

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1985

18th Board of Representatives

Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 18th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1985, 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 8:50 P.M. by President Sandra Goldstein, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION was given by the Rev. Ralph Mugford, Pastor of Bethany Assembly of God Church, 2 Scofieldtown Road, Stamford.

"Shall we pray? Heavenly Father, we first of all want to thank You for your help over the past year. We also thank You for these dedicated public servants. We acknowledge that without your interventions, we would be helpless. We come to You on behalf of this Board tonight. We are fully aware that You have keen insight into the future, and we know that You are knowledgeable about all problems, and You are full of wisdom and strength. So we ask, as did King Solomon of old, for your wisdom and your guidance, for your knowledge, for your strength in the business of this coming session.

"More and more we are aware of the problems that face this Board, and many there are, and they are so complex that it takes your intervention to solve them. Give to each member of this Board the know-how for all situations that they will face this year, and grant each one, for their services rendered, a very productive year as they endeavor to help our community. This, I pray, in the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG was led by President Goldstein.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk of the Board ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE. There were 34 present and 4 absent at the time of the Roll Call. Absent were Jeanne-Lois Santy (excused); Brien Malloy (excused); Claire Fishman (excused); Mary Jane Signore (excused); Katie Glover (excused); Bobby Owens. Rep. Barbara McInerney left at 9:19 due to illness, at which time the attendance roll stood at 33 Present and 7 Absent.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

MACHINE TEST VOTE was conducted by the President. It was found to be in good working order. The President said it was indeed in good working order and that Rep. Terrence Martin worked for two weeks this past month on the components of the machine, and he is getting additional parts made for it. On behalf of the Board, President Goldstein thanked Rep. Martin for a very fine job that he has done.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

For the late HAROLD J. KEELER, SR., father-in-law of Rep. Donald Donahue, who passed away - submitted by Rep. Ruth Powers. Rep. Scott Morris joined with Mrs. Powers. Rep. Grace Guroian said she, too, joined Reps. Powers and Morris, and that the Keeler family were her neighbors for over 30 years.

For the late IRVING PECKERMAN, formerly of 43 Norman Road in the Belltown section, and former owner of the LaSarette Corset Shop on Main Street, who passed away in Florida on Feb. 10, 1985. He was a very community-minded individual, who contributed a great deal of time to the City of Stamford and to the Congregation Temple Beth El - submitted by Rep. Scott Morris.

For the late JACK RITOFF, Rep. Claire Fishman's father, who died Saturday in Israel of a heart disease at age 84. He was born in Poland, a retired kosher butcher. He is survived by two daughters, Claire, and Lila in Israel; also a sister in England - submitted by Rep. David Blum.

For the late ABE LEVENSON, a retired clothing salesman, owner of T. Levenson & Sons Clothing Store in Stamford, who died yesterday in New York Hospital of a heart attack at age 87. He resided on Hoyt St. He was born in Newark, N.J. in 1897. He lived in Stamford for 86 years and was a member of Agudath Sholom Synagogue. He is survived by two daughters plus several nieces and nephews. Submitted by Rep. David Blum.

For the late AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, a giant of a man, who served his country irrespective of party affiliations; a legend in his own time. Submitted by Rep. Thomas Burke.

PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said Mrs. Fishman will be observing a five-day mourning period at her home, through this Friday, if anyone cares to pay their respects and visit her at her home.

Also, our Researcher, Sherry Dorfman, gave birth to a girl.

We also have a new grandfather, Roger Taranto, whose daughter, Debbie, Taranto-McGrath, gave birth to a boy.

The Board sent a token of good luck to both Mrs. Dorfman and Mrs. Taranto-McGrath.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Waive the Reading of the Steering Committee Report of the meeting held on Wednesday, February 13, 1985.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on Wednesday, February 13, 1985, in Conference Room I in the Board of Education Administration Building located on Hillandale Avenue. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., at which time a quorum was present, by Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
John Boccuzzi
Mildred Perillo
Alfred Perillo
Scott Morris
Mary Lou Rinaldi
James Dudley

Donald Donahue
David Martin
Maria Nakian
Robert Skovgaard
Lathon Wider
Annie Summerville

Audrey Maihock
Pat Wen, Advocate
Len Gambino, WSTC
Helen McEvoy
Sherry Dorfman
Anne Kachaluba

1. APPOINTMENTS

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

2. FISCAL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were all 22 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

3. LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were all 6 items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

4. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

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

5. PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were all three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Note, item 3 was in three parts. This item was approved to take each part separately, making the total of items on the Agenda five.

4. MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1985

4.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

6. PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

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

7. HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

8. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and one item that appeared on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda: request from Sacred Heart Church to hang banner on Summer Street.

9. EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

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

10. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

11. URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

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

12. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

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

13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

14. HOUSE COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

15. CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Suspension of the Rules approved to place an item on the Agenda and that being: Update on recodification of ordinances.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)16. COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

17. LABOR CONTRACT LIAISON COMMITTEE

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

18. RESOLUTIONS

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda, Sense-of-the-Board resolution honoring Joseph Fahey as citizen of the year.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Steering Committee, upon a motion made, seconded, and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRWOMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

SG:ak

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

CHAIRWOMAN PERILLO said the Appointments Committee met Thursday, Feb. 28th, at 7:00 P.M., at Hillandale Avenue. Present were Reps. Anne Summerville, Gabe DeLuca, John Boccuzzi, and Chairperson Millie Perillo. There was no quorum. She Moved to take Items #1 and #3 out of committee. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote, unanimously.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY ADVISORY PANELTerm Expires

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| (1) <u>MR. GORDON MICUNIS</u> (D) | Reappointment | July 14, 1986 |
| One Rogers Road | | |
| Held from 10/17/84 through 2/4/85. | | |

MRS. PERILLO said Mr. Micunis has already served one term and is seeking a reappointment. He has represented the Coliseum Authority on the selection committee for the architectural firm for the Center for the Arts. He headed a sub-committee to encourage tourism in Stamford. He has an extensive background in the Arts and she Moved for his confirmation. Seconded.

APPROVED by voice vote, unanimously.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)PERSONNEL COMMISSIONTerm Expires

- (2) MS. PATRICIA A. BILLINGS (D) Replacing W. Askew Dec. 1, 1985
48 Seaton Road who resigned
Held in Committee 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. PERILLO said Ms. Billings did not appear for the interview, and is being Held in Committee.

MRS. PERILLO Moved to take #3 out of committee. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote.

PERSONNEL COMMISSION

- (3) MR. MORTON D. SEMEL (D) Replacing E. Miller Dec. 1, 1989
93 Riverbank Road whose term expired

MRS. PERILLO said Mr. Semel has resided in Stamford for 27 years. He is a graduate of Michigan State University, and served in the U. S. Navy. In 1959, he founded the Omega Lighting Co., which he sold recently, and is now a lighting consultant to architects, engineers, and municipalities. He is a land developer, builder of single-family homes, and is a restaurateur in Westport. He owns and operates indoor tennis facilities in New Haven and Westport, and is involved in many community activities. She Moved for his approval. Seconded.

APPROVED by voice vote with Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

FISCAL COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee met on Wednesday, February 27th, with Mr. Lyons, Mrs. McInerney, Mr. Mallozzi, Ms. Rinaldi, Mrs. Conti, Mr. David Martin, Mr. Livingston, and Mr. Donahue in attendance.

There was also a short meeting held this evening to consider a number of items on which they did not have correct figures at the time of the Feb. 27th meeting.

Mr. Donahue Moved to the Consent Agenda, Items #2, 3, 4, 7, 18, 19, 20, and 21. Seconded. In each case where a secondary committee was involved, concurrence was given.

MRS. MCINERNEY asked if Mr. Donahue had skipped over Page #5, Items 13, 14, and 15.

MR. DONAHUE said he had been informed that all items on Page #5 would be taken off the Consent Agenda, which is why he skipped them.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said Item #1 has been discussed for a number of months now by the Fiscal Committee ^{and} Personnel Committee. There are many problems concerning the way this Board has been faced in handling pay increases for classified, non-union administrators. The Fiscal Committee was able with various members of its sub-committee, and of the Personnel Committee, and Contract Liaison Committee, to hold a joint meeting with the Personnel Commission to express the views that this Board has constantly expressed over the past few years, and to get a general agreement between those involved from the Fiscal Committee and the Personnel Committee, with the Personnel Commission, that a Pay Plan would have to be submitted to this Board, one that we could approve and agree with, and solve this problem for some years to come. It is unfair to get to a day like today, or a few months ago, or last year, or years in the future, where this Board has to find a fair and justifiable way of approving salary increases for this group.

He asked that either Mr. Boccuzzi or Mr. Lyons would amplify on the subject of the meeting that was held with the Personnel Commission before he goes on to make a number of motions. Mr. Donahue felt it was a very productive meeting, and unfortunately, he could not attend due to the death of his father-in-law.

THE PRESIDENT said she would prefer a Motion on the floor before there is discussion of any aspects of this item.

MR. DONAHUE said he would like to briefly talk about the philosophy behind the Committee's recommendations. They would like to reduce the amount of \$158,300 so they could make recommendations for salary increases for these individuals who have not had a pay increase for three years. They are the only City employees who have not had pay increases. To show good faith that the Committee is attempting to resolve their situation, and yet to go on and work with the Personnel Commission so that a Pay Plan is developed that is submitted to this Board for approval, Mr. Donahue would first Move to recommend the holding of the sum of \$21,390. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said for purposes of clarification, it might be preferable to first Move for approval of whatever sum they wish to recommend; and then after that, he can make a Motion to Hold in Committee the remainder.

MR. DONAHUE thereupon Moved for approval of \$136,190. This represents, for 1982/1983 and 1983/1984 fiscal years, a total of \$85,133. On the Agenda, all those items for retroactive salaries, retroactive F.I.C.A., and retroactive pension, would stay the same.

Under 1984/1985, the amount of \$61,744 under Salaries would be reduced to \$43,712; F.I.C.A., the sum of \$4,631 would be reduced to \$3,082; and pensions would be reduced from \$6,792 to \$4,983. This brings the total for 1984/1985 to \$51,777. The Motion is to approve \$136,910, and to Hold in Committee \$21,390. Seconded.

MR. DUDLEY said Personnel concurs unanimously, as amended.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM made a Point of Order that there were two Motions on the floor and suggested the approval of the \$136,190 be taken up first.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said a Motion to Re-Commit takes precedence over the Main Motion, so she would take the Re-Commit Motion for \$21,390 first and vote on that, and next would be the approval of \$136,190. Discussion is now in order.

MR. DONAHUE wanted it made clear for the record that they were authorizing tonight the approved salary increases as recommended by the Personnel Commission and passed by the Board of Finance for 1982/83 and 1983/84; and are only funding the portion of 1984/85 to assure that there is an appropriate amount of money to only pay those salary increases. They are holding any salary increases for 1984/85 so that this Committee, and Personnel, and others, can work with the Personnel Commission to develop a Plan. It is also being held so that any action taken here this evening will not conflict with any Plan coming forth.

MR. BURKE said he would like to send some more back. He is not against the figures as they apply to the individuals, but he is against, as he has told Mr. Donahue, the methodology used in requesting money for F.I.C.A., which is not necessary, as these people's salaries were above the limit of F.I.C.A. before the increases were put through, but Mr. Donahue assured him that this is the way it is done, and it goes back into the General Fund. Mr. Burke does not feel this is right. Right is right. An incorrect figure is an incorrect figure. Next time we should not do it this way.

MRS. McINERNEY has left as she is not feeling well, said the President, and there are now 33 members present.

