscal, \$100,000.00 Bell Street revenue control system, Bell Street garage. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED 29 affirmative, 0 negative, 1 abstaining and 5 not-voting.

I'd like to remind the members that it is now twenty of eleven. We have a lengthy Fiscal Agenda. We need two-thirds on most of this Agenda which is 24 votes. Please try to stay in your seats and vote on all these items.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (2) \$ 9,765.00 - LAW DEPARTMENT - Pursuant to Ord. 510, TRANSFER from  
(Transfer) Code 230.1110 SALARIES to Code 230.2650 New Equipment  
(Ord. 510) (new copier) per request of Corp. Counsel Fraser 9/29/83.  
Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Education, Welfare and Government Committee.

MRS. HAWE: This item as well as six (6) other items on the Agenda, is not properly before this Board. The only inter-departmental transfers we deal with are those related to Ordinance 510S. Ordinance 510S states that and I quote, "Requests to utilize existing salary funds, or any transfer requests to achieve increases, whether for the purpose of increasing salary, compensation or any benefits, through re-classification, re-allocation, promotion, job transfer, or any other reason, shall first be approved by the Board of Representatives, except when such changes are effected through a labor contract."

This item #2 is a transfer from a salary account into a new equipment account to buy a new copier. The Committee unanimously concurs with me that this and the other six like items that are listed on our Agenda, do not belong on our Agenda. So, we are not dealing with item #2.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, the only objection I have here is that the Steering Committee met and I brought this to their attention, and the Steering Committee voted to put these items on the Agenda, and it's at the Steering Committee's discretion that this Agenda is set, and I don't think the Committee has a right to remove these from the Agenda." We have to take some type of action since it is on the Agenda. Mr. Boccuzzi, would you like to comment on that? This is the reasoning why it was put on at Steering.

MR. BOCCUZZI: The only reason why I asked to have it put on Steering, especially, this particular one we start with. At budget time, we gave the Law Department X amount of dollars for new personnel that we felt that Department needed at the request of the Law Department. At budget time, we gave this money in the salary account to the Law Department for a specific reason. One, which was to hire lawyers and secretaries to perform the duties of the City of Stamford because the Law Department could not handle them. We wanted to cut down the outside attorney fees. We wanted to get the work done, the back log in the Law Department.

If, indeed, this \$9,765.00 transfer from the salary account means that we're not going to get a lawyer or a secretary, I object to it. I think that's the reason why I really wanted to know where this money was coming from. Are we still going to get the personnel that we wanted when we voted at budget time? It was my impression from the presentation, that those slots would be filled by this time.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, do you want to comment on that?

MRS. HAWE: I think Mr. Boccuzzi has a legitimate question, and I will attempt to answer it because I did get a letter from Ben Fraser concerning this thing about the new attorneys. The point that I'm making is that even though he has a legitimate question, this item is not something that this Board should deal with, and the Committee has voted that...doesn't matter if we turn it down or what because it's not legitimately before us, we don't believe. His question is legitimate, however, but that doesn't mean you should put this item on the Agenda.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) Let me answer Mr. Boccuzzi. We received a letter from Ben Fraser November 15, and if I might just quote, he addresses this question about the lawyers that he has not been able to hire, and this is from his letter. "As you know, our professional services account was slashed rather dramatically largely on the assumption that the three new lawyer positions would be timely filled and correspondingly reduce the customary dollar-drain resulting from the ever increasing tab for outside lawyers. In point of act, it being the single, most disappointing aspect of my otherwise tremendously satisfying term of service. The filling of the lawyer positions has been frustratingly stalled by one thing after another, including challenges to the creation of the position by the new Lawyer Union, Public Works failure to schedule renovation work necessary to create the space and facilities to accommodate the people, etc.," and he goes on saying that he believes it's a priority now and he will work with his successor to see that qualified people are hired. That's obviously why they have money left in the salary account because there was money in there for these new lawyers, and for one reason or another, they haven't been able to hire them yet.

MR. DeLUCA: Yes, I have to agree with Rep. Boccuzzi on this. When I look at something like this here, it becomes a farce because at budget time, Ben Fraser appeared before the Fiscal Committee. before the Board of Finance, stating of the urgency to hire people to increase his staff. So, we go along with his request because of the urgency. We give him the money hoping that he's going to have these people on board by July 1, but unfortunately, the Law Department, as we noticed also in the Police Department, the Fire Department, we give them the funds because they say they are under-staffed, and all we end up with is surpluses coming back later on for transfers from the salary account to buy equipment or to pay a gasoline allowance, etc.

Hopefully, I plan to submit to the 18th Board in due time, a request to amend Ordinance 510 whereby, any funds in the salary accounts can only be used for salaries, and not to be transferred on a slip-shod basis for equipment, and hopefully, the 18th Board will go along with that recommendation to stop this loop-hole in the farce that is being created by various departments.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca. I would further state and the Chair will rule that I have to agree with Mrs. Hawe. Under Ordinance 510, it specifically states for wage increases and fringe benefits or any other form of compensation for any municipal employees, but we did not, and as I said, Mr. DeLuca, it's good to amend this because we did not when we approved this ordinance, add anything else other than the wage compensation. So, Mrs. Hawe is right. I think it was good to have it on the Agenda because it will be part of the Minutes and it will be part of the permanent record that we are distressed, or some members are distressed as how they transfer funds out of certain accounts, and I think this has to be brought up. But, I think at this time, Mrs. Hawe, I would just go along with that, that we do not have the right, it's not properly before us, but we will discuss each item because if someone wants to comment that it is on the Agenda. Does my Parliamentarian have any argument with that decision at all? Mr. Hogan, do you agree with the Chair?

MR. HOGAN: I agree with the Chair, and just to say a few words in my capacity as Co-Chairman of Fiscal, I agree Rep. Boccuzzi and Rep. DeLuca. I think that the ordinance as drawn, that the spirit of the ordinance and the Steering Committee putting it on the Agenda was to find out what loop-holes there were in this, and



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: (continuing) we've come up with it. We've got letters from Mr. Fraser, etc., and discussion here tonight, and I think that Mr. DeLuca has hit the nail on the head when he says the way to remedy this is now to tighten up on 510S. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

(3) \$ 5,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Pursuant to Ord. 510 TRANSFER  
(Transfer)

(Ord. 510) From: Code 343.1201 overtime \$5,000.00  
Bureau of Sanitation

To: Code 330.1201 overtime \$5,000.00  
Bureau of Engineering

-0-

Per DPW Comm. Spaulding's request 9/28/83.  
Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Public Works Committee.

