

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 12, 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, AUGUST 12, 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 8:40 P.M. by PRESIDENT SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, after both political parties had met in caucus.

The INVOCATION was given by the Rev. William Scrivener, Chaplain of the Stamford Hospital, Department of Pastoral Care, 190 West Broad Street.

"Let us bow our heads in prayer. Lord, God, You have created this world and given us the responsibility of caring for it. You give us the freedom to do as we see best, only asking that we exercise the care You have shown for us.

"Bless this gathering as it meets here to work on behalf of the people of Stamford. Guide its actions, as it seeks to decide on the many and varied issues which confront this community.

"And finally we pray help us all to serve as faithful stewards of the Creation you have entrusted to us. Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG was led by PRESIDENT SANDRA GOLDSTEIN.

ROLL CALL. CLERK OF THE BOARD ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll. There were 38 Present and 2 Absent. Absent were Reps. Owens, and Schlechtweg (who had resigned).

After election of Patricia McGrath to fill the vacancy in the 14th District, the attendance was 39 present and 1 absent (Rep. Owens).

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RESIGNATION OF JOHN SCHLECHTWEG (14th District):

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the first order of business would be her reading of a letter she received on July 19, 1985:

"I want to take this opportunity to personally inform you that for a number of personal reasons, I have relocated to Trumbull. My decision to make this move was not an easy one, especially since Stamford has been my home for all of my 37 years. I have left behind a heritage of five generations with a strong commitment to the community. Thus, it

(continuation of the reading of Mr. Schlectweg's letter of resignation):

"is with deep regret that I submit my resignation as 14th District Representative.

"To fulfill my obligations, I have given a great deal of thought to my replacement. I ask for your support for PATRICIA McGRATH. It has indeed been a pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with individuals like you. We may not always have agreed on solutions to the issues, but I feel we have always respected each other's views.

"I sincerely hope that the constituents of our City know how fortunate they are in having dedicated people like you representing them."
(Signed Jack Schlechtweg)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said it was with a great deal of regret that the CHAIR accepts the resignation of Mr. Schlechtweg. She and other members of the Board have worked with Mr. Schlechtweg, and he has given a great deal of time, effort and integrity to this City. He will be missed. Pursuant to Section 201 of the Charter, she opened the floor to nominations to fill the vacancy in the 14th District.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the Board is losing a good Representative and he wishes Mr. Schlechtweg well in his new home. Mr. Schlechtweg spoke to Mr. Boccuzzi before he left and recommended Patricia McGrath of 99 Unity Road, who has lived in the 14th District for 13 years, to fill the vacancy. She is a Stamford native, is married, and has two children. He Moved for the nomination of Patricia McGrath for the 14th District Representative. Seconded by Mr. Lyons.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN noted there were no other nominations.

MR. SKOVGAARD Moved to close nominations. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote.

CLERK OF THE BOARD ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE cast one ballot on behalf of the Board to confirm Patricia McGrath as the Representative for the 14th District.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN administered the Oath of Office to Patricia McGrath, who thereupon took her seat on the floor of the Board.

There are now 39 members present and one absent.

MACHINE TEST VOTE was conducted by the President and found to be in good working order.

The President said the next Order of Business would be MOMENTS OF SILENCE and Mr. Dudley would be first.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

For the late HELEN RIVERS, who had been a Stamford schoolteacher for 38 years. Submitted by Rep. Dudley.

For the late MARGARET A. STORK, mother of former 15th District Representative Philip Stork. She died suddenly on June 25th at her home in East Rockaway, Long Island, from a massive heart attack. She was 69, and will be greatly missed by her family and friends. Submitted by Rep. McInerney.

For the late JOHN J. DILLON, who was one of his and Mr. Santagata's constituents, and passed away on Sunday, August 4, 1985. He was a City firefighter for 32 years from 1946 until retirement in 1977. Before that, he served as a sergeant during World War II in the U.S. Army. He was the Chief's Driver for 20 years in the City Fire Dept., having a cheerful attitude and solid commitment to the Fire Dept. He was hard-working and very dedicated. Heartfelt sympathies are extended to his wife, Celia, and to his son and daughter, Dennis and Linda. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris.