MR. DeLUCA said he still has a problem with the whole package. He realizes that the intent is to show good faith, that these people have gone without a raise for two years, but his hang-up still is, and always has been, the fact that part of these increases include steps beyond Step 7 which the MAA pay schedule has as their final step in each grade.

The argument has been made that these are non-union administrators and the Personnel Commission has approved steps beyond Step 7, which, to Mr. DeLuca's logic, is still illegal. Any increases beyond Step 7 should not be approved, but unfortunately those people have met with the Personnel Commission and they feel we must show good faith, and therefore we should approve tonight's recommendations.

His other hang-up is that the Board just received a letter from Paul Pacter dated March 2nd, which is last Saturday, asking only for \$124,000. However, this evening the figures have gone up to \$136,910. Hopefully, these are the correct numbers, and that no further corrections come up increasing it back to \$158,300.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA went on to say that by this Board approving increases that go beyond Step 7, the door is being left open for the MAA in their negotiations to say if the non-union administrators are given increases for Steps, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 by a 5-person committee of the Personnel Commission, then the MAA should have the 13 steps also. This is ridiculous; and if Merit increases are added on top of the 13 steps and percentages across-the-board, how can that be justified, especially since the increases are supposed to be based on merit. In the past, they got 9% based on merit, and if they are supposed to be the cream-of-the-crop, why should they also get an automatic step increase, which is not based on merit. It is just based on the fact that they are here another year. It is like a longevity increase, and they are already in place; in amounts of \$150 per year Longevity after 10 years; \$250 after 15 years, and \$350 after 20 years. If we are going to talk about merit increases, let us talk about merit increases.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he has some of the same concerns that Mr. DeLuca has. Part of the questioning at that meeting was the Merit System, who does it, and what not. We were reassured that it is not going to be like it was in the past, where commissions do it, and almost everyone gets it. Reference to Mr. Blum's remarks, there actually is no money in this \$136,910 to give any increase in 1984/85. That money in there for 1984/85 is to pay their salary for that year with the increase you gave them for 1983/84. We don't appropriate the money for 1984/85. There will be no money in this operating budget to pay the raise they got back in 1983/84.

MR. LYONS said he intends to vote for this and he urges his colleagues to do likewise.

MR. MARTIN said Dick Lyons said it very well and he would like to echo his comments.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a machine vote on the Motion to Re-Commit \$21,390 to Fiscal for further study. APPROVED with 27 Yes votes, 3 No, and 3 Abstentions.

The Board will now consider the Main Motion to approve \$136,910, which has been Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK was also present at the meeting which met jointly with Transportation, and she was not mentioned by Mr. Donahue in making his Committee Report.

MR. DONAHUE said he usually only lists the members of the Committee who were present, so the record shows that they had a Quorum, but Mrs. Maihock was in fact there.

MR. GUROLAN said she would like to know why the Board is giving these people retroactive pay.

MR. DONAHUE said it is simply out of a sense of fairness that they are the only group in the City that have not got raises in three years. We hired a tax assessor, who has not got a dime more in salary since the day he was hired, and he has been here over 2 years now. Everyone else in the bargaining unit has, of course, gotten increases and retroactive pay.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

(1) ~~\$158,300.00~~ - SALARY INCREASES FOR VARIOUS CLASSIFIED NON-UNION ADMINISTRATORS - Additional Appropriation request approved by Personnel Commission for 1982/83, 1983/84, and 1984/85. Request by Mayor Serrani 9/5. Board of Finance approved 11/27/84. (Note: Board of Finance failed to have sufficient number of votes to approve the Personnel Director's salary increase, and they took no action on salary increase for Director of Welfare.) Held in Committee 12/3/84, 1/7 & 2/4/85.

APPROVED: \$136,910.00
 25 Yes; 6 No; 2 Abstain.
 HELD IN COMMITTEE:
 \$ 21,390.00
 27 Yes; 3 No; 3 Abstain.

1982/83 and 1983/84 Fiscal Years (reduced from \$136,574)

Code 994.9202

Retroactive Salaries \$72,147.

Retroactive F.I.C.A. 5,050.

Retroactive Pension. 7,936.

Total Retroactive 1982/83 & 1983/84. . . \$ 85,133. APPROVED:

1984/85 Fiscal Year (reduced from \$152,432)Total Salaries 1984/85 ~~\$61,744~~ 43,712.Code 270.1310 F.I.C.A. ~~4,631~~ 3,082.Code 293.1410 Pensions ~~6,792~~ 4,983.Total Appropriation 1984/85. ~~\$73,167~~ \$ 51,777.

GRAND TOTAL: 1982/83, 1983/84, 1984/85 \$158,300.

APPROVED.....\$136,910.

HELD.....21,390.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MRS. GUROIAN asked what the reason was that he had not come up for an increase.

MR. DONAHUE said the recommendations had not come up from the Personnel Commission because other contracts were pending. Other items in the same vein as this have come before this Board and have been defeated, and several through litigation. There are a lot of very complex reasons why they are not here til now, but Mr. Donahue believes they were waiting to make recommendations until the MAA contract was settled.

MRS. GUROIAN asked then is she to assume that everybody who works for the City of Stamford is entitled to a pay increase every year.

MR. DONAHUE said he doesn't know if they are entitled, but the vast majority of those working for the City are in a bargaining unit and they have gotten increases every year.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Mr. Donahue's Motion to approve \$136,910 for salary increases for various non-union classified administrators. She asked that members off the floor please take their seats so they can vote. She said a two-thirds' vote is required with a minimum of 21. APPROVED with 25 Yes, 6 No, and 2 Abstentions.

Mr. Livingston voted Yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) \$116,184.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.1110 SALARIES - Additional Appropriation request to fund short-fall for current staff and to fund six vacancies for five months of the fiscal year. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) \$164,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.1204 MINIMUM MANPOWER - Additional Appropriation requested to fund estimated amount needed for balance of fiscal year due to vacancies and long-term sick leaves. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) \$ 15,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 450.3443 HYDRANTS MAINTENANCE - Additional Appropriation requested to purchase parts and pay contractor excavation charges for remainder of fiscal year. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) \$ 7,505.00 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT - Code 650.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT - Additional Appropriation requested to purchase IBM Model PCXT Word Processor in order to facilitate the operation, planning and scheduling of year-round programs. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

DEFERRED BY
FINANCE BOARD.
Not before this
Board tonight.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said the Board of Finance DEFERRED action on this item, and is not with this Board this evening.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said at the request of Mr. DeLuca, Item #6 was taken off the Consent Agenda. Mr. Donahue Moved for approval.

MR. DeLUCA said the Parks and Recreation Committee concurred.

THE PRESIDENT said that would serve as a Second.

- (6) \$ 36,440.00 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT - Code 650.2310 - MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT - Additional Appropriation requested to replace deteriorated equipment throughout the City's playgrounds and athletic facilities. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DeLUCA asked if Supt. Giordano, when he appeared before the Fiscal Committee, explained whether or not he plans to come out with a preventive maintenance program for the future. To replace all this equipment at one shot gives the implication that the Board of Recreation has not done their job in providing for preventive maintenance, or gone out each year either replacing something, or getting into a bind where at one shot we must replace all of our recreational facilities. What are his plans for the future?

MR. DONAHUE said the question of preventive maintenance on this equipment never came up. The two reasons for this being funded is to eliminate a serious liability for the City, and also to bring this equipment up to a new consumer safety recommendation as promulgated by the Federal Consumer Safety Commission. Preventive maintenance was not discussed. Most of this equipment when it arrives is either painted or constructed and designed in such a way that it can withstand the elements for a long period of time. The only maintenance is generally repainting periodically, or small repairs.

MR. DeLUCA said he hears what Mr. Donahue is saying but it really does not make much sense to him, to a certain extent. In all industries, they more or less have a preventive maintenance program, similar to the FLEET MANAGEMENT PROGRAM for the City. Fleet Management may be a bad example, but that was intended to be a cure-all, also, but later on down the line, we had to vote for \$100,000 for fleet management. He Moved to reduce this amount by \$10,000, leaving \$26,440.00. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA said his rationale in Moving for this reduction is that \$10,000 is for expenses required on school property. Although certain areas are set aside for Mr. Giordano to run his recreational programs, such as Little League baseball, he finds it difficult to believe that the Board of Education with a budget of more than \$60 Million can't find \$10,000 in their funds to install the fences at these school grounds. There is a potential liability and protection must be provided. One would expect the Board of Education would be willing to meet this safety criteria, because the fences serve more than just Board of Recreation activities and young people.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said the reason for the installation of this fencing is because of the many softball programs that are run by the Board of Recreation at these various fields. If the Board of Recreation does not continue to run them at these fields because of the liabilities involved, or if we have to wait for a period of time for fencing to be erected, or if someone is injured because the fencing is not in place, the liability will be the City's. The only reason they put the fencing up is to protect spectators who would attend softball or baseball games at the various fields. He does not think there is a need to provide that kind of protection for any other agency in the City. The \$10,000 should be funded to protect the City as a whole.

MR. WIDER spoke against the reduction.

MR. LIVINGSTON thanked the entire Board for the flowers and warm thoughts that were sent to him during his illness. He wants them to know that his love, respect, and appreciation for his colleagues on this Board, and the past Boards he has served on, will continue to be overwhelming and will not be diminished.

Speaking to this particular item, this Board cannot force the Board of Education to reallocate their expenditures, and this funding should be approved as requested, with no cut made at this time.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion to cut. DEFEATED with 9 Yes, 20 No, 3 Non-Voting.

A machine vote on the Main Motion to approve \$36,440 for Item 6, was APPROVED with 24 Yes votes, 2 No votes, 1 Abstention, and 5 Non-Voting.

- (7) \$ 44,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #343 SCALE HOUSE REPAIRS. Additional Appropriation requested for large platform on scale that is badly deteriorated. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani's letter 2/4/85. Contingent upon approval by Planning Board and Board of Finance.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS and SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. DONAHUE said Items #8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are all related, and they involve providing money for operations of the Transportation Center Garage to honor a commitment we have made with the State of Connecticut, that when the construction of the garage is finished, that we shall provide the operation to allow the garage to open and to solve some of the problems that commuters are facing in a timely fashion. The total amount was reduced to \$75,000 by the Board of Finance. For the sake of clarification, he will go over each one and vote separately.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

-0-

- (8) \$--1,220.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 284.2310 MAINTENANCE OF FACILITY - TRANSPORTATION CENTER GARAGE - Additional Appropriation request anticipated that some funds will be needed when Center Garage is activated. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.
- BOARD OF
FINANCE
reduced to
Zero.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #8 was \$1,220.00 and was reduced to Zero by the Board of Finance.

THE PRESIDENT said this is no longer on our Agenda.

- (9) \$ 20,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 284.2320 ALTERATION OF BUILDINGS - TRANSPORTATION CENTER GARAGE - Additional Appropriation request for manproofing new Center Garage essential to obtain reasonable security. Some money may be returnable from the State. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon approval of the Board of Finance.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #9 was approved by the Fiscal Committee by a vote of 4 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstention.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said Transportation concurs.

MR. BURKE made a point of clarification, asking for a definition of manproofing.

MR. DONAHUE said funding is needed to provide fencing, gates to restrict access to individuals not going in and out of the parking garage to get their cars, to pay parking fees; it is a form of controlling access to the building so it can provide for greater security.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approval of Item #9. APPROVED with Mrs. Conti voting No; and there being 5 Abstentions: Reps. Maihock, Guroian, Skovgaard, Livingston, David Martin.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #10 was \$3,000 and has been reduced by the Board of Finance to \$1,600, being for gas and electric for the Transportation Center Garage. He Moved for approval.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said Transportation concurs.