MRS. HAWE: Item #3 is in the category as item #2, and the Committee unanimously concurs that it's not something that we deal with.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there any discussion on item #3? Continue, no action on item #3.

(4) \$ 14,661.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Pursuant to Ord. 510 TRANSFER  
(Transfer)

(Ord. 510) From: Code 114.1110 salaries \$ 8,743.00  
Code 114.1130 part-time salaries 5,918.00  
\$14,661.00

To: Code 114.1135 Permanent part-time salaries \$12,158.00  
Code 114.1140 seasonal 2,503.00  
\$14,661.00

Per COA Chairman Harry Selin 8/11/83.  
Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Education, Welfare and Government Committee.

MRS. HAWE: Item #4 is the same.

- (5) \$ 1,350.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Code 114.4201 PROGRAM SERVICES -  
"Additional appropriation" to put into departmental budget  
\$1,350 received and deposited to General Fund, a gift  
from Stamford Exchange Club, Saks Fifth Avenue, and  
Courtland Gardens Retirement Residence, per Mayor's  
request 10/17/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (6) \$ 1,150.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - Code 114.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT -  
"Additional appropriation" to put into departmental budget, gift of \$1,150.00 received from Saks Fifth Avenue and Courtland Gardens Retirement Residence, and deposited to General Fund; per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (7) \$ 25.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 571.4292 SHAPE HEALTH FAIR -  
"Additional appropriation" to put into departmental budget, \$25.00 received as a donation and deposited to the General Fund; for the Annual Health Fair; per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (8) \$ 2,162.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 562. MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES -  
Additional appropriation to be reimbursed by a State Grant, per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Health and Protection Committee.

MRS. HAWES: This is a grant from the State Department of Mental Health. We have this grant at the present time, and this is a renewal of the grant. This money will be used to provide services to mentally ill patients discharged from Fairfield Hills. Beds in institutions for the mentally ill have been reduced from 8,000 to 3,000 in recent years. This money is used to train our nursing services to serve these people who are in the Community and to go into their homes and serve them. Fiscal voted 5 in favor and 1 opposed and I so move.

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

MRS. GERSHMAN: I would like to speak to this motion. Through this grant, people who, perhaps, might be confined to a hospital are allowed to come out into a better environment for them, and they are allowed to return to their own home, and still be served as necessary. I think that it is a very important function of the Health Department to continue this service. It has been proven that it helps people get well quicker if they can stay in their own surroundings.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman. I neglected the Secondary Committee, Mr. Wiederlight, Health and Protection Committee on #8.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: I move that the Secondary Committee report be waived.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion to waive the Secondary Committee report. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed. Secondary Committee report is waived. Any other speaker? No other speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote on \$2,162.00 Health Department code 562. Mental Health Services. We need 24 votes on all these items. Has everyone voted? We're voting on item #8 under Fiscal. The motion PASSED 29 affirmative, 2 negative, 1 abstaining and 3 not-voting.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (9) \$ 384.00 - STAMFORD YOUTH PLANNING & COORDINATING AGENCY (SYPCA) -  
(Transfer) Resubmission of item defeated by Board of Representatives.  
(Ord. 510) TRANSFER \$384.00 from Code 792.1330 MEDICAL AND LIFE to  
Code 792.1110 SALARIES to 'Bring salaries of SYPCA  
Director and Secretary in line with those covered by MEA  
contract". Mayor's letter 9/22/83. Board of Finance  
approved 6/23/83, and 10/26/83. Pursuant to Ord. 510.

MRS. HAWE: This is pertinent to Ordinance 510S. This is the resubmission of an item. It involves the transfer of \$384.00 from the medical and life line inter-salaries to bring the salaries of the director and the secretary of SYPCA in line with those positions as covered by the MEA contract. In this case, Ordinance 510S does apply. \$384.00 will pay their increase for the last fiscal year. An affirmative vote on this will authorize an increase in their salaries per Ordinance 510S. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, 2 opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Second to that motion approving \$384.00 transfer and this pertain to Ordinance 510 to increase the salaries of the SYPCA director and secretary.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I would like the Board members to know that we are talking about two people who have been on the job two months and one month, respectively, at the time this increase was requested. After two months and one month on the job, respectively, we're giving these two individuals a 16.6% increase. These are not union members. We have no legal obligation to pay this kind of an increase to people who are on the job such a short time. If we do this, that will be an automatic increase in next year's budget because this is being done by transfer and I think this is the type of thing that we were trying to avoid by amending 510S, and I would urge a no vote. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Conti.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Throught you to Madam Chairman Marie Hawe, if I recall correctly, we have defeated this because of some questions. I would like to hear the answers to the questions on the old item that was on the Agenda which was defeated before. I'd like to hear those answers, and also I would like to echo what Mrs. Conti has said. I agree with what Mrs. Conti has said as far as the time period in which these positions have been filled. Is that correct?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, she's correct. I think it was defeated because people probably agreed with Mrs. Conti. What were the questions?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: The question was, at the time when the item came before us, I don't think the director was there. There was some discussion if I recall correctly if the person was in place.

MRS. HAWE: I think at that time she had been working but she was probationary or something and was taking the test, and subsequently, took the test and passed it, and now Ms. O'Neill is permanently in the position. I don't know whether that was why it was defeated or not. I think that what it comes down to is the question of, do you feel this is an out-of-line increase or do you agree with the principle of paying these people in line with what the MEA people get?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: Madam Chairman, my question through you to Fiscal Chairman, what was their entry salary? What were they supposed to be employed at?

MRS. HAWE: What the director is making at the present time is \$18,716. This would raise here salary to \$21,830 and the secretary is now making \$11,900, and with the increase would make \$13,972.

MR. WIDER: What I mean is was that what they were suppose to be coming in at? All the employees come in under a classification. What I'm concerned with is did they bring them in under a lesser classification than they were supposed to be brought in under and this is make up money that they are entitled to?