For the late MICHAEL YORK, who was a resident of Stamford for 32 years, being 66 when he died. He served in the Marine Corps in China and the Pacific Theatre of World War II. He was retired from the ConRail lines in 1980. He is survived by his wife, Helen, and a son and daughter, Michael and Kathleen. He lived on Fairfield Ave. Submitted by Rep. Boccuzzi.

For the late LUBOV STRESLOV, a Russian emigrant, having come here in 1977. She was 86 when she died last week. She was in the seige of Leningrad, where she lost her three-year-old daughter by starvation. She came to this country, learned a new language, and was a joy to know. Submitted by Rep. Claire Fishman.

REP. THOMAS BURKE said he wished to make a somewhat different statement. Since he was intimately involved in the happenings during the time that is in question here, and because of the events of the past week, he wanted to express a feeling of profound sorrow for all the Japanese people killed at both Hiroshima^{and} Nagasaki, but he would also like to say that it was not without one ounce of guilt that he does it. Consequently, he is requesting a Moment of Silence for those Americans killed at Pearl Harbor, thousands of whose bodies still lie entombed in The Arizona and many other ships lying on the bed of that harbor, those killed at Corregidor, Bataan, Wake Island, Iwo Jima, Tarawa, New Guinea, Okinawa, Singapore, and many other places; and it is for these people that I would like to request this Moment of Silence.

For the late GRACE H. DUFFIN of Shippan, who died suddenly last Friday. She was the mother of five children, the wife of an F.B.I. agent, Tom Duffin, a career man assigned to the New York Office. She was a quiet, efficient, lovely woman and will be greatly missed. Submitted by Rep. Mary Jane Signore. Rep. Richard Lyons joined Rep. Signore in this tribute to Mrs. Duffin.

MR. DUDLEY asked that the Board congratulate Mr. Donald Donahue and his wife, Kathy, who are "expecting". (Much applause)

MRS. GOLDSTEIN asked "What?"

MR. DUDLEY said he did not know that yet.

MR. BOCCUZZI said probably a Giant fan.

STANDING COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE: Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report.
Seconded. CARRIED.
HMM:MS

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on WEDNESDAY, JULY 24, 1985, in the Board of Education Administration Building on Hillandale Avenue. The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. by Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein who declared a Quorum.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
John Boccuzzi
Mary Lou Rinaldi
David Martin
Donald Donahue
Lathon Wider
Robert DeLuca
Scott Morris

Jeremiah Livingston
James Dudley
Mildred Perillo
Alfred Perillo
Maria Nakian
Dennis White
Audrey Maihock
Robert Skovgaard

Terrence Martin
Sherry Dorfman
Pat Wen, Advocate
Helen McEvoy
Len Gambino, WSTC
Richard Robinson
Anne Kachaluba

1. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two of the three items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Pending Steering Agenda and that was the name of Kenneth Lundmark for the Transit District. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the name of Irving Blum for the Planning Board. Suspension of the Rules approved to place an item on the Agenda and that item being the Evaluation of Members of Various Boards and Commissions.

2. FISCAL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four of the six items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two of the items appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and they were \$22,740 Welfare Department transfer for new positions; one for Housekeeping Aide and one for Laundry Aide, and \$12,995.00 Welfare Department transfer for a new clerk/typist position.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

3. LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were seven of the nine items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. On the proposed ordinance Regulating Visual Display of Obscenity to Minors, it was voted on for republication instead of final adoption. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING were two items; one being for final adoption, proposed ordinance on Allocation of Funds for Works of Art in Municipal Buildings, and the other being for publication, as amended, proposed ordinance Concerning the Abatement of Taxes on Structures of Historical or Architectural Merit. ORDERED OFF THE PENDING STEERING AGENDA was the proposed ordinance Requiring Mobile Vendors to be Equipped with Flashing Lights.

4. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

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

5. PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were three of the six items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING were two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and they were the Request to review certain actions of the office of the Zoning Board enforcement officer, and for publication, proposed ordinance concerning the sale of city-owned property to Smeriglio and Smeriglio, Inc. for land known as lots 27 and 28 on Carter Drive for the sum of \$108,000. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the proposed resolution and contract concerning the approval of the purchase of premises located at 54 West Main Street from Nick J. Downer and Ruth M. Downer for the purchase price of \$350,000.

6. PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN STEERING were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA appearing under the Fiscal Committee was the item of the Matter of the Booz, Allen and Hamilton Study of solid waste collection and funding alternatives for the City of Stamford.

7. HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was one of the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, and that was the Matter of litter as per letter of 5/17/85 from Dr. Angelo Mastrangelo, Chairman of the Health Commission. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the item Inquiring into the procedures and policies used by the Stamford Police Department for an officer to follow if a motorist appears to have been drinking. And, also, what procedures and policies are followed to return documents to individuals after a case is nolleed or dismissed. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Pending Steering Agenda and that item was for publication, proposed ordinance amending Ordinance 206 concerning the establishment of fees for fire alarm tie-in service to the City of Stamford Fire Department.

8. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the four items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and one item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was the Matter of no lights being put on in Veterans Park during the night time.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)

9. EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Pending Steering Agenda and that item was the Matter of the bi-monthly report from the Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility.

10. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing 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 were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Item one was changed to a resolution concerning property located at 191 Belltown Road, Stamford, CT., owned by Joseph Franchina.

13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

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

14. HOUSE COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

15. CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

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

16. COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda.

17. LABOR CONTRACT LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

18. RESOLUTIONS

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Steering Committee, upon a motion made, seconded, and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRWOMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

SG:ak

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

MRS. PERILLO said the Appointments Committee met August 8, 1985, at 7:30 P.M. at Hillandale Avenue. Present were Gabe DeLuca, Robert Austin, Ruth Powers, John Boccuzzi, Anne Summerville, and Chairwoman Millie Perillo. Also present were Reps. John Mallozzi and Barbara McInerney; and Len Gambino.

She Moved to the Consent Agenda Items #2 and #3.

PLANNING BOARDTerm Expires

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| (1) <u>MR. THOMAS GILLICK</u> (R) | Replacing Mel Young | Dec. 1, 1989 |
| 32 Mitzi Road | whose term expired | |
| Held in Steering 4/17, 5/15, | | |
| and 6/13/85. | | |

MRS. PERILLO said Mr. Gillick has a very impressive background, is very familiar with Stamford, and his wife has worked in Stamford for many years. He served on the Planning and Zoning Commission in Greenwich for six years, was a Selectman for two years. He feels the Planning Board should work in close concert with the Zoning Board, the Zoning Board of Appeals, the Sewer Commission, and the Environmental Protection Board. Mr. Gillick was interviewed for an hour and twenty-five minutes, and he was questioned very thoroughly. Mrs. Perillo will, therefore, answer any specific questions, should there be any from the Board members. She Moved for confirmation. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA said he endorses Mr. Gillick wholeheartedly for several reasons. He was very impressive at the interview. Since Mr. Gillick was from Greenwich, Mr. DeLuca contacted a friend in Greenwich and received most favorable comments. The friend felt Mr. Gillick would have been the next First Selectman, had he remained in Greenwich. Mr. Gillick was described as articulate, astute, does his homework, knows his planning and zoning, is not a "Yes Man", and will fight for the homeowners as well as the developers, depending on the circumstances. Mr. DeLuca is sorry Mel Young cannot remain on the Planning Board but feels Mr. Gillick would be an excellent replacement.