MR. BURKE said he was sorry he was unable to attend the Committee meeting, and he would like to know for what length of time this funding will cover. Also why is the City appropriating money for the garage when the City does not own it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said we are responsible for all costs of operation. The State will continue to own the building but we have agreed with them that we will provide for the operation of the facility. We will staff it after we have a C.O. (Certificate of Occupancy), provide contract operations of the facility on a day-to-day basis, etc.

MR. BURKE said since we do not have a C.O., and we have not accepted the building, why, then, do we appropriate money on a contingency of something that may or may not happen, according to the papers recently; and when it does, we have no idea. Why are we appropriating money now?

MR. DONAHUE said for one thing, there are at least three engineering firms studying the condition of the Transportation Center Garage. Everyone feels that by April 1st, we will be able to go forward and begin operation. We do not meet until after that period of time. None of this money will be spent in any way if there is no C.O. granted by the Building Department of the City, but to honor the spirit and the legal aspect of the commitment that we made with the State, we have to be able to run that garage the day we get the C.O. This only provides for that. If the C.O. doesn't come for whatever reason, the money will not be spent or allocated for spending in that garage until the C.O. does come.

The projection of income from that garage in a year is somewhere around \$500,000, of which in excess of \$200,000 will be profit from the garage. That money will be placed in a revolving fund for future operations of the Transportation Complex.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked why was Item #10 reduced to \$1,600 from \$3,000, and for what period would this cover.

MR. DONAHUE said it was decided after the reduction by the Board of Finance who cut all the items down to a total of \$75,000, that the department could reallocate to fit in with this sum. This is for funding from the date of the garage opening until the end of the current fiscal year, so they felt they could live with \$1,600 in the gas and electric account.

MR. LIVINGSTON wants the record to show his reasons for abstaining on these items, and that is he questions why the City should be the one who must always show good faith and appropriate money. Is there not a responsibility for others to fulfill their obligations? Granted that we are not the occupants of the building, There seems to be something wrong when a legislative body seemingly goes along with an idea simply because it doesn't seem to be their responsibility at that given time, it keeps leading Mr. Livingston back to the problems they had with the Multi-Purpose Incinerator concerning which instance, it keeps coming back to him that had this Board been more scrutinizing at that time, before they were led down the primrose path into an awful lot of outrageous problems. He hopes that at some point tonight, a motion is placed on the floor to hold or reject some of these items because he honestly feels the best way to alert all of the parties concerned that this Board is going to use its rights to scrutinize; and not go along just for the sake of going along. The Board of Finance exercised their rights in making cuts. We are asked to approve money for supposedly from April 1st to June 30th. What if is May 1st, or June 1st, or July 1st, or even later, before the facility opens with a C.O.? He is very disappointed and will abstain on these items.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI agrees with much of what Mr. Livingston has said. This was discussed at great length in Committee, but on this particular item, she feels it important to mention that part of this \$1,600 is for the facilities being provided now at the Railroad Station, such as the boxcar with lighting, some heating, etc. This is not really for the new Transportation Center entirely. We should provide the best comfort we can for those poor souls down there, who have been put upon so poorly these past months. She urges voting for this item, and not for the others.

MS. RINALDI Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

| | |
|--|---|
| 1,600.00 (10) \$ -3,000.00 | - <u>PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 284.2720 GAS & ELECTRIC - TRANSPORTATION CENTER GARAGE</u> - Additional Appropriation request for lighting and heating new Center Garage; more funds needed to meet needs of present buildings in this fiscal year. Requested by Mayor Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval. |
| <u>REDUCED BY</u> <u>BOARD OF</u> <u>FINANCE</u> | |

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approving \$1,600 for Item #10. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote with Rep. David Martin Abstaining.

| | |
|---|---|
| 7,000.00 (11) \$ -8,660.00 | - <u>PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 284.2916 ADMINISTRATION/ SECURITY - TRANSPORTATION CENTER GARAGE</u> - Additional Appropriation requested for security guards seven days a week as soon as Center Garage is activated. Requested by Mayor Thom serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval. |
| <u>REDUCED BY</u> <u>BOARD OF</u> <u>FINANCE.</u> | |

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #11 was reduced from \$8,660 to \$7,000; and it is to provide security for the garage seven days a week, and he Moved for approval of the \$7,000.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said Transportation Committee concurs.

MRS. CONTI Moved to Hold in Committee. Seconded. This is required for the opening and not for the existing facilities now. Those of us who attended the joint meeting of Public Works and Transportation, discovered that the entire complex is so beset with design flaws and riddled with problems that there is not one area of the structure that is sound or safe. It all has to be re-done. The garage was designed and built by the same people. There is no reason to expect that that is in perfect shape while the rest of the complex is so poorly designed and is so unsound. She cannot give one penny, in good conscience, to open that garage. It has not been stress-tested. In addition to the consultant retained by the City, the contractor is so concerned that he, too, has brought in his own consultant.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI is opposed to returning to committee. Last month the commuters' problems were discussed at length. What is being attempted here tonight by appropriating this money is to have everything ready so that when the time comes that all the consultants, the Contractor has one, the City has one, the Federal Government has one, and the Architect has one; when they sit down and agree that all the problems are solved, and no more can be anticipated, and the City can take it over, the City will be ready to set everything in motion to open the garage, allow the people to park, open the street so it is possible to get from Washington Blvd. to Atlantic St., do away with the parking lot which we are now paying about \$25,000 per month to rent, and give the commuters a break. When our own Building Department issues the C.O., which is additional protection for us, everything will be ready to go.

MR. DONAHUE concurs with what Mr. Boccuzzi has said, and he wishes to remind the Board that the most important thing the City has to provide there is security. Visible security from Day 1, when the garage is opened.

MRS. GUROIAN said she tends to disagree with Mr. Boccuzzi. She feels in appropriating this money, it is just another demonstration of the Board's tacit approval and agreement that the garage should be opened irregardless of whether or not it is safe. She is loathe to appropriate even one dollar for something which has not yet been proven to be safe, but rather is dangerous. Money will come in every day from the meters; they will not be penniless. If, as has been stated by Mr. Donahue, the facility is going to show a six-figure profit, then there will be a profit every day. She will not vote to spend a penny.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED with a few No votes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion to Return to Committee. DEFEATED with 10 Yes, 21 No, 1 Abstention, 1 Not Voting. Mr. David Martin will be recorded as voting Yes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Main Motion to approve \$7,000 for Item #11. APPROVED with 24 Yes, 6 No, 3 Abstentions.

46,400.00
(12) ~~\$-57,120.00~~ - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 284.5560 CONTRACT PARK-
REDUCED BY ING GARAGE - TRANSPORTATION CENTER GARAGE - Additional
FINANCE BOARD. Appropriation request to sign contract with Edson Park-
ing for the next four months. Requested by Mayor Thom
Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance
approval.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item 12 has been reduced from \$57,120 to \$46,400, and he Moved for approval.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said Transportation Committee concurs.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said the reservations expressed indicate a very grave concern about this garage and its problems. She is anxious for it to open, but when a consultant, V. Bonnesen, believes that the series of diagonal cracks near the support columns may have resulted from faulty design, it does frighten some of us because it shows what a fiasco there is in the Transportation Building right now. This problem won't be prolonged month after month if everything is in order; but if it is not in order, then it will take time and they won't need the funds immediately. Again, she feels the Board should consider putting this back into committee. She Moved to return it to committee. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion to Re-Commit. DEFEATED with 8 Yes, 23 No, 2 Abstentions.

MR. D. MARTIN said, ^{under normal circumstances,} he feels all the funds should be approved. The Parking Director and the Public Works Commissioner have assured the Committee that none of these funds will be expended until everything is completely safe and assured. He is abstaining only because he feels uncomfortable relinquishing a responsibility until there is a more firm understanding of exactly the situation at the garage. Given the history of the problems, he takes this position, which is his reason for abstaining, and for the record.

MRS. GUROLAN asked exactly what is this \$46,400 for?

MR. DONAHUE said all the City garages are run by contracting the service out. Edison Parking Systems runs all the garages. There are certain maintenance functions they have to perform. They have to handle the money back and forth, and account for all the funds; they provide personnel to do that for all the hours that the garages are open.

MRS. CONTI said she wanted to clarify something Mr. Donahue said and she is not sure he meant what he said. He said the funds from this garage would go into a Revolving Fund to help support the garage. It was Mrs. Conti's understanding that the revenues would go into the General Fund. Which is correct?

MR. DONAHUE said he understood under the State's agreement that the money would go into a Revolving Fund so it can be used to maintain the entire Transportation Center. It will help to provide funds for its ongoing operation. The State has the power to do that. None of this money will go into the City's General Fund. It will stay ear-marked for the Transportation Center Garage and Complex.

MRS. CONTI asked where, then, was the profit to the City, that the Board was told the City would receive.

MR. DONAHUE said he was not sure he and Mrs. Conti were talking about the same thing, but that Mr. Boccuzzi wished to speak on the matter.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI said he understood that the income from the garage, after all operating expenses have been paid, goes into a fund that will maintain the garage the next year, the year after, and so on. It is like a "rainy day fund". It would also cover their Capital Projects needs down the road. The fees from the garage and complex pay for the day-to-day operation of the facility, and what is left goes into that rainy day fund for whatever future need arises. The City cannot take any of this money to put into its General Fund to expend it for road repairs, or other such things, unrelated to the complex.

MR. D. MARTIN said the City is going to be responsible for all operating expenses of this entire station, garage, and all other aspects of the station included. The revenues from the Center will come primarily from the rental of space to shops, if that should come to be, and from the revenues from the parking garage. Those two sources of funds, and obviously, primarily, from the rental of the garage, are there to offset all operating costs for the entire Transportation Center. Then, above and beyond that, there is a "revolving fund", and he uses that description for want of a better word, with regard to a long-term capital issue with regard to the State.

MRS. CONTI said then what they were told that the City would realize a \$235,000 revenue is incorrect.

MR. DONAHUE said there will be a profit realized above the operating expenses, which is what he was talking about, and that money will be ear-marked and placed into a revolving account for future expenditures at the Transportation Complex. The operating expenses will be offset, and other monies will be set aside for future use, but none of the funds will go back into the General Fund of the City from the profit. It is a separate fund to be set up.

MR. BURKE said when you have an excess of income over expenses, that is exactly what it is; it does not become a profit until it is distributed. This is not distributed. It is held there, so it is merely an excess of income over expenses, and not of profit. That connotes the fact that the City is going to get money from this to do with it as it pleases, which it is not.

MS. RINALDI Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Main Motion. The \$46,400 has been APPROVED with 22 Yes, 6 No, 5 Abstentions.

APPROVED \$100,000.00 (\$50,000 held by Public Works Committee)

(13) ~~\$150,000.00~~ - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - BUREAU OF HIGHWAYS AND MAINTENANCE - Code 314.2181 ROCK, SALT, AND SAND.
 APPROVED: \$100,000; Additional Appropriation request required due to storms thus far encountered. Requested by Mayor
 28 Yes; 2 Abstain. Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of
 3 Non-Voting; Finance approval.
 HELD IN COMMITTEE
 \$50,000; 17 Yes,
 11 No, 3 Abstain,
 1 Non-Voting.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said on Item #13, it was the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee by a vote of 8 in favor, none opposed, to approve this sum and he would so Move. Seconded.

MR. PERILLO said the Public Works and Sewer Committee met on Feb. 25th. Knowing that the Public Works Department was \$64,614 in deficit, this Committee reduced this \$150,000 request by \$50,000, approving \$100,000. The reason is that no one defended this appropriation whatsoever. Two days later, they had all the information they needed to give to the Fiscal Committee, but not the Public Works Committee. By a vote of 3 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention, the Committee voted to cut this request by \$50,000, and he so Moved. Seconded. This is to cut, not return to committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to amend the motion to reduce the amount to be approved to \$100,000, and to return to committee the balance of \$50,000, for further information.