MRS. HAWE: No, these are grant employees, Mr. Wider. They're employed by the SYPCA grant and they are not classified and they don't get the union rate. What this increase would do would be to bring them in line up to a wage that a union person would get even though they're not classified. For instance, the secretary because she works for SYPCA receives \$11,900. Now, if she was doing the same job under the classified system, she would be receiving \$13,900. This is to bring them in line with the MEA although, as Mrs. Conti said, and it's correct, we're not obliged to because they're grant employees, and they are not classified employees, but yet doing the same work as the classified employees although paid by the grant.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MR. DeLUCA: I have to agree with Mrs. Conti. You accept a position at \$18,000 and just because the job scale goes up to \$21,000 which is part of the MEA, doesn't mean that you're entitled a \$3,000 increase which is roughly 16%. This is ludicrous on numerous scores. Here it is we've been hollering about giving 7%, 8%, and now a person only been on a job two months, one month; they haven't even proven themselves yet. In private industry, they don't even do this. Coming at \$18,000, just because a company buys you out and they have different grade levels, you don't automatically go up to \$21 or \$22,000. Needless to say, if you've only been on a job one month or two months, you sure as heck aren't going to get a \$3,000 increase. I object to the whole thing coming back to us again, and to vote for this increase would be against what we've been preaching for the last two years as far as salary increases go. I would hope that this Board rejects this item.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. GAIPA: Move the question.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to move the question. All in favor of moving the question, please say aye. Opposed? 1 no vote to moving the question. We're going to move the question. It's on the approval of \$384.00 transfer to increase the salaries under SYPCA, reminding the members that a simple majority is all that is necessary under a transfer; a simple majority. Please use your machine. The motion is DEFEATED 7 affirmative, 25 negative, 1 abstaining and 2 not-voting.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (10) \$ 600.00 - MAYOR'S OFFICE - CODE 201.2750 GASOLINE - additional appropriation for Relocation Officer, per Mayor's request 9/21/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (11) \$ 2,560.00 - MAYOR'S OFFICE - GROUP 20.5609 CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES (CCM) - additional appropriation requested to fund Stamford's share in order to participate in the municipal challenge to Northeast Utilities' proposed street lighting rate increase, per Mayor's request 10/4/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to Education, Welfare and Government Committee.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (12) \$ 1,200.00 - PURCHASING DEPARTMENT - CODE 243 - TRANSFER - ORD. 510 -  
(Transfer) per request of Finance Comm. Marra 10/13/83. Approved by  
(Ord. 510) Board of Finance 10/26/83.

From: Code 243.5271 testing services \$ 800.00  
Code 243.1110 salaries 400.00

\$1,200.00

To: Code 243.1220 car allowance

\$1,200.00

Effective 9/8/83 Thomas Canino became a member of AFSCME/AFL-CIO Administrators' Union and eligible for car allowance \$100/month, plus gasoline (being removed from non-union administrator status)

MRS. HAWES: Item #12 is not properly on our Agenda because it does not pertain or Ordinance 510.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there any remarks regarding that? That was another item that refers to 510.

- (13) \$ 1,194.00 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT - CODE 655.4183 SELF-SUSTAINING PROGRAMS - MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES - additional appropriation representing "collections over and above the appropriation", per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (14) \$ 840.00 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT - CODE 655.4183 SELF-SUSTAINING PROGRAMS - MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES - "additional appropriation" to into departmental budget \$840.00 received from Kiwanis Club to the Awards Program and deposited into General Fund, per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

- (15) \$ 448.50 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT - CODE 655.4180 SELF-SUSTAINING PROGRAMS - CITY ANNUAL TENNIS TOURNAMENT - representing "collections over and above the appropriation", per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Approved by Board of Finance 10/26/83.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (16) \$ 789,583.00 - STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM - CODES 750 THROUGH 760 - additional appropriation requested to fund Day Care Centers. This amount is to be received from the State Dept. of Human Services, per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83. Serving 295 children from 282 families annually.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

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

- (17) \$ 45,000.00 - YERWOOD CENTER - CODE 745.4390 YERWOOD CENTER - additional appropriation to assist in operations and maintenance expenses of the Center, per Mayor's request 10/17/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: The Yerwood Center's request for funding during the City's regular budget cycle had not been approved due to the uncertainty surrounding the Center's ability to secure sufficient operating funds. However, \$45,000 was placed in the contingency reserve for the Yerwood Center to be released pending their successful development of a full operational plan and budget. Since that time, the Yerwood Center has obtained funding commitments sufficient to support their programs, and the Board of Directors has devised the necessary strategy to strengthen the Center and to attract the necessary funding support for continued operation. Therefore, the request is now before us to approve this money which has been provided for in the contingency fund. Fiscal voted 5 in favor, none opposed and two abstentions and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: The motion made; several seconds. Any discussion?

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Yes, Mr. Boccuzzi.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I'm going to leave the Floor and take no part in this discussion.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi is leaving the Floor and will not take part in this discussion.

MRS. MAIHOCK: Through you, Madam President, to Mrs. Hawe, I was just curious to know how does, if this information is available, and you are ready to dispense it, how does the amount of money we are considering here compare with the amount of money that is given to the other Centers?



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: I don't have the budget book with me. It's in there. How much does it compare given to the other Centers?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I think I remember somewhere I saw \$38,000 to the Chester Addison Center, and I have no way of knowing how much Glenbrook got because they go through the Public Works budget of the City of Stamford, but I'm sure it's more than \$45,000 because their total operation is there.

MRS. CONTI: I wanted to answer Mrs. Maihock's question more extensively. The problem with the Community Centers and the way they're funded is within the ownership of the Centers. All the Community Centers are not owned by the City of Stamford. Southfield is owned by the Housing Authority. Some are owned by private, non-profit organizations. Some receive funding from the United Way, but they're not all under the same ownership and that's why they're not all funded the same way. Unless we bring the ownership into line where they are all owned and funded the same way, we're never going to know what they're costing us.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Ms. Summerville, would you like to comment on Mrs. Conti's remarks?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Just to clarify and correct some incorrect statements that Mrs. Conti made. Yerwood Center is funded as Southfield Community Center United Way. Southfield Community Center, the Federal Government gives them funding. the Housing Authority gives them nothing, alright?

MRS. CONTI: I'm not speaking of the funding, Ann, I'm speaking of the ownership.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Conti, please don't speak until you are recognized.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm just looking at the total amounts on my notes here and I'm not sure if these are correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Bonner, I'm sorry to interrupt you, but Secondary Committee, Ms. DeGaetani or you Ms. Rinaldi, would you give the Secondary Committee report?

MS. RINALDI: E, W, & G voted to concur unanimously.

PRESIDENT SANTY: E, W, & G concurs with Fiscal. Mr. Bonner, continue and I do apologize.