MRS. CONTI feels with all due respect to Mr. Gillick's credentials, that a two-year residency is not sufficient for present-day circumstances. Stamford is today, two cities, the new and the old, existing side-by-side. It is too much for a new resident with which to cope, since the history of Stamford's zoning and planning has to be considered in present day decisions. She has to vote against Mr. Gillick for a Land Use Board.

MR. BOCCUZZI agrees with Mrs. Conti on the two-year residency. He said Mr. Gillick was in Norwalk for many years, and spent much time in Stamford. He is immersed in Stamford's history before consolidation. He recalls the C.O. Miller Department Store, and other landmarks. Sometimes it is wise to substitute land use knowledge, background, willingness, and experience for a short residency, as in this case of Mr. Gillick.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY thanked the Appointments Committee for permitting her to question Mr. Gillick at their meeting. She was impressed with his willingness to learn and to concern himself about Stamford. His over-all basic philosophy as he expressed it, was that the spirit of the law must count, but that there must be fairness, equality, and justice for the community. He was willing to serve on any board. Impressed as she was by Mr. Gillick, she finds herself on the horns of a dilemma, as she is saddened that the Planning Board is changing in its complexion and losing the continuity of its members and their experience, as has occurred here with the exit of Mr. Mel Young, who served Stamford with pride and honor, and integrity. Unfortunately Stu Robbins has resigned, which leaves another void in that commission. Pat Grosso will be leaving shortly. Too much newness on this Board might have an adverse effect on the City. Reluctantly, she will not vote for Mr. Gillick.

MRS. GUROIAN said she will echo Mrs. McInerney's sentiments. Mr. Gillick and his resume are impressive. She feels the Planning Board is the heart of the City and must plan ahead if the City is to develop in a comprehensive way, and flooding the Board with new residents is not her idea of the way to proceed. Perhaps Mr. Gillick would better have been appointed as an Alternate to the Planning Board, and gotten on-the-job training. Having shopped in C.O. Miller's is no qualification for knowing what is going on in Glenbrook, in Springdale, and in the Cove. She cannot vote for him.

MR. DONAHUE Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a machine vote on Mr. Gillick. APPROVED with 30 Yes and 9 No votes.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSIONTerm Expires

- (2) MS. ANITA Y. CASON-BUTLER (R) Replacing J. Wiltrakis Dec. 1, 1987
81 Woodridge Drive South whose term expired.
Held in Committee 5/15 & 7/1.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.TRANSIT DISTRICT

- (3) KENNETH LUNDMARK (R) Replacing Leonard Vig- Dec. 1, 1987
56 Kenilworth Dr. East nola whose term expired.
Held 4/1 and 4/17/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) EVALUATION OF MEMBERS OF VARIOUS BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS. Submitted
by Rep. Mildred Perillo, Cjairwoman, Appointments Committee, 7/24/85.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. PERILLO said the Committee planned to ask all of the chairpersons of all the Boards and Commissions of the City to appear before their Committee. They have been getting a lot of feedback, some good, some not so good, and would like to clear this up. They would like an evaluation of the members on these boards, an attendance record, members should have cars to investigate and many don't, and other matters. The goal in mind is to have good boards who can serve the City much better than they have been in some cases.

MRS. PERILLO Moved for acceptance of Items 2 and 3 on the Consent Agenda. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee met on July 31, 1985. Representatives Rinaldi, David Martin, Lyons, Vos, Livingston, McInerney, Donahue, Mallozzi, and Betty Conti were in attendance. We also met with the full Committee in attendance on August 7, 1985. He Moved the following items on the Consent Agenda: Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5.