THE PRESIDENT said the proper Motion would be then to send that \$50,000 back to committee because the amendment to the motion was to reduce it by \$50,000. The Motion on the floor is to send the \$50,000 back to committee...

MRS. GUROIAN interjected here she disagrees. She said, in effect, Mr. Perillo did not ask for a division of the question, as Mr. Donahue did previously. Mr. Perillo moved for a cut to \$100,000. Now, for Mr. Boccuzzi to Move to first amend the item to send \$50,000 back to Committee is wrong. Mr. Perillo's Motion to amend to approve \$100,000 should be voted on first, as he did not include that \$50,000 at all.

THE PRESIDENT asked the Parliamentarians for a ruling on the question. Mr. Skovgaard said the Motion to Re-commit would take precedence over the Motion to cut the \$50,000.

MRS. GUROIAN said we do not vote to cut on this Board. The Board votes to approve set amounts, whatever is the final figure.

THE PRESIDENT said the Board votes really to amend and Mr. Perillo Moved to amend that \$150,000 by cutting \$50,000, which is a proper Motion.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the Public Works Committee did not get the information that was given to the Fiscal Committee, so until such time as Public Works and the Administration provide that information to them, they will hold it. The next time the Committee meets, if the information is not forthcoming, the Committee will request that it be deleted; or if the information is not satisfactory, it will be deleted.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she had a Point of Information in an attempt to clarify this. At that meeting, she thought Mr. O'Brien said that there was a \$52,600 deficit in that account, and she wondered did she understand the amount correctly.

MR. PERILLO said the correct amount at that particular time was given as a deficit of \$64,614. By giving them \$100,000, they could pay off the deficit and still have a balance of \$35,386 on hand, which would buy a lot of salt and sand. That was the Committee's feeling.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI asked if Mr. Perillo could advise how much was spent last year.

MR. PERILLO responded it was \$313,186 that was expended last year. This year to date they have expended \$229,600, and they have a deficit of \$64,614, total \$294,214.

MR. ZELINSKI said he ^{is} on the Public Works Committee and his reason not to approve the \$50,000 was not due to lack of information, but because he felt there should not be a surplus in this account at this time so that transfers could be made to other accounts, which transfers do not require any action by this Board, only by the Finance Board, or in \$500 amounts by the Controller. This is the time of year when the Board of Finance is inundated with transfer requests before the end of the fiscal year. He feels the other two members of the Committee held this same opinion.

THE PRESIDENT said she wished to make something clear to the Board. If a member wants to vote to reduce the amount by \$50,000, the proper vote would be to vote against re-committing, which would give the member the opportunity to vote on Mr. Perillo's Motion to cut the \$50,000.

MR. BOCCUZZI said if you want to cut the money, you vote against the Motion. By putting \$50,000 in committee, theoretically, the Board is giving them \$100,000 which is what the Public Works Committee wants done. There is no way the Public Works Department could transfer the \$50,000 this Board is sitting on, to any place they want. If the Public Works Department can prove to the Committee that they need that \$50,000, they can come down here and ask for it, and not have to wait three months to go through the procedure from scratch.

MR. DONAHUE said he would go along with the Public Works Committee and send the \$50,000 back in committee. There was, however, a projection of a deficit running in this account, running up to \$202,000, so he thinks it would be prudent to return to committee and hold, rather than deny it, and have it go through the Mayor, the Planning Board, and the Board of Finance, and this Board.

The question was MOVED, Seconded, and CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on sending the \$50,000 back to ^{Fiscal} committee, the primary committee.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the Public Works Committee will again be the secondary Committee on the \$50,000, if and when it might come up for a vote. If they are satisfied with the information they get then, they will recommend approval; if not, they will ask it to be denied.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion to send \$50,000 back to committee has been APPROVED with 17 Yes, 11 No, 3 Abstain, and 1 Non-Vote.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for approval of \$100,000. for Item #13. Seconded.

APPROVED by machine vote with 28 Yes votes, 2 Abstentions, 3 Non-Voting, for \$100,000 for Acct. 314.2181 Rock Salt and Sand. Mr. David Martin and Mrs. Nakian will be recorded as voting Yes.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

25,000.00 recommended by Public Works Committee
(14) ~~-\$100,000.00~~ - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - BUREAU OF HIGHWAYS AND MAINTENANCE - Code 314.1201 OVERTIME (SNOW AND FLOOD EMERGENCY) - Additional Appropriation request required to meet projected needs for next few months. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.
APPROVED \$25,000 voice vote with Nakian & Skovgaard abstaining.
DELETE \$75,000 OK
17 Yes, 11 No, 3 Abstentions, 1 Non-Vote.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee recommended approval of the \$100,000 and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. PERILLO said the Public Works Committee by a vote of 4-1 recommended a cut of \$75,000, and approving \$25,000, and he so Moved. Seconded. The rationale is that it being so late in the season, with only a few weeks left of winter, and they still have \$37,541. in the account the night that the Committee met. Giving them \$25,000 more, would leave them with \$62,541, so if they can spend that in the next 30 days, they are doing pretty good work. Seconded.

MR. TARANTO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote. APPROVED with 16 Yes, 14 No, 1 Abstention, and 2 Non-Voting. The \$75,000 will be cut.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on appropriating \$25,000. APPROVED with Mr. Skovgaard and Mrs. Nakian Abstaining.

(15) \$ 60,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - BUREAU OF HIGHWAYS AND MAINTENANCE - Code 314.5530 CONTRACTORS, SNOW REMOVAL - Additional Appropriation requested for snow removal contractors. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the \$60,000, and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. PERILLO said the night the Committee met, the account showed a balance of \$100,000. Why do they need \$60,000 more, if they still have \$100,000. The Committee voted to cut the entire \$60,000.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Re-commit the \$60,000 back to the committee. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD Seconded, also, the Motion to Re-commit.

There was a substantial discrepancy between the information received by the two committees, so it is appropriate that the Public Works Dept. be able to provide the same information to every committee of the Board dealing with a question before it.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MS. RINALDI Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Item #15 for \$60,000 to be returned to committee. APPROVED to re-commit with 18 Yes, 13 No, and 2 Non-Voting.

- (16) \$160,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 323.2620 REPAIRS, EQUIPMENT - Additional Appropriation requested due to age of fleet and repairs more expensive. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/84. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #16 received the unanimous approval of the Fiscal Committee and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. PERILLO said the Public Works Committee voted 5-0 to HOLD this in committee, the full amount of \$160,000. The night of their meeting, they had \$49,800 left in that account. The total approved by all Boards was \$285,000, and with \$49,800 on hand, they had something like \$334,800. Last year, the total amount used was \$345,518. The Committee requests a breakdown of where they spent \$235,105 and requests also what will they spend the \$160,000 on. On that basis, he Moves to hold for a month. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Returning to Committee Item #16 for \$160,000. APPROVED TO RETURN by a vote of 27 Yes, 4 No, 1 Abstention and 1 Non-Voting.

- (17) \$ 6,000.00 - STAMFORD YOUTH PLANNING AND COORDINATING AGENCY - (SYPCA) - Code 205.7551 MEDIATION SERVICE - Additional Appropriation requested for development of mediation program designed to serve Stamford's youth. Amount to be reimbursed by a grant. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/5/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said this grant money is already on hand, and the Fiscal Committee voted 5 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention to approve this item and he so Moved.

MRS. NAKIAN said Education, Welfare and Government concurred.

THE PRESIDENT said that will serve as a Second.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI spoke against this appropriation. This is a mediation program for which there is only money for this year, and if it is approved now, it will be like everything else, nobody wants to let it go, and it would be piled on the back of the local taxpayer next year. They say they will give the youths 15 or 18 hours of training and they are expected to go out and mediate disputes. This is not adequate training and more problems can be caused than can be solved, with half-trained people. It should be denied and we should not add another new program or department to the budget. The whole thing is ridiculous and should be by-passed. There is adequate room in other programs to handle youths that need mediation.

MR. LIVINGSTON said there are many agencies in the City, one is a youth-oriented agency within the Police Department, we have a Family and Children's Guidance Service, we have all kinds of different programs within our Board of Education that are oriented toward the youth, and quite frankly and honestly, Mr. Livingston feels that we have the personnel, equipment, and skills and knowledge within other agencies already in place in this City to adequately handle the function of what SYPCA appears to be intended for.

Mr. Livingston said he knows the argument, that, well, this is a grant, and if we don't take it, someone else will take it. At the same time, he feels everyone is well aware of what is happening within Washington, D.C. these days. One of the things happening, is that programs are being eliminated, and pretty soon, we may well be faced in deciding what are we going to keep, what is going to go by the wayside. And, at some point, he feels our State Government has been talking about an end to revenue sharing. \$6,000 is not that much, but once we start adding programs, just when and where does it stop.

Mr. Livingston is not convinced that the services that this group is offering is not already available within the framework of the different agencies in the City, and may well be duplicated.

MR. AUSTIN Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote, requesting the Leaders to get members out of the caucus rooms, that a two-thirds' vote is required. APPROVED with 24 Yes, 7 No, 2 Abstentions.

- (18) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH THE CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR \$30,000.00 AVAILABLE TO AID IN TWO CAPITAL PROJECTS CONCERNING TRANSPORTATION.
Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (19) \$100,000.00 - TRANSPORTATION CENTER - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1984/85 ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION - Code 284.538 TRANSPORTATION CENTER MULTI-MODAL INFORMATION DISPLAY. \$90,000 is grant from Federal Dept. of Transportation and State of Connecticut Dept. of Transportation; and \$10,000 is Additional Appropriation. (\$90,000 is funding by grant and \$10,000 funding by bonds.) Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/3/85. Planning Board approved 1/29/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (20) \$ 32,000.00 - TRANSIT DISTRICT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1984/85 - Code 283.780 BUS SIGNS - Funding has become available through UMTA Program for bus stop and informational signs. Recommended funding source is grant. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/3/85. Planning Board approved 1/29/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (21) \$ 13,000.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1984/85 - Code 114.136 DIAL-A-RIDE MINI-BUS REPLACEMENT - this is an additional \$13,000 grant. Recommended funding source is a grant. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/3/85. Planning Board approved 1/29/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (22) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A BUDGET APPLICATION FOR THE STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$636,774.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/22/85.

MR. DONAHUE said his Committee voted 7 in favor and one opposed to recommend approval of the item and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #22. APPROVED WITH Mrs. Conti voting No, and Mrs. Maihock Abstaining.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for approval of the Consent Agenda Items #2,3,4,7,18, 19, 20, 21. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said that Item #21 seems to have an apparent miscalculation in the mathematics. They requested \$13,000 but it appears from their submitted material that they intended to ask for \$23,000. If Mr. Donahue will inform them that they only got \$13,000, the Committee would want them to be informed of that.

MR. DONAHUE said all the papers that were submitted show \$13,000, and the Board of Finance approved \$13,000 so that is all that is before this Board.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

- (1) FOR RE-PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 483 CONCERNING THE REDUCTION AND CONTROL OF NOISE. Submitted by Rep. Robert Skovgaard 9/20/84. Held in Steering 10/17/84. Approved for publication 12/3/84. Held in Committee 1/7 and 2/4/85.

MR. SKOVGAARD said his Committee met Monday, February 25, 1985 at 7:30 P.M., Conference Room II of the Board of Education Building. Present were Committee members Dudley, Maihock, Martin, Nakian, Powers, Zelinski, Skovgaard and Morris. Also in attendance were Asst. Corp. Counsel Wm. Hennessey, Dr. Ralph Gofstein, George Jepsen, Douglas Reid, Richard Saunders, Renee Kahn, Ralph Loomis, William Jorman, Daniel Weiner, Sherry Dorfman, and Reps. David Martin, Sandra Goldstein, Claire Fishman and John Mallozzi, as well as members of the press.