MR. BONNER: I believe they have a total of with this \$45,000, it would come up to a total of \$236,000 for the year if that figure is correct. There was \$68,000, I think, from United Way and I was reading this from a letter of October 6, '83. I don't seem to have the exact amount. Does anyone know what the total amount of money per year has been provided for this organization? I have \$236,000, but I'm not sure that that figure is correct.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, can you give those figures?

MRS. HAWE: I can. The question was about the other Community Centers, but anyway, the total revenue that they received, total support in revenue is \$356,959.00 of which \$68,500 comes from the United Way. They get money from contributions, from special events they have, from other organizations, from government agencies including the City of Stamford, membership dues, program service fees, rentals, and that's what it comes up to, \$356,959.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BONNER: Does that include the \$45,000?

MRS. HAWE: I believe so, yes.

MR. BONNER: That would include the \$45,000. So, without the \$45,000 they would be having \$311,000; about \$312,000. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner. Please wait until you are recognized before you speak.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. I think that, perhaps, we're losing track of the real purpose of this appropriation. The Yerwood Community Center does a very, very fine job on the West Side and they have been in trouble and they are trying to get themselves of their financial difficulties, and I think that they should be supported with this. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for beautification of the City, for Public Works and so forth, but this is directly spent on people. It affects really the entire West Side and I would urge you to support this.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I just wanted to get it straight exactly. Since this says an additional appropriation, what is precisely the total amount of money that the City gives the Center? That's what I wanted to figure this out.

MRS. HAWE: What was the question? The total amount....This is what the City will give the Yerwood Center for this year. It is going to be released to them quarterly, but not \$45,000 a quarter. This is the whole amount, but it will be released, one-fourth of it at each quarter.

PRESIDENT SANTY: This is all that we have given to the Yerwood Center. That's Mrs. Maihock's question...in 1983.

MRS. HAWE: Right. For this fiscal year that we are in now, the City will give Yerwood Center \$45,000 total.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. Mrs. Maihock, does that answer your question?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you, Madam President. I think if we can assume that Mrs. Hawe and her Committee have adequately researched the need for the \$45,000, then I feel that there is not too much debate that should go on as to whether or not we should pass the appropriation. We are talking about a Community Center. It does not matter where the Community Center is as long as we recognize the fact that this Community Center serves our people, and we have an obligation to fund this money to serve our people. We funded all sorts of things over the last year from sidewalks to Coliseum Authorities. We are talking...

PRESIDENT SANTY: I know this is our last meeting and it's getting late, but please respect the speaker. Mr. Wiederlight does have the Floor.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Thank you. We are talking about an appropriation to help our people and people are the biggest resource that our Community has and I feel we will be letting down our people if we do not vote for this appropriation. Thank you

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wiederlight.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I think Mr. Wiederlight said much better than I can say it. We can spend money to take care of everything else trucks and everything else, but when it comes to people, we drag our feet, and I think it's about time that we stopped dragging our feet on people that contribute the money, and the people on the West Side are taxpayers like anyone else. I feel that we have a responsibility to at least spend \$45,000 for the Center in their area. I would ask this Board to let's get it out of the way and be done with it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. The Yerwood Center provides a service, a much needed service in the Community, and I think it behooves us to appropriate these funds which are needed because they are for the people as was mentioned. I don't think it's important in our discussion that we consider what other monies are provided for for other centers or what we spent money for in the past. I think the bottom line as was mentioned is the people. They're taxpayers in the City. They deserve this type of Center. It provides good in the Community and this appropriation should be passed. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Zelinski.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Mrs. Hawe. Mrs. Hawe, this was not in the original budget it was it?

MRS. HAWE: It was requested but I believe it was cut out at the Mayor's level, and because they wanted to be sure that the Yerwood Center had a plan to raise funds themselves and to be viable economically and so they put it in the contingency fund until such time as a plan was drawn up and the City was sure that they were on solid ground financially. At this point, the City is sure and so the money is coming through for an appropriation. It was put in the contingency fund all along with this in mind.

MRS. SAXE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. Mrs. Saxe, are you finished?

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Yes, I do recall here that this \$45,000 was placed in the contingency reserve. This is not a new requirement, and it was based on the successful operation of the organization there and apparently, it has been organization and I would vote for the \$45,000 based that it was something that had been thought of and now it's time to provide it. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner. There being no further speakers, we'll move right to a machine vote. We are voting on \$45,000 additional appropriation for the Yerwood Center. Please use your machine. We need 24 votes. Has everyone voted? Mr. Boccuzzi has absence himself from this vote. The motion has PASSED 29 affirmative, 0 negative, 2 abstaining and 4 not-voting.

(18)	\$	2,660.00	-	CENTRAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT - TRANSFER	pursuant to Ord. 510,
	(Transfer)			per Finance Comm. Marra's undated request:	
	(Ord. 510)			From Code 244.2930 Stationery and Supplies	\$2,660.00
				To: Code 244.1130 Part-time salaries	<u>2,660.00</u>

(Part-time, 19 hrs. week, no benefits, \$4.00 hr., 35 wks.)

Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: Item #18 is one of these that does not belong under our jurisdiction as is item #19.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before you go on, and the Chair agrees with you, Mrs. Hawe. Is there any comments on 19 or 20 from this Board for the record? 18, 19, or 20. Anyone want to comments on any of those? We're not taking any action on it. We'll move right along.

MRS. HAWE: I didn't mention 20, but actually, you are right. That's something that just the Board of Finance does. We don't look at the close-outs. That got on there by mistake.

(19) \$ 600.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE/CONTROLLER - TRANSFER pursuant to  
(Transfer) Ord. 510, per Comm. Marra's undated request. Board of  
(Ord. 510) Finance approved 10/26/83.  
From: Code 240.1110 Salaries \$600.00  
To: Code 242.1230 Accounting Finance  
Records (Group 24 Controller)  
College Tuition (MEA/Fairfield Univ.) 600.00  
-0-

BOARD TOOK NO ACTION

(20) \$131,400.25 - CAPITAL PROJECT CLOSE-OUTS/UNISSUED BONDS - Request for authorization to close-out the following Capital Projects, which either have been completed, or will not be started:

Traffic Department, #280.629 Bus Shelters	\$106,000.00
Smith House SNF 4-wheel drive vehicle	220.25
Recreation Dept. #650.541 Band wagons	<u>25,180.00</u>
	\$131,400.25

Per Comm. Marra 10/18/83.  
Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT.