- (1) \$100,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET F/Y 1985/86 FOR GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT #201.3491. Amount appropriated for completing feasibility studies on Block 9, the Municipal Office Bldg., and Rippowam High School sites. Studies to be completed before October meeting of Board of Finance. Project to be financed by the issuance of BONDS. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 6/7/85 and 7/10/85. Planning Board denied 6/11/85. Board of Finance approved 6/24/85. Held in Steering 6/13.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said this \$100,000, as outlined by the Board of Finance, will be used for three feasibility studies. Additional data on Block 9 would be the first one; the Municipal Office Bldg. area where we are now, would be the second study; and the Rippowam Center would be the third study. Also flood plain and water level studies would be done; property appraisals, where necessary, would be made; and project management would continue. It is the majority of the Committee's feeling that while they may disagree on where or what to do concerning the present conditions in the M.O.B., that at least it is agreed that something does have to be done.

These funds will allow the City to go forward and to hopefully make a decision and take a course of action in the future. By a vote of 5 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions, Mr. Donahue recommended approval of the \$100,000.

MRS. NAKIAN said Education, Welfare and Government voted 4 in favor and none opposed to this item.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DONAHUE said this has been discussed quite often, but the Board of Finance has asked for more definitive project cost data, and how the project will be financed, and the financial impact on other Capital Projects. They have also required that three feasibility studies be done on the three separate locations.

MR. DUDLEY is reluctant to approve money for feasibilities and we have seen a lot of them. However, he will support this, but he would like to see one thing. He would like the Mayor to be advised that a public hearing should be held and the public be given an opportunity to speak out on the issue of where the new City Hall is to be located. Something has to be done. It is the hottest issue in town, and he, for one, would like to know how the City as a whole feels about certain individual sites; whether we should go with the new building, renovate the existing building, which should help all the Board members to make their determination as well. He asks the Chair to address such a letter to the Mayor.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said such a letter could be written if the Board so wished, but such a motion would not be binding on the person to whom it is addressed. It would be independent of the Motion to approve or not approve the funds.

MR. DeLUCA said he finds it very difficult to vote for \$100,000 for another feasibility study. The City has spent close to \$200,000 for the H-O-K (Hellmuth, Obate & Kassabaum) studies. About a month ago, Mr. DeLuca proposed a resolution to try to get some funds from the State, and before the Education, Welfare and Government Committee, Mr. Butler stated we did have all the studies we needed. Now, the Mayor is asking for \$100,000 to do more studies. Mr. DeLuca will vote against this for several reasons.

Going back to the 1960's, when each Mayor has sought in some fashion to approve space available for government function, without exception, they have been downtown, either Atlantic Street at the present site, or one time, the Stamford High School was considered but was rejected. Going along with Jim Dudley's comments, the public has seldom had an opportunity to indicate its feelings because Mayors have usually found support for many other community needs. If the comments were more down to a layman's terminology and not the Taj Mahal image that is being projected, it might make a difference as the public does not really know what is going on at this time.

Furthermore, the Planning Board, in a Six-year Planning Program for Capital Projects, has not shown a new City Hall, or a renovated one, to even be something in their six year projections while they have shown needs that total into the tens of millions of dollars. An example is Sewers and Storm Drains, Waste Disposal Sites, Plants, Haulaway Problems, Housing Below Market, Roads, Bridges, Traffic Improvements, Parks, Replacement for Rolling Stock, just to name a few. A good question is what happens to these other high priority projects if we now fund a City Hall at the cost which has been proposed. One figure was \$30 Million, but being realistic, it would be closer to \$90 or \$100 Million before it is finished.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)MR. DeLUCA (continuing)

Block 9 in the Urban Renewal Area where plans have been made and changed, and made and changed. The proposed City Hall is large. It has been suggested that the City seek to exempt itself from the floor area ratio so as to transfer its development rights to other developers. This is a new concept not yet adopted in the City regulations that may draw objections from other propertyowners and developers, and even the Land Use Boards that would be required to act upon it. Because it would require an Urban Renewal Plan change, agreements would have to be made and approved, and could be open to legal action by any injured party. This could up the final cost to over \$100 Million, a prohibitive, exorbitant cost. The potential for delay is here, if anyone is in a hurry, as the property-owners in this area have a right to know what is going on.