At this meeting, a number of amendments were proposed by the Committee, all of which are in front of the members tonight. He asked if the Chair wished them Moved individually or en masse. They were all approved unanimously 6-0.

THE PRESIDENT said they should be taken individually, as briefly as possible.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the first amendment that was Moved was to Section 3.5 concerning the definition of Construction Equipment, including the words "or air or hydraulic pressure," after the word "electric power", as well as changing the word "operation" to "operated" which he believes was put in incorrectly originally. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote, on this first amendment. CARRIED.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the second amendment in Sec. 3.6, definition of day-time hours, amending the Sunday, Federal and State Holidays to 10:00 A.M. through 8:00 P.M. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the third amendment is Section 3.17 is the definition of night-time hours: night-time hours shall mean the hours between 8:00 P.M. and 8:00 A.M. Sunday evening through Saturday morning, except Saturday night shall mean the hours between Saturday 8:00 P.M. and Sunday 10:00 A.M. and Federal and State holidays. The intent was to conform night-time hours to the converse of day-time hours, and he so Moves. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PPRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED unanimously.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the fourth amendment is to Section 5.5, which is exemptions from the noise standards. The first change is in the title, changing the title from "Exemptions" to "Exemptions and Special Conditions" and he would so Move. He would also Move in the introductory sentence in that Section, the following shall be exempt from these regulations subject to the special conditions as may be", inserting the words "may be", spelled out. And also adding in Section 5.5a, sentence reading "it being the express intention of this provision to prohibit the use of contruction equipment and machinery before the hour of 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M. Saturday, and 10:00 A.M. Sunday; and in Section 5.5e, to include at the end of sentence "it being the express intention of this provision to prohibit the use of equipment and machinery used in demolition work before the hour of 7:00 A.M. Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M. Saturday, and 10:00 A.M. Sunday; provided that when considered emergency work, demolition shall be exempt at all times from the noise levels set in this regulation.

Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved for the change in Section 9, that being the addition of one final sentence. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote. (the amendment was not read into the record, as the President had said there appeared to be no objections to these amendments.)

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved for an amendment to Section 11, by amending the title and adding a Section 11.3 mediation. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved to delete the original Section 13 as had been proposed in Committee, and substituting for it, a new Section 13. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT said she would entertain a Motion to re-publish, as amended. Moved. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote, with Mrs. Perillo in opposition.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted to Hold items 2, 3, 4.

He said the Committee voted 4-1-2 in favor of Item #5 for the lease for the Aid to the Retarded of Belltown School. However, this vote was contingent upon the Board of Finance approval, which approval was NOT granted, so he Moved to Hold item #5. Voice vote CARRIED.

He said the Committee voted to Hold Item #6.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE DELETING SECTION 14 of ORDINANCE 80.7 SUPPLEMENTAL. (This concerns the waiver of building permit fees on buildings that serve non-profit or eleemosynary institution). Submitted by Reps. D. Martin, Morris, Skovgaard, Nakian, T. Martin, Powers and Maihock 1/4/85. Held in Committee 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CREATING A WAITING PERIOD BEFORE THE START OF DEMOLITION WORK. Submitted by Reps. Nakian, Goldstein, Fishman, and Mallozzi 1/9/85. Held in Committee 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AND LEASE CONCERNING THE APPROVAL OF A LEASE BETWEEN THE STAMFORD BOYS CLUB, INC. AND THE CITY OF STAMFORD FOR PREMISES LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF STILLWATER AVENUE FOR THE TERM OF TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS, COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE FIRST MONTH AFTER APPROVAL OF LEASE BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES AT THE ANNUAL RENTAL OF ONE DOLLAR (\$1.00). Submitted by John E. Smyth, Asst. Corp. Counsel 12/28/84. Planning Board approved 12/18/84.. Board of Finance approved 1/10/85. Held in Committee 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AND LEASE CONCERNING APPROVAL OF A LEASE BETWEEN THE AID FOR THE RETARDED, INC., and THE CITY OF STAMFORD FOR PREMISES LOCATED AT BELLTOWN SCHOOL, 21 BURDICK STREET, STAMFORD, EXCEPT THE LAND WHICH PRESENTLY IS OCCUPIED BY THE "PORTABLE CLASSROOMS", FOR THE TERM OF TWENTY-FIVE (25) YEARS, COMMENCING ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE MONTH FOLLOWING EXECUTION OF LEASE AND APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOR A TERM RENT OF ONE DOLLAR (\$1.00) PAYABLE UPON EXECUTION OF LEASE. Submitted by John E. Smyth, Asst. Corp. Counsel, 1/8/85. Planning Board approved 2/11/85. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS and SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. SKOVGAARD MOVED TO HOLD THIS ITEM. BOARD OF FINANCE DENIED IT.

MR. SKOVGAARD SAID ITEM #6 IS BEING HELD.

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REQUIRING THE EXTERMINATION OF RODENTS AND VERMIN PRIOR TO THE DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES. Submitted by Dr. R. M. Gofstein, M.D., Health Director, letter 1/28/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY said the Committee met on Thursday, Feb. 21, 1985, at Police Headquarters following a joint meeting with the Fiscal and Personnel Comm. Present were Reps. Burke, Blum, Morris and Dudley. Also present was Anne MacDonald, President of the Board of Education. Mary Jane Scarpolino, Bd. of Ed. Personnel Director, and Dan Cook, Bd. of Ed. Dir. of Admin. Services.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DUDLEY (continuing). He said after receiving a reply from Deborah Steeves, Sr. Asst. Corp. Counsel, concerning this matter, it was the Committee's consensus that if the job-sharing approach is for the better of the City, then it should be further explored; therefore, the Committee will submit amendments to Ord. 531 at the next Steering meeting. This item is being HELD.

- (1) CLARIFICATION AS TO WHETHER THE JOB-SHARING APPROACH IS CONSISTENT WITH THE INTENT OF ORDINANCE NO. 531 CREATING THE POSITION OF S.H.A.P.E. DIRECTOR IN THE UNCLASSIFIED SERVICE. Requested by Finance Comm. Paul A. Pacter, letter 12/21/84. Held in Committee 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION REQUESTING THAT STAFF ANALYST OF THE BOARD OF FINANCE BE INCLUDED IN DENTAL, HEALTH, HOSPITALIZATION, AND MAJOR MEDICAL POLICIES AVAILABLE TO OTHER CITY EMPLOYEES. Staff Analyst is permanent part-time position. Requested by Michael G. Morgan, Board of Finance Chairman, 1/21/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. DUDLEY said this is being Held.

SUSPENSION OF RULES TO BRING ON THE FLOOR AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA
Proper procedure followed and approved to Suspend Rules.

- (3) TO CONSIDER RATIFICATION OF LABOR CONTRACT BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' CONTRACT - Rep. Dudley.

MR. DUDLEY said this item must be acted upon tonight or will be automatically approved, and he Moves for approval. Seconded.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said he wished to voice his disapproval. He is aware that nothing can be done about the contract and the salaries. From his viewpoint, the salaries are indeed excessive. We had better wake up. This is a 7% increase with an inflation for 1984 of 3%. People seem to feel it is their divine right to a salary increase. Mr. Schlechtweg is not awed by amounts of salaries, no matter how large, but in his opinion, these tonight are excessive salaries. It is time to take a hard look at them now and in the future. He wished to go on record as to how he feels on the subject.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she cannot understand why an item is before a legislative body when the legislative body has not right to be voting on it, or if they vote on it, something is automatically going to happen. She will abstain purely because she disagrees with the methodology on how it is presented on the Board. She is here to vote seriously, not to play around. Her vote of abstention is a protest on the manner of presentation.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said to clarify the questions, what is before the Board now is the approval of a contract between the City and the Board of Education Administrators, is something that this Board has a say over. The Board can vote to approve, or can vote to deny the contract. Mr. Dudley's original point was that if the Board does not consider the matter tonight, if the Board voted not to consider it because it was not on the Agenda, because the Board submitted this contract to this Board, we have 30 days from submittal during which we can act; if we don't act, it is an automatic passage. But, since we have chosen to consider it on our agenda tonight, we have a say on what we do. We can approve it, or we can oppose it.

MR. BOCCUZZI had a question of Mr. Dudley. Is it correct that this Board is just approving the contract tonight, and not appropriating any money tonight?

MR. DUDLEY said that was correct.

MR. BOCCUZZI said they have to come back for the money unless they want to pay it out of their own budget.

MR. DUDLEY said that was his understanding.

MR. LIVINGSTON said he wanted to clarify his understanding of what Mr. Boccuzzi just said, that if we are just passing on the contract and will have to pass on the funding later, if the Board of Education comes to an agreement with a bargaining unit, then we are forced to go along with it anyway. Mr. Schlechtweg just stated a very valid reason for this contract to be opposed right now, if it is ever going to be opposed at all by this Board. If the inflation rate is 3% or less, and this contract represents increases of 7%, Mr. Livingston said in his industry, the employees received about 5%, more or less. If this Board of Education is out of line, it should be denied now and go back for re-negotiation.

MRS. GUROIAN asked for a Point of Clarification from the CHAIR, in view of what the CHAIR stated, if this is rejected, what happens next?

THE PRESIDENT said if this is rejected, the Board of Education and the bargaining unit can....she asked Mr. Boccuzzi to outline the procedure.

MR. BOCCUZZI said if it is rejected, it goes back to the Board of Education and the bargaining unit again. If the unit decides to go to Binding Arbitration, then you are taking the chance of what happened in Darien, they got 8% and 9%. If you want to take a chance of it going to Binding Arbitration, then you vote it down. Otherwise, you can vote for this contract and when the money request comes in, you can do what you please.

MR. LYONS said this is a responsibility of this Board under the Charter, and we either vote for it, against it, or abstain. If we vote against it, we run the risk of having someone in Hartford determining what these employees will receive. If you are willing to do that, fine. Or, we can vote for it and say this is what was negotiated the best possible by our Board of Education, and that's it.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said this contract should be ratified for the several reasons he went on to state. It is better than Binding Arbitration would bring, he thinks, judging from past experience.

MR. BURKE said two groups of people (Board of Education and the labor union) sat down for months, hammered out over the table the give-and-take, a contract. They both have indicated to this Committee that this was the best agreement that they could reach. There is absolutely no reason on the face of this agreement that we can sit here in judgment on this. I don't think any of us really know enough about the contract, what went into it, and why any particular clause is there in favor of another. However, when we do get to the money, that is something else again. If the contract settlement says 6.9%, and in our wisdom we find the City cannot afford 6.9%, then 5%, 6%, is allocated and it will have to go as far as it can go under that existing labor agreement or term of the contract, which is what Mr. Boccuzzi was referring to. On the face of it, there is no logic to turning down this contract as a contract.

MR. DUDLEY said Representative Burke expressed it quite well. However, first, if we should decide to turn down this contract as Mr. Blum had stated, we have a couple of alternatives: either go back to where both parties would start from scratch, or it would go to Binding Arbitration. No, we are not voting for the money for this contract. The money will come out of next year's fiscal budget for this contract, and if at that time, we decide that we do not want to fund the full amount, we have the option not to do so, but it will come out of next year's fiscal budget.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote, which requires a majority vote.