BOARD TOOK NO ACTION

(21) \$ 74,000.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET  
(Transfer) by adding \$74,000 for a new project to be known as #610.458  
VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (Parks Dept. garbage truck), to be  
financed by bonding, as follows, per Mayor's request  
10/18/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Transfer from Close-outs (see item #20 above) ..	\$48,278.46
Additional appropriation to be bonded .....	<u>25,722.00</u>
	\$74,000.46

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam President, I know 21 is on the Consent, but something just came into my mind from a letter from the Planning Board. May I ask a question of the Fiscal Chairman even though that particular item is on Consent?



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: I think you can ask a question, Mr. Boccuzzi, certainly.

MR. BOCCUZZI: This garbage truck is going to be for the Parks Department. It's not to be buy it, give it to the Public Works; Public Works is going to give you an old one such as the letter from the Planning Board?

MRS. HAWE: No, in fact, we specifically asked that, and no, they are going to use the new one. Parks Department is going to use the new truck.

MR. BOCCUZZI: I figure if they can buy station wagons, they can buy their own truck.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Boccuzzi.

- (22) \$ 14,500.00 - CULTURAL EVENTS - additional appropriation, representing increases in 83/84 budgets of the following cultural agencies, per Mayor's request 10/18/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83. (These requests identical to amounts approved for 83/84 budgets.)

Code 730.3350 Young Artists Philharmonic.....	\$ 1,000.00
Code 730.3340 State Opera.....	5,000.00
Code 730.3315 Hartman Theatre.....	5,000.00
Code 730.3330 Stamford Symphony.....	3,500.00
	<u>\$14,500.00</u>

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: At budget time, each of these four cultural institutions, the Young Artists Philharmonic, State Opera, Hartman Theatre and Stamford Symphony had their requests for funds cut 50%. The Mayor has requested reinstatement as it appears that their operations are affected by this decrease in revenue. Fiscal voted in favor; 3 in favor, 1 opposed, and 3 abstentions and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded. Secondary Committee, Parks and Recreation, Mr. DeLuca.

MR. DeLUCA: Waive the Committee report on this, please.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion to waive the Secondary Committee report. Is there a second? Seconded. All in favor of waiving the Secondary Committee report, please say aye. Opposed? We'll waive the Secondary Committee report. Discussion on #22 under Fiscal.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I had a call from someone who is interested in the distribution, and this particular person wondered why, for instance, the Stamford Symphony was only given \$3,500 and the State Opera \$5,000? I was just wondering since we have the Opera and the Hartman Theatre at \$5,000, why is that?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, can you answer that question?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, because traditionally, all these cultural institutions do not receive the same amount. For instance, in the fiscal year just passed, 82,83, the Hartman got \$10,000, the Symphony got \$6,000, State Opera got \$7,000, Young Artist Philharmonic got \$1,725. It's reflective of what they ask for and the size of their operating budget and the size of their organization. All of them would not get the same amount because they have different size groups.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. HAWE: (continuing) The Philharmonic is not as big as the Hartman, for instance.

MRS. MAIHOCK: I understand that. This person did feel, however, that they really should be more equalized, and I just wanted to draw that to your attention.

MRS. HAWE: It also depends on what they ask for. They didn't ask for the same amount.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe, and Mrs. Maihock.

MR. BURKE: This is just a question through you, Madam Chairman. Of the amounts of money that was cut at the Mayor's level, of what portion of that is this \$14,500 repress? Is it restoration of the full cut or?

MRS. HAWE: It's a restoration, yes, it's a restoration of the full cut. Their requests were cut in half and this is a restoration of that amount. So, it would bring them up to what they had originally requested at budget time.

MR. BURKE: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Burke. Thank you, Mrs. Hawe.

MRS. GERSHMAN: Thank you. I must speak in favor of this. After all, we are always talking about the quality of life in Stamford and we are talking about having something to do and bringing people into Downtown, and here is a chance to provide these funds so that our own organizations in Stamford can continue to operate. They do operate on a shoestring. They count the paper clips, so, I would urge you to vote for this to help their continuance through this year.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Gershman.

MR. LIVINGSTON: Yes, through you, Madam President to Mrs. Marie Hawe, there was one item I recall on here that people from other cities participate in, but for some reason, their municipalities have turned them down. Which one was that?

MRS. HAWE: That was the Young Artist Philharmonic. Can I elaborate on this?

MR. LIVINGSTON: It's not really necessary. I'm not going to nitpick on that one, but I am a little upset with the Hartman Theatre squeezed in here. I don't know how much money we are going to continue to spend on the Hartman Theatre and allow the Coliseum Authority to really as I see it, soak up partically all of the funds that have been allocated for cultural events in this City.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Livingston.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I really would like to speak in favor of this \$14,500 appropriation. When you look at this in comparison to the rest of the budget, it is small. It is so critical though to a vibrant Downtown. As critical as it is to have community centers and that's very important; to have a live neighborhoods across the City. That's how critical it is to having a live Downtown. Each one of these things really depends upon subscriptions, upon corporate contributions, and upon the City's help. This is not a fortune in help, and I really believe that these four cultural events as they occur during the year, really make this City something special, and I hope that this appropriation is passed.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Through you to Chairperson Hawe, if these appropriations are passed tonight, the performance that would be put on by these particular groups, will this be free to the public?

MRS. HAWE: If they're not free now, they won't be. It won't change anything.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Was there any back up material? Give "for instance," what will the money for State Opera be used for?

MRS. HAWE: State Opera's total budget is \$108,000. I can't tell you exactly what this \$5,000 will be used for but their budget goes for things like paying staff, advertising, their flyers, their mailings, the productions itself, the program tickets, insurance; all things like that.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: How do they arrive at coming before this Board for a figure of \$5,000? Is that just something they thought of?

MRS. HAWE: What are you talking about, State Opera?

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Yes.

MRS. HAWE: They had asked for, I don't know what possessed them to ask for \$10,000 this year. They had received \$7,000 last year from the City, and they had requested \$10,000 this year.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: For what? They just say to the City, I want \$10,000.

MRS. HAWE: Every department and every one of these community services or cultural events, puts in a request to the Mayor and the Mayor if he feels it's legitimate, puts it in the budget.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I'm not trying to be facetious, but I'm think of them on the level of a community center. Southfield had to say what they are going to use their money for. They had to produce their budget to show that the audit was approved. Yerwood Center had to do the same. I could go on and on with other groups that came before us. I'm just wondering what kind of order did they come before the Board as to say, this is why I justify asking for the use of \$5,000. I used that one because I just picked that one up. I'm really thinking of all of them.