Mr. DeLuca's preference is Rippowam High School. If we cannot have Rippowam High School, then the site that provides the next best options is the present site where the City owns the greatest amount of real property so that it can best influence the development of the entire area by its decision. This site would not involve the complexities that accompany Parcel 9 of the URC.

The present proposal is for 180,000 sq. ft. building. Does the City need this size building which includes a cafeteria, space to rent, and includes functions that might better be conducted in other locations?

Mr. DeLuca received a letter from one constituent asking why is it necessary for the Mayor to get on the bandwagon for a new Civic Center in Area 8 and 9? Why can't Rippowam High School be used similar to what Greenwich did with their high school? This constituent went on to say he told this to the Mayor, stating he did not understand him.

He urges the \$100,000 be rejected and used for more worthwhile projects.

MRS. CONTI is opposed to this appropriation. She endorses Mr. Dudley's remarks and would be highly in favor of a public hearing on this issue. Her 7th District constituents wanted first, Rippowam High School. If that could not be secured, they preferred staying in the present location. They do not want upward of \$50 or \$60 Million for a new building. Their taxes are too high now. If we had that kind of money to spend, there are other more important projects with higher priorities. The Sewage Treatment Plant has to be expanded, the Incinerator has to be rebuilt or repaired. In some areas, the septic systems are causing health hazards. Those areas should be sewered. These are all higher priority items. In good conscience, she could not vote for this expenditure. Taxpayers are getting less and less of the most basic services, but their taxes keep going up, and there is a trend toward aesthetics and frills which fall outside of sanitation, health, safety, protection, and education. Have any of the studies and projected costs included the accoutrements that would go into a new government building, the desks, furnishings, equipment, etc.? It would be enlightening to find out. Or will present equipment and furnishings continue to be used? Let's get some figures on this.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM said he is in favor of the \$100,000 for the reason that they are now sitting in a condemned building. Must we wait until someone incinerates this building as was done in 1905 when a fire occurred in the Town Hall which would have been located where the Gurley Bldg. was. A new Town Hall was planned, and that is the Old Town Hall we have across from the Town Center. We are speaking about the old Old Town Hall that we had in 1830 to 1867, but time goes on, and we all get older, and so does this building get older. He does not know why this Board is meeting here, because if the fire bell rang, where would the Board members go, dive out the windows? During the day, the City employees are sitting here in a fire trap. Do we wait until it burns down? We need one centralized building where all the agencies are located, eliminating a lot of expensive travel for man and vehicle. That is economy. (Rest of Mr. Blum's comments lost in flipping cassette tape over.)

MR. BOCCUZZI is saying "if we had this \$100,000, all the questions they ask would probably be answered. There are people on this Board who would like to see Rippowam High School. Then there are those who would like to see a new building. There are also those who hope the building now in use could be renovated. And the fourth group is the one that will vote NO, regardless, whether it be personal, or what. With this study, the answers will come down to all the three groups who probably makeup the majority of this Board. It may be yes, when it's all over, we may decide to stay here. Maybe we'll see if we can get Rippowam. Maybe we'll see if we can get a new building. These are the answers that we need. This is the what the study is all about. We are zeroing in on three of the popular places to put a City Hall. We started out with five choices, then another was put in at the end."

Mr. Boccuzzi went on to say that the only way if yes, indeed, this Board wants to do something about this building or a new building, the only way to do it is to approve this \$100,000. He cannot see how, by rejecting it, the problem will be solved. He implores this Board, and those who are not sure how they are going to vote, or are looking for further information, and those who feel they don't want to vote for it for some reason or other, remember that you are not voting for a City Hall for any particular person, you are voting for a City Hall for the general public, no matter where it is. We have to do something, as everyone well knows, and that is what this \$100,000 is for.