MR. SKOVGAARD said he is abstaining because he did not receive his mail in enough time. It was mailed to his home address instead of to his office address where he normally receives his Board mail.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she, too, did not receive her mail, and will abstain. She had not had enough time to read all her mail.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion is APPROVED with 19 Yes votes, 3 No votes, 8 Abstentions, and 3 Non-Voting. The contract has been ratified.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said his Committee met on February 21, 1985 at 7:00 P.M. Present were Representatives Donahue, White, Wider, Vos, Mallozzi and Schlechtweg. Absent were Reps. Guroian, Signore and Jachimczyk. Item #1 is for final adoption concerning Fire Limits. The public hearing was called to order, with no one speaking either in favor or against. The Committee voted 4 in favor and 2 opposed for final adoption and he so Moved. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI asked if any of those who voted against this item, would be kind enough to state the reasons, for the enlightenment of members.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

MR. WHITE said he voted against it because he doesn't particularly like the R-MF Zone because it is an over-crowded zone to begin with, and the fact is that although they have re-done the Regulations somewhat, he really sees this as somewhat of a ploy to shove in more R-MF housing around, put it up more cheaply though not necessarily to sell it more cheaply. These people talk out of both sides of their faces. They come around and tell you, when it suits them, that the market determines the price of housing, and then the turn around and say the construction costs determine the price of housing. This R-MF is to build more cheaply but not sell more cheaply and that is why he is against it.

THE PRESIDENT said this requires 21 firm votes, and asked that those in the caucus please come out to vote.

MRS. GUROIAN made a Point of Order, stating there was someone in the caucus rooms who was not a member of the Board and this was against the Board's Rules while the Board was in session.

THE PRESIDENT said she would have Majority Leader Boccuzzi look into this.

She called for a machine vote on Item #1. APPROVED with 21 Yes votes, 6 No votes, 1 Abstention, and 5 Non-Voting.

- (1) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 468 CONCERNING DESIGNATION OF FIRE LIMITS WITHIN THE CITY OF STAMFORD, DELETING THE R-MF MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND ADDING C-B COMMERCIAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. Submitted by M.P. Levine, Chairman, Zoning Board, 3/28/84. Held in Committee 5/7, 6/4, 7/9 and 9/12/84. Held in Steering 7/26/84. Held on Pending Steering Agenda since 9/19/84. Approved for publication 2/4/85.
- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING UNACCEPTED STREETS - Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 12/6/84. Held in Committee 1/7/85. Approved for Publication 2/4/85.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said the public hearing was called to order with no one speaking either in favor or against. The Committee voted to amend the ordinance to delete the list of streets and wording pertaining to that list, and he so Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT requested that Mr. Schlechtweg be specific in what he wanted deleted.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said on the second page, which reads "attached is a list of unaccepted streets in the City of Stamford. This list will not be considered all inclusive." That will be eliminated, in addition to the list. Moved and Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approval of Mr. Schlechtweg's amendment. APPROVED with Rep. Blum voting in opposition.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

A Motion was made and Seconded to approve the ordinance, Item #2, as amended.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Item #2 as amended, and was APPROVED with 25 Yes votes, 4 No votes, 1 Abstention, and 3 Non-Voting.

MR. SCHLECHTWEG said Items 3, 4, 5, pertains to petitions against the Master Plan, because the Charter requires any petition filed to contain 20% or more of the signatures in the affected area, and in this case, the area affected is the entire City of Stamford, the Committee voted unanimously that said petitions were not legally before the Committee, or Board.

That completes Mr. Schlechtweg's report.

- (3) REFERRAL OF PLANNING BOARD'S ACTION APPROVING OF MP-271, 1984 MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT. PURSUANT TO SECTION 522.4 OF THE CHARTER, REFERRAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD'S DECISION CONCERNING THE MASTER PLAN, A PETITION RECEIVED FROM THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY AFFECTING PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE SOUTH END AREA OF STAMFORD. Received from Patrick F. Grosso, Chairman, Stamford Planning Board, 1/31/85. Received by Board 1/31/85.

NOT LEGALLY BEFORE THIS BOARD AS DOES NOT HAVE 20% OF SIGNATURES OF ALL CITY PROPERTYOWNERS.

- (4) REFERRAL OF PLANNING BOARD'S ACTION APPROVING OF MP-261, 1984 MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT. PURSUANT TO SECTION 522.4 OF THE CHARTER, REFERRAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD'S DECISION CONCERNING THE MASTER PLAN, A PETITION RECEIVED FROM THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY AFFECTING PROPERTY LOCATED IN THE GLENBROOK AREA OF STAMFORD. Received from Patrick F. Grosso, Chairman, Stamford Planning Board, 1/31/85. Received by Board 1/31/85.

NOT LEGALLY BEFORE THIS BOARD AS DOES NOT HAVE 20% OF SIGNATURES OF ALL CITY PROPERTYOWNERS.

- (5) REFERRAL OF PLANNING BOARD'S ACTION APPROVING OF MP-261, 1984 MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT. PURSUANT TO SECTION 522.4 OF THE CHARTER, REFERRAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD'S DECISION CONCERNING THE MASTER PLAN, A LETTER WAS RECEIVED FROM BERNARD O. NEMOITIN, M.D., WISHING TO APPEAL THE ZONING CHANGE OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 96 MAIN ST. Received from Patrick F. Grosso, Chairman, Stamford Planning Board, 1/31/85. Received by Board 1/31/85.

NOT LEGALLY BEFORE THIS BOARD AS DOES NOT HAVE 20% OF SIGNATURES OF ALL CITY PROPERTYOWNERS.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OF BELLTOWN SCHOOL FROM THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF CITY OF STAMFORD TO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT OF STAMFORD IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF ORDINANCE NO. 144 OF THE GENERAL ORDINANCES OF THE CITY.
Submitted by Allen G. Grafton, Asst. to Supt., Board of Education, 11/29/84. Held in Committee 1/7 and 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. PERILLO said his Committee met on Feb. 25, 1985 at the Board of Education on Hillandale Ave. Committee members present were Reps. Taranto, Zelinski, Santagata, Conti, and Al Perillo. Absent was Tom Burke, who was excused, having called in advance and advised he could not attend. Also absent was Rep. Malloy. Other Board members present were John Boccuzzi, Sandra Goldstein, Lathon Wider, Dave Jachimczyk. City administration present were Commissioner John O'Brien, Deputy John Canavan, and Supt. M. Serra, Supt. of Sanitation. Len Gambino of the radio station and Pat Wen of the news media were also present.

This meeting, being of a public hearing, there were some 90 homeowners, condominium owners, etc., plus some 13 speakers. This meeting went on for some two hours. There were a lot of angry taxpayers out there who felt the City is denying them services for which they are paying. Either they were misinformed of this ordinance, or it was misinterpreted. The general feeling was they want their garbage picked up without having to also pay a private collector. The speakers who spoke felt the ordinance is of no value for it says nothing except what was already on the books. The Public Works Committee, taking all these issues into consideration, does feel on Page 3, Line 2 of the ordinance needs clear language. In addition there were two more concerns of Committee members. One was investors who own units of condos and rent them out. Two, investors who own a whole complex. With these questions in mind, the Committee MOVES TO HOLD THIS IN COMMITTEE for one more month and send it back to the Law Department to re-word the language. The vote was 3 in favor, 1 No, and 1 Abstention, and Mr. Perillo so Moved. Seconded.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 8-2 and REPEALING SECTIONS 8-4 and 8-5 of CODE OF ORDINANCES. This concerns the collection of refuse. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/9/85. Approved for publication 2/4/85.

THE PRESIDENT said no vote is required if the Committee voted to Hold in Committee, and Mr. Perillo does not have to Move to hold.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to take Item #2 out of committee as he believes the corrected language has been put on everyone's desk tonight to satisfy the two members of the Public Works Committee. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD feels this should go back to committee and that the entire Board be made aware of the feeling of the members of the Committee that there be a vote of the Committee with regard to the final adoption; and he feels it is very important that the public have an opportunity to speak on the ordinance in its final form. He urges against taking this out of Committee.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI said on everyone's desk is an ordinance which contains language stating it is the intent and definition to include private homes, condominiums, multi-family dwellings, and cooperatives, then the words added are "notwithstanding whether such residential dwellings are owner-occupied or occupied by a tenant," and what that means is that the owner does not have to live in the condo to have the trash or garbage picked up, and it spells it out, word for word, what their intention is. That is the reason why Mr. Boccuzzi asked this to be taken out of committee. It is no big change in the ordinance. It is a clarification as to the questions of some of the members of the Public Works Committee.

MR. LYONS said he concurs with Mr. Boccuzzi's remarks and urges his colleagues to take this out of committee.

MR. MORRIS Moved the Question. Seconded.

MRS. GUROLAN made a Point of Order, asking if it were not true that unless an ordinance is received by the Members 24 hours before the meeting at which it is to be considered, that it must be read in full at the meeting.

THE PRESIDENT asked if someone would find that Section, but that still does not pertain to this vote. This vote is on taking this item out of committee. To take it out of committee, the ordinance does not have to be read. A machine vote was called for. APPROVED with 21 Yes, 9 No, 1 Abstention, and 1 Non-Vote. The item is on the floor.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to amend on Page 3, Section 2, where it says "residential dwellings shall be defined as all buildings occupied by individuals as their principal place of habitation", it is the intent of this definition to include private homes, condominiums, multi-family dwellings, and cooperatives. This is the addition: "notwithstanding whether such residential dwellings are owner-occupied or occupied by a tenant." The rest of the ordinance remains the same. Seconded.

asked

MR. BLUM how does the addition of this language change the ordinance any from which the condominium owner or the tenant of a multi-family house or an investor who invests in a condominium, how will this help him any way from the ordinance as it exists today. There is nothing here to help condo owners or renters, or Mr. Blum's landlord, in which the refuse that he now pays to get picked up by a private garbage man, nothing to give him relief from this additional cost. It is already on the books that if you are in a sewered district, in which Mr. Blum's apartment is, then you put out a certain type of container and that container will be picked up - maybe, maybe, as he heard today - it might be picked up or not, a they don't have sufficient help to pick up the 90 cans - so Mr. Blum wants to know what are they voting on with Mr. Boccuzzi's proposed amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Blum was out of order. The question before the Body is on an amendment to this ordinance and just deals with those two sentences.

MR. BLUM said he is just trying to ask Mr. Boccuzzi how those condominium owners can get their garbage picked up.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he never said that sentence would pick up the garbage. All he said was that some people, like some members of the Public Works Committee, who wanted the definition of who was living in a condo as to make it a place where City would pick up the garbage. To qualify that, and to clarify it, the words were put in the ordinance. Nobody said that this was going to solve the problem. Commissioner O'Brien said right at the beginning of that meeting that it was not going to solve the problem. It is only Step I. All this does is clarify whose garbage will be picked up when the City figures out how they are going to do it. He is not saying this is going to do it. They will pick up everybody's garbage who lives in a sewered district who comes under that heading.

THE PRESIDENT said she is going to limit discussion on this to what the Motion is and that is just the amendment. Whether the amendment is passed or defeated, everyone will have an opportunity to speak on the entire ordinance. Right now, speaking will be only on the amendment.

MR. SKOVGAARD inquired when Corporation Counsel received the request for this language, and when the language was received.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he got into touch with Finance Commissioner Pacter over the weekend, and he got in touch with Corp. Counsel in Westport over the weekend; and Mr. Boccuzzi was called at work first thing this morning by Mr. Hennessey. They discussed the problem, also the difference of opinion on the Public Works Committee, and that unless language was provided that would satisfy those members of the Public Works Committee who had questions, then the ordinance would be in trouble. Mr. Hennessey sent this down to the Staff Office sometime today. All Board members got a copy, and Mr. Boccuzzi also personally discussed it with both Democrats and Republicans in the caucus rooms. That is how it got here.

MR. SKOVGAARD urged that this amendment not be approved for several reasons. There has not been enough in-put on this amendment in terms of time and public opinion. There are substantial language problems that should be worked out.