MRS. HAWE: I can tell you what their budget is if you want to see it. \$66,000 for expenses for production. \$6,000 for the Artistic Director; \$7,500 to rent the theatre; \$2,000 for lighting; \$17,000 for advertising; \$9,500 for other things like telephone, insurance, dues. I can't tell you what this particular \$5,000 is going for. It's just part of their ...

MS. SUMMERVILLE: This will help their operating budget.

MRS. HAWE: Yes, their operating budget.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe and Ms. Summerville.

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If I understand it rightly, the Coliseum Authority would provide money to Hartman Theatre. If that is correct, it would seem that they might not need the \$5,000, and we could go in for a \$9,500 budget to fund the Young Artist for a \$1,000, the State Opera for \$5,000, and the Stamford Symphony for \$3,500. First of all, is my assumption correct that the Coliseum Authority provides money for the Hartman Theatre.

MRS. HAWE: No, it's not.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mrs. Hawe, will you comment? Mr. Bonner, I think your question as stated is could we eliminate one of these?

MR. BONNER: Yes.

MRS. HAWE: No, it's not, Jim. The Coliseum Authority funds the Stamford Center for the Arts. The Hartman Theatre is an entity that will be housed in the Stamford Center for the Arts but it is a different entity and they are not funded by the Coliseum Authority. I think Mrs. Gershman can bear me out on that.

MR. BONNER: Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BOCCUZZI: 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 need two-thirds. Please use your machine to move the question. We need 24 votes. Use your machine. We're voting on moving the question on item #22 under Fiscal. Has everyone voted? The motion to move the question has been DEFEATED by one vote; 23 affirmative, 9 negative, 0 abstaining and 3 not-voting.

MRS. SIGNORE: Thank you, Madam President. I feel that \$14,500 is a modest sum for programs that are available to the entire City. If we have people Downtown in the evening, we have a more vibrant City which is what we've been trying for. We've been trying to get this City populated in the evenings. If we can draw people Downtown by activities such as these, we do have that more vibrant City, and we also have a safer City. Thank you.

MRS. MCINERNEY: Madam President, on Fiscal Committee, I was one of the people who abstained only because I reserved my right to vote until such time as I could look at previously submitted financial reports by the groups involved with this request.

I feel that based on the fact that everything, unfortunately, increases in life, including utilities and production costs and things of that nature, it comes a time when you have to look at the cost versus the benefit on some items, and truly, we do support as Mr. Wiederlight mentioned earlier, sidewalks, parks, Pink Tent if that's what you want. We do have a lot of cultural things in Stamford that people can go to and along with having active and viable community center in neighborhoods where we are trying to improve the quality of life for the residents. I think that the quality of life for all of Stamford will be improved and can continue to grow and be improved. What we fail to see sometimes because we're so close to it is the fact that Stamford is probably one of the best cities in the United States of America.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. MCINERNEY: (continuing) I certainly would support this and I think it's because of items like this that our community has reached such recognition across the country and it is a small amount. I would encourage them to raise their own funding, however, I think it's a small amount; I'd support it.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. McInerney. Any further speakers?

MRS. SAXE: Thank you, Madam President. I have a problem not with the fact that we should support these issues, I think that all of these particular things are very good for the City, but I do have a problem with the budgetary process. How can we continue to fund these things if we came in with a tight budget, and now all of a sudden, we're giving things that weren't there away? Can you answer that, Mrs. Hawe?

MRS. HAWE: As all of you, I'm sure know, the outlook for the deficit versus surplus was not as bleak as we had thought in March being that some money turned up. There was additional money that was discovered in the bookkeeping error about a decade ago, which reduced some of that deficit.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Hawe. Any other speakers? No other speakers, we're going to move right to a machine vote.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I don't think you want to have me, do you?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Wider, I don't see your name. I'm sorry. It's in Ms. Summerville's head but she didn't tell me. Thank you, Mr. Wider.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Ms. Summerville. You're looking better all the time. I become a little concerned with people talking about a strenuous budget and then we appropriate this little money for cultural art activities. We are only returning a few dollars back to the people who pay it in there, and the more that we serve these people, the more content they are for us to go up on their tax; their assessment. If we don't give them anything, I don't blame them for lining up against going up on their taxes. Some of these people, I can't understand their thinking. We are serving the people that are paying their way, and I would like to see this little \$14,000 appropriated and get on with some other business. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Wider. No other speakers?

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I intend to vote for this because I think it is important. I think that it is a nice thing, but the thing that is disturbing is that we cut these items down in the beginning and come back later on and over and over and it's getting to be a habit. I think there has to be a lot of discipline on that budget when it goes through and people have to know that they have to live with that budget. However, I will vote for this item because I do think it's important. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner. No other speakers? We'll move right to a machine vote on the approval of #22 under Fiscal, \$14,500 Cultural Events. Please use your machine. 24 votes are needed. Has everyone voted? The motion PASSED 26 affirmative, 3 negative, 2 abstaining and 4 not-voting.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: I would remind the members present that it is now 11:30; we still have a lengthy Agenda and we start losing a quorum around 2 o'clock in the morning, so let's proceed as quickly as possible. I would please ask the members, if the speaker before you previously has said the same sentiments that you want to say, please just agree with the speaker. Thank you.

- (23) \$ 31,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - CODE 343.5903 BUREAU OF SANITATION - Legal settlement of claims, U. S. District Court (Civil Action #B81-596) breach of contract between City and William F. Cosulich Associates, P.I., per Mayor's letter 10/18/83. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA

- (24) \$218,506.05 - SELF-INSURANCE MANAGEMENT (GR #69) - CODE 290.1392 - additional appropriation per Mayor's request 10/18/83 to replenish funds in 1983/84 Self-Insurance account resulting from an arbitration decision of 9/27/83, chargeable as follows. Board of Finance approved 10/26/83.

1982/83 290.1392 Self-Insurance Management	\$208,049.7
1983/84 290.1392 Self-Insurance Management Interest costs	10,456.2
	<u>\$218,505.0</u>

Related to URC Town Center Garage Engineering Study for structural safety.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWES: This request is in connection with the Town Center garage. The City has applied to the URC for reimbursement of this. When the City was assuming responsibility for the garage, the City had an insurance expert look it, and this insurance expert said that they didn't like the looks of some of the structural aspects and said that they were not equipped to make a judgement and the City should get an engineering study done on this. Ramp Engineering who had done the garage, the principal person that had been involved with it, was deceased. In the meantime, a certificate of occupancy was issued. The contract that the City had with the URC said that on the issuance of the CO, the URC would give \$600,000 to the City to be put into an escrow account for maintenance. The City then used \$218,000 from this maintenance escrow account to pay for the engineering study to find out about whether it's structurally safe or not.