MR. BURKE hopes that the remarks he is about to make will be as well-thought out and as cogent as everyone else's, but he feels it is a reflection of his state of mind on this whole particular project. He is no apologist for any proponent of this mausoleum in which we meet, this magnificent monument to mediocrity in architectural design. It's terrible. As Mr. Blum has said, it is unsafe. What do we do? Centralization per se is no indication of anything. If it were, then all the fire companies would be under one roof and dispatched from there. The minute they are not, we say that centralization per se is not necessarily good.

Efficiency. Speaking of efficiency, we must take into consideration the law of diminishing returns, which states rather succinctly, and brought down to basic terms, you pay \$1,000 to get \$50 worth more of efficiency. That is not very intelligent; and are we doing that? Insofar as Rippowam High School is concerned, Mr. Burke lived across the street when it was built, using the term loosely. It has been rebuilt, redesigned, refurbished several times since then.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BURKE (continuing) When it was put up, the talk was that those schools that were built in those days, were built to last 40 years or so, 35 years. It was built a little over 25 years ago. Comparing it to Greenwich High School is like a Volkswagen and a Mercedes. They are both automobiles, but that is where the resemblance stops. He does not know the answer, but he hopes that by the time the vote comes, he will have found an answer. Something has to be done. We can't ask the people who work in this building to put up with the conditions they have to work, very much longer, in good conscience. Please convince him one way or the other, he asks.

MR. ZELINSKI asked what is the total amount of money that has been spent up to this evening for any type of studies, surveys dealing with where a new City Hall would go.

MR. DONAHUE said they approved \$250,000 and the back-up information suggests that sum is all committed and spent. Nothing is left in the account. This \$100,000 would be for the studies he outlined in his report tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI said it is long over-due that where the City Hall is to go should have been gotten from the residents, the taxpayers of this City. He has received letters and phone calls not only from his 11th District constituents, but also from other residents with whom he comes in contact in his business. The repeated theme that comes across is that the public, yes, would definitely want another long-over-due City Hall, but their concern is mainly with the cost to build or refurbish a structure that would serve this purpose.

He said that one of our existing high schools would be most feasible and economical. Norwalk and Greenwich are using one of their old high schools for the same purpose. This is not a safe building either for us to meet, or to have civil service employees work in. Four or five years ago, he was amazed to find there were no fire or smoke alarms in this building. The administrations at that time knew this building was not safe. The MGM fire and the Stouffer's Inn fire brought this to his attention. The Mayor is looking to this Board to do something about this crucial issue. On the radio today, the Mayor stated that regardless of what site it is, he wants this Board to get off base and take a stand. With that in mind, hopefully this appropriation is defeated this evening. If that happens, then Mr. Zelinski will recommend that this Board hold a public hearing to allow the public to express their opinions. While it is likely that the Representatives have heard from their own constituents and from other Stamford residents on this crucial issue and have formed an opinion, it is time other people in City Government hear what the people of Stamford want. If such an hearing is held, speakers should state if they reside in Stamford. Mr. Zelinski is going to vote against this item tonight as he does not feel it necessary to appropriate one more penny to make the site decision. Much time has been wasted, and the delays only make the final choice that much more expensive to acquire and implement. He urges everyone to vote No.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN stated she is in favor of this appropriation without question. However, she agrees with Mr. Dudley that, along with the appropriation, the Mayor be sent a letter asking that a public hearing be part of this process. The citizens of Stamford deserve this. As far as she is concerned, it is absolutely impossible to vote on the final site without having a clear idea of how people feel. We have a lot of hearsay, of second-hand opinions. Something as important as a new City Hall deserves an organized way of getting public opinion out. She proposes the Board President write a letter to the Mayor asking for the public hearing for the citizens to let us know if they want a City Hall and what site they would like to see it on, if that is their wish.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the CHAIR has already said she would write such a letter. There are many, many speakers.

MR. DUDLEY made a Point of Personal Privilege. His original request was that he would like to make a Motion to have that letter sent.