MRS. CONTI said, as a member of the Public Works Committee, that the original intent of this ordinance was to differentiate between residential and commercial garbage. Now it has been complicated by adding this language about owner-occupied and investor/tenant type of thing. Was it the original intent of the Corporation Counsel to make a differentiation here? She does not feel anything further should be voted on until the Board members receive it in writing from the Law Department, that this is the language that he approves of, and that it still makes the differentiation that he wished in the beginning. That was the entire intent of this ordinance. It was not to solve the garbage problem.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI (continuing): It was to protect the City from a possible suit by the commercial interests.

THE PRESIDENT said she believed this amendment came down from Corporation Counsel.

MRS. CONTI said she did not see anything in writing that this was from Corporation Counsel. All she has is a copy of the ordinance.

MR. BOCCUZZI said it came from Bill Hennessey.

MRS. CONTI said she has nothing to indicate it came from Mr. Hennessey, no cover letter, nothing, just a copy of an ordinance. The problem she feels is that there is a committee, and a committee chairman, and the chairman made the request of Corporation Counsel, and it is only common courtesy that the response comes back to the Committee Chairman and to the Committee members.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the amendment. APPROVED with 22 Yes, 7 No, 1 Abstention, 2 Non-Voting.

THE PRESIDENT called for speakers now on the Main Motion, which is the ordinance as amended.

MR. SKOVGAARD is opposed to final adoption of this ordinance, as amended. He thinks it was made amply clear at the public hearing that the City of Stamford cannot comply with the directives of this ordinance. It is a disservice to the City and to the citizens to pass an ordinance which the Board knows in advance that the Public Works Department cannot comply with. If this ordinance is passed by this Board, the Board is issuing, for all intents and purposes, a dare to every condominium owner, to every condominium association in the City, to buy two garbage cans, or to buy two garbage cans per condominium unit. If even 10% of the condo owners in this City accept that challenge, the City will be completely smothered in its own garbage. It is completely inappropriate for this ordinance to pass.

MR. ZELINSKI is against this proposed ordinance. The Mayor's letter of January 9, 1985 addressed to the Board President does state "as you know, there is a legal action brought by several condominium associations pending in Superior Court, and that action, the condominium associations claim that the existing City ordinance on the topic entitles them to refuse collection. While the City maintains the Plaintiffs' interpretation of the intent of the present ordinance is incorrect, particularly in view of the long-standing City refuse collection practices". The Mayor continues that "it is my belief that all parties concerned with issues of refuse collection would benefit from an up-to-date and concise revision of these Sections, and a clear statement of the City's intent"... Mr. Zelinski said he wished to repeat "of the City's intent". Intent? Sanitation services are obligations and basic services due to taxpayers, along with police and fire. Does anything, anything at all, come before health and protection services? If so, he would like to know what they are.

(NOTE: Mr. Zelinski had requested that all his remarks be in the minutes.)

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI (continuing): The Mayor's letter goes on to state "to this end, much time has been invested by me and the staffs of the Public Works Dept. and Law Dept. The result of our efforts is the enclosed proposed ordinance. It is my hope that after the passage of this ordinance, we can move forward to determine how to implement the collection in a cost-efficient manner."

Mr. Zelinski does not believe by any stretch of the imagination, that if this Body approves this ordinance, the problem will be solved and the garbage will be collected. That is not going to happen, when and if we pass this particular ordinance this evening. All of us received a letter dated January 30, 1985 from a Mr. James Doyle, President of the Riverside Terrace Assn. Mr. Zelinski wished to put into the record a couple of paragraphs of Mr. Doyle's letter. He is writing on behalf of all unit owners of Riverside Terrace regarding the ordinance, which would entitle each unit owner to have at least two standard-sized garbage cans picked up by the City. We find this proposal both logistically and sanitation-wise inadequate. On Riverside Avenue alone there are approximately 90 condominium units and it is hard to imagine the potential of 180 garbage cans being placed on the street, already a hazard area due to heavy traffic and street parking, without creating chaos. Even if condominiums could find adequate space on their own property, which in the case of most existing structures is not possible, the time required by sanitation workers to empty them would be overwhelming. The discussion regarding refuse collection of condominiums has been going on for far too many years. The monies collected from homeowners not receiving this service from the City, although paid for in real estate taxes each year, is tantamount to extortion or theft, and could by now have paid for a significant percent of the funds necessary for purchasing the trucks and dumpsters, perhaps several times over. We ask the City to meet its obligation to the condominium owners at the earliest possible date. The options for solving this problem are limited, and have been discussed many times by the Board of Representatives. We look forward to the prompt resolution of this matter.

Mr. Zelinski, as a member of the Public Works Committee, did attend the public hearing and listened to all the speakers. There were approximately 80 people who attended this public hearing, one of the largest turn-outs that he can recall on any subject. Twelve speakers were against the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Zelinski feels it is very important to remind his colleagues that last year during the budget process, the Public Works Department, among their other requests, did ask for and got approval by this Board, funds in the amount of \$50,000 to purchase a vehicle to pick up garbage from dumpsters. At this point in time, he does not know if the City has purchased that particular truck.

What about the small businesses, the mom-and-pop stores, who should also, if they are in the sewered district and are entitled by ordinance to have garbage picked up? What about them? This ordinance does not address that problem whatsoever.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI (continuing): As he mentioned last month when they discussed this for publication, it seems a lot of effort has been put into this, but in the wrong areas. There are only two major changes from the original, and he is strongly opposed to them. One is on page 2, under Section 1: "The City of Stamford shall collect, or cause to be collected, at regular intervals established by the Commissioner of Public Works", that is new and is going to put more jurisdiction, if you will, in the hands of the Public Works Department or the Commissioner, whoever that happens to be, now or in the future, and they change frequently.

Also on page 3, under sub-section c: "The size, shape and location of containers may change at the discretion of the Commissioner of Public Works with approval by the Board of Representatives by amendment to this ordinance as new methods and equipment used for the collection of refuse become available to and are adopted by the Department of Public Works." Here, again, there is nowhere in here that says that the garbage collection issue as far as pertaining to the multi-family, the cooperative, the condominium is going to be solved. As a matter of fact, that evening, one of the speakers asked directly of DPW Comm. John O'Brien, if they in their complex put out the garbage cans that meet the specifications as are in the ordinance, would the City pick up the garbage. And Comm. O'Brien's reply was no.

This is getting to the point where it is becoming a joke, and this Body should not be a party to misleading the taxpayers by having them think that by passing this ordinance tonight, that their garbage will be collected, because it will not be collected. We have waited far too long. It seems the Administration is not going to do anything and this Board should pass some legislation to get this accomplished. He urges his colleagues to vote against this ordinance.

MS. SUMMERVILLE agrees wholeheartedly with Reps. Skovgaard and Zelinski. She has a lot of condominiums in her district also. She has not received a single call in favor of this ordinance, whether they understood it or not. She could not attend the public hearing herself but many of her constituents did. If 80 people were there, at least 40 were from the 6th District. Most of her calls came from Buckingham on Strawberry Hill. She sympathizes with what they are saying. They have a beautiful building there, and the Board is not going to set a policy with this building, but are giving one person the authority to choose who shall and who shall not, and that gives her real problems. She will not vote for this ordinance, as she feels it is exactly what Mr. Zelinski said, we are fooling the public.

MRS. CONTI said with all due respect to Ms. Summerville and Mr. Zelinski, this ordinance was never proposed as being a solution to the garbage problem. The Committee has known that for some time. They are struggling to get answers on the cost factors on various options, but the Administration is concerned that there is going to be a suit brought by the commercial interests, just as there was a suit brought by the condominium owners, and they did not want to City to become enmeshed in that, and they tried to reiterate what is already on the books. She refers to Mr. Skovgaard's remarks. This is nothing new. This matter of the garbage cans, the size of the containers and their location from the street, has been on the books probably as far back as the 1940's. It is not new. It was not intended

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI (continuing): to be new. It was just reiterating what is on the books, and to segregate the issue of commercial garbage from residential garbage. The way it is worded tonight throws the problems and the issue the same as it was, because the commercial is being thrown back in with the residential. That was a very bad mistake.

MR. JACHIMCZYK Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote and asked that those in the caucus rooms returned to their seats to vote. DEFEATED with 20 Yes, 9 NO, 2 Abstentions, and 2 Non-Voting. (Note: See below and next page for passage upon reconsideration.)

(3) THE MATTER OF TRASH COLLECTION. Submitted by Rep. DeLuca 1/28/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. PERILLO said this item, too, was discussed for over an hour. Many questions were asked of the Public Works Department Heads by Representatives who were present at this meeting. The answers given did not satisfy everyone. The Commissioner did admit the timing of the operation was the first set-back. The Deputy Commissioner took on the blame of implementing the timing with the reduction from 10 routes to 8 routes in the middle of winter, which just did not make the new system a success. The Department Heads assured the Committee that with a few changes in altering the routes, it can work. With these thoughts in mind, the Public Works Committee by a vote of 5-0, moved to hold this for one month and give the Department of Sanitation a chance to prove themselves.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MS. RINALDI said there was no report.

MR. WIDER Moved to Reconsider Item #2 under Public Works Committee. He voted No, which was the Prevailing Side. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved to Re-commit. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said since nothing was on the floor, they would have to first take up the Motion to Reconsider, and after that, the Motion to Re-Commit. The Motion on the floor is to Reconsider and speakers will please confine themselves to that.

MR. ZELINSKI said this was already discussed for some 45 minutes, and the merits were considered, and he ^{is} against Reconsideration.

MR. DONAHUE said this has been discussed for a number of years. The current ordinance has to be amended if they are ever to solve the problem of picking up garbage at multi-family dwellings and condominiums. He feels it should be re-considered.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion to Reconsider Item #2. APPROVED with 25 Yes, 5 No, 1 Abstention, 2 Non-Voting.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved to Re-Commit. Seconded by Mr. Burke and Mr. Wider, also Ms. Summerville.

MR. TARANTO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on returning to committee. DEFEATED with 14 Yes, 19 No.

On the floor is the final adoption of the proposed ordinance.

MR. BLUM said he is voting against this ordinance as it does not solve a thing for the condominium owners.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on approval of the ordinance, Public Works Item #2. APPROVED with 23 Yes, 9 No, 1 Abstention.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

MR. DeLUCA said his Committee first met on Feb. 25th, but due to a lack of a quorum, they held another meeting this evening. Present at tonight's meeting were Committee members DeLuca, Skovgaard, and Rybnick. By a vote of 3 in favor, none opposed, they placed Item #2 on Consent Agenda.

- (1) APPROVAL OF PARKS DEPARTMENT PROPOSED 1985/86 FEE SCHEDULE FOR TENNIS. Submitted by Robert Cook, Parks Supt., 1/16/85. Approved by Parks Commission 1/14/85. Held in Committee 2/4/85.

MR. DeLUCA said on Item 1, the Committee voted 3 in favor, none opposed, for the following recommendations, the proposed fees recommended by the Parks Commission, and hopefully, after the Board votes this evening, they will not get another nasty letter, their proposed rate for the resident card day rate is \$1.50 per person, which is all right. Resident for the car, for night-time is \$3.00 per person. The Committee made two additions to this: a resident day for seniors after 3 p.m., a discount rate of \$1.00 per person; and a resident night-time for seniors at \$2.00 per person. How does the President wish these voted on, one at a time, or all together?

THE PRESIDENT said one at a time. The first amendment is a fee for senior residents after 3:00 P.M. of \$1.00. Moved and Seconded. CARRIED voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the next amendment for resident senior night-time of \$2.00 per person. Moved. Seconded. CARRIED voice vote, with Mr. Blum in opposition.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA said where it states without card, day or night, delete "without" and put in its stead "non-resident". Seconded. CARRIED voice vote with Mr. Blum in opposition.