The Rich-Taubman Company felt that the City shouldn't be able to use this money for that study. It went to arbitration and the arbitration award was that the City should restore the money to the escrow account, and this is to pay that arbitration decision which was handed down on September 27. As I said, the City has applied to the URC for reimbursement of this. That remains to be seen. Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made. Is there a second to that? Several seconds. I don't want to interrupt the train of thought, but Ms. Summerville has some sentiments to express and now is appropriate.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MS. SUMMERVILLE: I think that the 17th Board of Representatives should be proud of the fact that our Police Department has been very courteous in taking our Pages home. I think the Police Department should also be commended for fine job they have job on putting on women and minorities on the Police force, and New York has something to learn.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: We would like to thank the Pages for the Record for being our Pages for the last Board meeting of the 17th Board of Representatives, and we hope you will come back for the 18th. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you so much. I would ask all the members to please take their seats. We're on item #24 under Fiscal. A motion has been made and seconded to approve \$218,506.05, E, W, and G Committee, Ms. Rinaldi.

MS. RINALDI: We concur unanimously.

PRESIDENT SANTY: E, W, & G concurs unanimously. Any discussion?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Through you, Madam President to Mrs. Hawe, why does this come out of the Self-Insurance Management account?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Would you repeat your question, Mr. Wiederlight?

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: Why does it come out of the Self-Insurance Management account?

MRS. HAWE: Because the arbitration award said that the City must repay this escrow account in this amount. The back up says the arbitration award necessitated a \$218,506.00 charge against the 83/84 Self-Insurance account. I don't know whether that answers you sufficiently.

MR. WIEDERLIGHT: No, it doesn't. I can see the arbitrator saying we owe somebody \$218,000 but I do not understand from what you answered me why we're taking it out of this account.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Please give the speaker your attention. Mr. Wiederlight, Mrs. Hawe cannot answer your question. Do you have anything further to state?

MR. BONNER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. If I recall, there were problems on the garage and this study was made to determine whether or not the garage could be opened, and whether it was safe. I'm not sure what the result was of that engineering study. If it was that the garage was not safe, and work had to be done, it's very possible that this kind of a charge could be back charged to the contractor. Could you give me a little information, Mrs. Hawe, as to the outcome of that study and who is responsible? Thank you.

MRS. HAWE: Concerning the whole question of the garage, we really didn't go into any great detail the question of the garage and was it structurally sound and that whole aspect of it which is a whole other story which could of taken a whole night in itself. We were concerned with why the money was needed. We were satisfied that you know it had to be paid because this was an award that was determined that the City has to pay. I understand what you are asking but we really didn't go into that whole aspect of it.

MR. BONNER: Thank you.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner and Mrs. Hawe.

MR. ZELINSKI: Thank you, Madam President. Being there are some questions raised and some very valid ones, I would like to move that we send this back to Committee for further study.

PRESIDENT SANTY: A motion has been made and seconded to send this item back to Committee. That's the motion on the Floor. Any discussion? No discussion, we'll move right to a machine vote. The vote is on sending this item back to Committee; a simple majority is all that is necessary. Has everyone voted? We are voting on sending it back to Committee which would be to be resubmitted to the 18th Board. The motion on the Floor is to send this item back to Committee because of the questions raised. Has everyone voted? The motion has PASSED to send it back to Committee 22 affirmative, 10 negative, and 3 not-voting. 0 abstaining.

(25) \$ 5,000.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - TRANSFER per request from  
(Transfer) Finance Commissioner Marra Sept., 1983; approved by  
(Ord. 510) Board of Finance 10/26/83.

From: Code 240.1110 salaries	\$5,000.00
To: Code 240.5120 professional auditing services	<u>5,000.00</u>
	-0-

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE, AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: Item #25 is one of these items that does not belong on our Agenda.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Before you go on, are there any comments on item 25? No comments, continue.

(26) \$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 Sec. 619.1  
used by Comm. Marra and Chmn. Pollard of Board of Finance  
to handle this emergency situation. Planning Board advisory  
opinion approved this item. Held in Committee 9/14 and  
10/11/83. Board of Finance approved 9/15/83.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.

MRS. HAWE: Fiscal voted 7 in favor and none opposed and I so move.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Is there a second to that motion? Several seconds. Public Works Committee, Mr. Bonner.

MR. BONNER: Yes, thank you, Madam Chairman. The Public Works Committee met and discussed this item at some length. The Committee recommended that construction of the new bridge rather than repair of the old bridge is necessary to correct the present floodwater flow deficiencies, but the new bridge design affects two schools, senior citizen housing area, traffic and EPA. Therefore, before a contract for construction is awarded, there should be a sign-off from all four of the above parties or a decision by the Mayor to over-ride any objections. Therefore, we recommend that the matter be sent back to Committee until sign-offs are received.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. BONNER: (continuing) We did get a letter in the mail today. I think we all had a letter in the mail today from the Housing group indicating that they were concerned. Therefore, Madam Chairman, I at this time would like to make a recommendation that this be sent back to Committee until we have sign-offs from the School Board, the Housing, Traffic and EPA. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: There's a motion made and seconded to send this back to Committee. We have a motion on the Floor to approve \$700,000 for the North Street bridge but a motion has been made by the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, who did not concur with the approval of that, to send this item back to Committee. That is the motion on the Floor. Discussion on sending it back to Committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Madam Chairman, when the Public Works Committee met, we had no in attendance from the Public Works Department at all; neither the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, or the City Engineer. Therefore, all our questions... Mr. Bonner tried to get answers to our questions prior to the meeting. He did get some. He did a good job. I know it's the end of our Board and the end of this present administration's term, but I would say that 50% of our Committee meetings were ignored by the Commissioner. I, for one, feel that if I can take my time and Mr. Perillo, Mrs. Saxe, Mr. Burke, Mr. Bonner and prior to that, we had other members on the Committee to give their time, someone should represent the Public Works Commission.

We had specific questions we wanted to ask and we wanted to know why the Frank Soldano report to Norman Liu of August 10th on the North Street Bridge, where he made some recommendations and in his last paragraph under recommendations, said, "After the above has been accomplished and good maintenance," listen to this part, "the four ton limit can be removed and the bridge can resume its normal highway loading." When you see a letter like that and then you see Mr. Liu's letter to Commissioner Spaulding disregarding his own engineering department's report, something has to be wrong. I think that the closing of the bridge by the Commissioner preventing anyone to go over the bridge whether it be four tons or over, was a disservice to the City. I think that what has happened he has now made in front of Hart School a raceway with cars. He's cut down where people can get in and out of that area. There is no reason to close that bridge, and I said it last month and he accused me of playing politics. The politics are over. All I can say to Mr. Spaulding, shame on him for closing the bridge.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Mr. Boccuzzi, I don't want to cut your remarks but we're now addressing sending this back to Committee. Please confine your remarks to that.

MR. BOCCUZZI: Due to the fact that we couldn't get any answers and no one from Public Works attended, I think it's only right that we send it back to Committee.

PRESIDENT SANTY: I'm glad you worked that in there.

MR. BONNER: If this does go back to Committee, we also are recommending that these letters referred to by Mr. Boccuzzi are addressed. That's the 8/10 letter to Soldano to Liu, the letter from Liu to Spaulding on 8/10, and a 10/13 Mr. Lubbers, EPA to Spaulding. We're asking that they also be addressed in their recommendation. The problem was the bridge could be repaired but it does not relieve the flood problems. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Bonner.



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN: Thank you. When this matter came up before Fiscal, I believe that Fiscal voted overwhelmingly in favor of the item, and I, for one, voted that way based on the Public Works representatives who came to speak before us. However, we had no input from the Environmental Protection Board. We had no input from the Corps of Engineers. We had no input from the Housing Authority which has a major problem with this. No so much with the appropriation as with the fact that they weren't allowed or given the courtesy to see the specifications, and there are so many different loose ends to this that I feel kind of embarrassed that we voted upon it without touch all these bases. I am going to vote against it, and I am going vote to return it to Committee to have these answered, and furthermore, I think it's important that if the rest of the Board shares these concerns that this be a resounding motion to return, and that's because the money for this has really already been appropriated through the emergency powers of the Charter. The Chairman of the Board of Finance, Mr. Pollard, and the Finance Commissioner, Mr. Marra, and the Mayor used their emergency powers when Mr. Spaulding closed this bridge to give this high priority and to appropriate the funds. So, I would really like them to know through this vote that we are concerned and that we do not want to see any action on this matter until our questions are answered. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mrs. Goldstein. The motion on the Floor is to return this item to Committee. Please address your remarks to that motion.

MR. WIDER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I was never so upset about any one item that I was when I read this bid request in the paper. I was more upset after working for two and a half years with the Housing Authority to get some senior citizen housing built over there that someone had the audacity to just take the property without any input from the Public Housing Committee, the Housing Authority, or from any of the concerned people. I'm not so sure that if they take 25% of that property, that the housing will be in compliance with the federal regulations. So, we would have to look at that before we even sign off on it. I am wondering who authorized the payment of these kind of things. I was told it was the Finance Commissioner. If the Mayor and the Finance Commissioner and the Chairman of the Board of Finance have these kind of powers; I'm speaking in favor of sending this back to Committee but I want to make one thing perfectly clear.

PRESIDENT SANTY: But, Mr. Wider, I think we detracting from the motion on the Floor. The motion on the Floor is to return this Committee. The merits of that should be discussed and not questions you have regarding this. If that is why you want to return it to Committee, fine, but please confine your remarks to returning it to Committee.

MR. WIDER: Right, but the fact is that I have to bring in some of the insults that have been dished out. Some of us have worked hard on this. I don't think I've been hiding during these last seven years. I would like the work that I have done to be appreciated and it wasn't appreciated when they interrupted some housing that we have built. I'm in favor of sending it back to Committee and the Committee to get all the facts and all the people to sign off. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Fine. There are nine speakers left.

MR. HOGAN: I'll be very brief, Madam Chairman. Thank you. In view of the fact that the new facts have come before this Board since the meeting of the Fiscal Committee, I would have to rise to the defense of the Fiscal Committee in their vote and echo Mrs. Goldstein's sentiments that at the time the Fiscal Committee originally heard this, we had no knowledge whatsoever of any letters that passed



FISCAL COMMITTEE: (CONTINUED)

MR. HOGAN: (continuing) between Mr. Soldano and the power that be. We had no idea of the magnitude that this move would have upon the housing for the senior citizens. I take exception to the fact that the people who appeared from the Public Works Department failed to make us aware of these facts. They must have been aware of them on the 10th because they certainly followed them up right away on Monday morning. Although I voted in favor of bringing this out, I'm in favor of sending this back to Committee and I ask my colleagues on the Board to send this back for reconsideration. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Before you rule me out of order, what I am about to speak on is sending this item back to Committee. All the statements I make after this are in reference to sending it back to Committee.

First of all, I would like to agree with Mrs. Goldstein said. I thinks it very unfair and disrespectful to the Committee for the person who came before Fiscal that they did not tell the truth and the whole truth, and through you, Madam President, I'd like to ask the Chairman for the record to state, the persons who came before Fiscal for this particular item.

MRS. HAWE: Mr. Canavan and Mr. Liu.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Spoke?

MRS. HAWE: Yes, they spoke.

MS. SUMMERVILLE: Secondly, I would like to say that the reason I would like to see this item sent back to Committee is because of all the things that Mrs. Goldstein said; she put it very well. We won't only send it back to Committee, we will physically put bodies there to prevent....sending it back to Committee does not allow time for them to justify what they're going to do. I think what I've heard here tonight will not only send a message back to the Committee but to get the house in order before you send something to us to approve. Thank you. One thing I forgot, Madam President. I, too, think in sending it back to Committee, there should be some clarification on who authorized it to go out to bid and what funds did it come out and how much they paid to have that done. I noticed in the paper it went out to bid already as if we're not involved at all and if not, why did they send it down in the first place?

PRESIDENT SANTY: Thank you, Ms. Summerville. A motion on the Floor to send this back to Committee.

MRS. CONTI: Thank you, Madam President. I'm opposed to sending this back to Committee. First of all, it will change nothing because the money has already been appropriated on an emergency basis. Apparently the members of this Board are completely unfamiliar with condemnation procedures. Whenever there's a condemnation procedure, the person who is losing the land must be completely satisfied before the municipality or the government agency can take the land. The government agency bends over backwards to please those whose land they're taking, and they make these arrangements.