MR. DeLUCA said non-resident day-time, the proposed fee is \$3.00 per person, his Committee is recommending \$4.00 per person during the day time and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. DeLuca's amendment. CARRIED with Mr. Blum and Mr. Wider in opposition.

MR. DeLUCA said on non-resident, night-time, the proposed fee is \$4.00 per person, his Committee recommends 6.00 per person, and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. BLUM said we appear to be increasing fees across the board, whether they be resident or non-resident. Yet at the same time we have a Coliseum Authority whose purpose is to attract tourism to Stamford. Do we really mean to keep raising fees?

MR. WHITE said he has been voting along with Mr. Blum but not for the same reasons, against raising fees for non-residents. Mr. White does not particularly want non-residents there.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. DeLuca's Motion. CARRIED with Mr. Blum in opposition, for the \$6.00 fee.

MR. DeLUCA said the two items where it states "discount ticket", it is to be changed to "resident discount ticket". And he so Moved. Seconded.

APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE.

MR. DeLUCA Moved to add "resident discount ticket for seniors 10 hours \$7.00 for day-time. Seconded. CARRIED voice vote.

MR. DeLUCA Moved for "resident discount ticket ten hours at night-time \$14.00". Seconded. This is for seniors. CARRIED with Mr. Blum opposed.

MR. DeLUCA said the last item under Tennis Fees for Season Pass, proposed fee is \$100.00 per person, plus \$1.00 an hour, which the Committee thought was an outrageous price. You can go to a private club and get better facilities. He recommends a resident season pass would be \$50.00. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI attended the Committee meeting even though there was no quorum. There were several residents there who were in favor of a \$35.00 fee for the season passes, and Mr. Zelinski thought the Chairman also favored that amount. There is not that much good time available during the summer season to play tennis, and there is the contingency of inclement weather and rain, etc., therefore he feels the \$35.00 fee is reasonable as the Tennis Assn. gives them free services during tournaments, so he Moves to amend this to \$35.00. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA said there is no current fee. They have been trying for years to get a season pass, but the Park Commissions had been reluctant to give one as it might be abused.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the amendment for \$35.00. The machine vote will show 4 Yes, 21 No, 1 Abstention, and 7 Non-Voting, with Mr. Santagata and Ms. Powers voting No.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the initial amendment of \$50.00. CARRIED, with one in opposition.

MR. DeLUCA said he had one more item, a resident season pass for seniors for \$25.00 and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved this be amended for the seniors to \$20.00. Seconded. DEFEATED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the \$25.00 senior season pass. APPROVED voice vote.

A vote to accept the tennis fees as amended was Moved, Seconded, and APPROVED.

MR. DeLUCA Moved to approve Consent Agenda Item #2. APPROVED.

MR. DeLUCA reminded the Body that the Retirement Dinner for Handy Dixon is scheduled for March 13th at 7:00 P.M. at Roger Taranto's Place. So far there are 38 reservations.

THE PRESIDENT said the Committee Reports that have been coming in have been most useful to Board members and she thanked the Chairpersons.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MRS. NAKIAN said her Committee met on Tuesday, Feb. 26th, at 7:30 P.M. at the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Reps. Maihock, Fishman, Rinaldi, Nakian, and Powers. Also present were Reps. Morris, members of the press, three staff members of the Smith House. Since everyone received a copy of the report and have had an opportunity to read it, Mrs. Nakian said she will not comment on the report at this time, other than to say that it is in complete agreement with the opinions of the members of EW&G that they formulated as they went through the renovation process. The Committee did, in that sense, accept the report. When the meeting was scheduled, it was planned to have the Mayor at the meeting so he could discuss with the Committee what he was going to do to implement the report. Unfortunately, he was still in the process of hearing the rebuttal from the Director of Welfare and had not made a decision. She will leave this item on the agenda for next month with the hope that implementation can be discussed at that point.

- (1) MATTER OF THE SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT. Submitted by Maria Nakian, Chairwoman, Education, Welfare and Government Committee 1/16/85. Held in Committee 2/4/85. HELD FOR NEXT MONTH'S AGENDA.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MR. WIDER said he had no report.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

MR. MALLOZZI said this is the second report this session of the Board of Representatives. The Committee met on Wednesday, Feb. 27th.. Present were Committee members Mallozzi, Dudley, Summerville, and White. From the Urban Renewal Commission, Chairman Charles Lee was present, as well as the full Commission, Steinberg, Magistro, Carvalho, and Rodwin.

- (1) STATUS REPORT FROM THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION. Submitted by Rep. John Mallozzi, Chairman, Urban Renewal Committee, 2/7/85.

MR. MALLOZZI said first on the accomplishment of the Commission, they have up to now completed the work on the Town Center Mall, which is the Shopping Mall Garage which was turned over to the City. Also they have started Blocks 8 and 9, and have reviewed the different plans from Collins and from Rich. On design reviews, they have approved preliminary plans for the deLima property where the Roger Smith Hotel used to be; also Curley's Diner is being renovated as well as Roven's Curtains. They have also obtained a deferral of the demolition of the Marley Bldg. even though they did not have the legal power to do it, but Rich is taking another look at the building. Also they have closed on Re-Use Parcel #1 which is Canterbury Green, Re-Use Parcel #38 which is at the northeast corner of Tresser and Greyrock; Re-Use Parcel #2 which is at the southeast corner of Broad and Greyrock. And also Re-Use Parcel 9a and 9b and 10, which is at the corner of Atlantic St. and Tresser Blvd. All the condemnation appeals are being settled except for Curley's Diner and the Palace Theatre.

As far as construction is concerned, the 4 and 6 Stamford Forum is about 60% complete, which is next to the Marriott Hotel which is about 450,000 sq. ft. of office space. The Marriott Extension is about 50% complete, and should be completed November, 1985, and the restaurant on top should be finished by early 1986. Canterbury Green, which is 94 units of housing and approximately 250,000 sq. ft. of office space is expected to be completed in two years.

In Re-Use Parcel #2, the foundation work has started for 160 housing units, but now it is being redesigned for possibly 180 housing units. Re-Use Parcel #38 is 450,000 sq. ft. of office space with a 30-month construction schedule. Parcels 9a and 9b will be another 260,000 sq. ft. of office space. It's at the ground level right now. The Union Trust is 90% complete.

The outstanding work load is the preparation for plans for Blocks 8 and 9 and the changes there, and the potential rehabilitation within the renewal area, and also the Commission is taking under advisement a study for the University Place proposal, and the loose ends are complete site improvement application still within the Urban Renewal area to Stamford New Urban Corp.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MALLOZZI (continuing): Also there is ^{still} the garage litigation to settle. This concludes the report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

- (1) REQUEST BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES INITIATE ACTION FOR REMOVAL OF FILL AND DEBRIS UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 7-146 OF CGS RE: OBSTRUCTION OF WATERWAY, PROPERTY OF J. FRANCHINA, 191 BELLTOWN ROAD.
Submitted by M. W. Lubbers, Exec. Dir., Environmental Protection Board 6/25/84. Report made 8/13/84. Held on Pending Steering Agenda since 8/13/84. Held in Committee 1/7 and 2/4/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. MAIHOCK said her Committee, consisting of Audrey Maihock, Terrence Martin, and Dennis White made an on-site inspection concerning the Joseph Franchina matter on Saturday, Feb. 16, 1985, at 10:00 A.M., accompanied by Mr. Franchina. The Committee observed the area fill at the rear of Mr. Franchina's property which Mr. Lubbers has questioned. The Committee met further on Feb. 20, 1985 at 7:40 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Audrey Maihock, Terrence Martin, Dennis White, Atty. David Cohen, Mr. Joseph Franchina, Mr. Mark Lubbers, Rep. Gabe DeLuca, and Mrs. Mildred Perillo.

Mark Lubbers estimated it would cost \$800 to remove the fill at the rear of Mr. Franchina's property, and would take approximately one day. Mark Lubbers stated that the area where the fill is located can't store flood water and take up pollutants which is the function of a flood plain.

Mr. Franchina and his attorney, at this meeting, maintained that this is not an appropriate test case for the Board of Representatives. The Committee voted unanimously to hold this matter until additional material is received from the Corporation Counsel.

In a follow-up letter to Chairman Audrey Maihock dated Feb. 21, 1985, Atty. David Cohen stated his opinion that Sec. 7-146 of the Connecticut General Statutes is not intended to cover historic fill, and the authority of the Board of Representatives may not be utilized in the manner required by the Environmental Protection Board in the present application. The Committee Chairperson has therefore now requested, by conversation, and confirmed by memo, ^{an} interpretation from the Corporation Counsel on this matter as to whether the Board of Representatives has authority to act on this matter. This concludes the report.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MR. DAVID MARTIN said his Committee met at 7:30 P.M. on Wednesday, February 27, 1985, and at 6:45 tonight, Monday, March 4th. Present were Reps. Maihock, Lyons, and David Martin. The items on Fiscal were considered. That concludes Mr. Martin's report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE

MR. RYBNICK said there is no report.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

MR. LIVINGSTON said everyone has received in their packet an up-date report on recodification of ordinances. He will not read the report as it is late in the evening and everyone has a copy.

- (1) UP-DATE ON RECODIFICATION OF ORDINANCES - submitted by Rep. James Dudley 2/13/85.
-

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. LYONS said there is no report to be made.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

- (1) INQUIRY INTO POSSIBILITY OF INSTITUTING COST CONTAINMENT FEATURES INTO CITY EMPLOYEES' MEDICAL INSURANCE PROGRAM, AND TO INCLUDE THIS IN NEGOTIATING LABOR CONTRACTS. Submitted by Reps. Thomas Burke and Ruth Powers 11/7/84. Held in Committee 12/3/84 and 2/4/85. Held in Steering 12/19/84.

MR. BOCCUZZI said his Committee, Mrs. Powers and himself, and Mr. Barrett and Mrs. Kilgrow met at the Board of Education Room and Mrs. Kilgrow gave in-put on insurance, benefits, and discussion ensued, but there was no action taken by the Committee. Mr. Zelinski was there as a member of the Committee, but by the end of the meeting, it was just Mrs. Powers and Mr. Boccuzzi, so there was no action taken. Mrs. Powers was able to put forth to Mrs. Kilgrow and Mr. Barrett some ideas of what she had in mind on insurance, benefits, and packages.

RESOLUTIONS

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING JOSEPH FAHEY AS CITIZEN-OF-YEAR. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski (D) 11th District 2/13/85.

MR. ZELINSKI asked that this be held for next month as he is awaiting information.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

RULES SUSPENDED ON PROPER MOTIONS MADE AND APPROVED TO CONSIDER ITEM NOT ON AGENDA.

- (2) PROPOSED SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE PRESIDENT REAGAN'S CUTS FROM AMTRAK BUDGET. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski 3/4/85.

MR. ZELINSKI attended a meeting at Rippowam High School last week sponsored by Senator Dodd. This resolution basically states it would not be in the best interests of Stamford residents to support the cuts. This would be sent to all the interested parties who might be of assistance in achieving proper funding. Moved. Seconded. Opposed by Mr. Burke and Mrs. Conti. Mrs. Perillo Abstained. APPROVED.

PETITIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

February 4, 1985 Regular Board Meeting Minutes.

HELD - on desks tonight - copies all out-of-order and could not be printed early enough. Seconded. Carried to Hold.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. DUDLEY Moved to Adjourn. There being no further business to come before the Board, upon Motion made and Seconded, the meeting was Adjourned at 12:25 A.M., and APPROVED by voice vote.

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

SG:HMM
Encls.

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
18th Board of Representatives