MRS. SANTY said this amendment to the Capital Budget borders on the ridiculous. Three months ago, this Board defeated this same appropriation. What has changed? Has the Board changed? Has anyone learned something that has not been disseminated among all the members and might cause opinions to change? Thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent on feasibility studies, outside consultants, etc., and yet more and more requests are being made for additional studies and consultants. This morning on WSTC, the Mayor said he is waiting for this Board to make a decision. That is ludicrous. This whole project was his idea. The Board was led into this major million dollar project without direction.

Mrs. Santy said, over the last couple of weeks, she had the opportunity to speak to about 200 taxpayers in her District. Without even bringing up the subject, 95% of them brought up the new City Hall and said not to spend another penny on a new building, on any type of a City Hall. They said if the present building needs repairs, they should be made. The Board should get back to meeting here. There are many more urgent projects on which to spent \$100,000, especially in her District, and some others. We have spent a quarter of a million dollars already, just imagine, and now another \$100,000, and how much more? The time to say No is now.

MRS. MCINERNEY said since its inception, the proposal to build a new City Hall has floated under a cloud of missing information. The issue relating to a new City Hall is not a matter of politics, which has often been the term used or given to the public. It is rather a question of dollars-and-cents and what is the best path for the City to take to provide a facility without encumbering future generations to millions of dollars of bonded indebtedness, and to insure the safety of our employees and public.

There has never been a doubt in any official's mind about the need to correct the problems in the present Municipal Office Bldg. She only wishes that in the past administration, those people who indicate that perhaps several Representatives are not voting on this particular project for a particular reason, or a personal reason, but should vote on it for the general public, would have voted on all the money that was necessary to correct the emergency hazards in this building, two, three, four years ago when the requests came from the other administration. However, that did not happen.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY went on to say that in October, 1984, the Administration invoked an authorized spending under Section 619.1 of the Charter for \$259,803. Those monies were needed for correcting the problems in this building, and that objective has still not been met. According to the Finance Commissioner, the City has made a decision not to demolish the Annex Building. It certainly has spent the money wisely. However, it has spent the money necessary to relocate the Planning & Zoning Departments; relocate the Central Services Division; and the Payroll Department; place the fire alarm system in this building; put in Emergency Exit boxes; and a public address system in the Municipal Office Bldg. But, but, the most important item: the need to insure the safety and remove the hazards to City employees, the one thing we heard and saw in the papers as being the largest endangerment to the health and safety of the people who come into this building, is now only being readied for bid. She refers to the need to build and renovate a new stairway for the chimney-type stairway which now exists at the M.O.B. What took so long to insure the safety of our City employees? Why was this stairway not started earlier? Mrs. McInerney feels the entire project has been poorly handled. It was placed in the 1984 budget after the validation of budget action was taken by City agencies and done in a manner where public input would be lacking on the original request for \$475,000 for planning for a Government Center Building. Where was the opportunity for the citizens to address this important issue at a public hearing when other budget items were being considered in 1984?

This Board has authorized a large amount of money since that time on the new City Hall project, but yet has never given the public the opportunity to participate. In accordance with the proposal before the Board tonight regarding the \$100,000, it is intended to incorporate the public at last at public hearings sometime in October and November. Everyone is concerned with the working conditions of the employees, but really need information on project costs. How will the project be financed? What will the financial impact be on other priority capital projects? What properties will be placed for divestment according to the preliminary feasibility study? The City had a total of 17 buildings: 8 administrative, and 9 schools, which were labeled as City-owned assets. Mrs. McInerney is disappointed that the City Administration has not deemed it necessary to supply the Board with information regarding specifics on disposing of our assets, i.e., what financial gains would be accomplished and at what cost and impact to the surrounding neighborhood? Since 1984, there have been studies and studies and studies, but it is time to place all the facts before the Boards and the public, and reveal all the scenarios, exactly. It does not take another study for the Administration to inform the Boards how it plans to sell off the assets, how much will go toward funding the City Hall. What other capital projects might be put off. Let us get a definite goal, an objective for the City, before any other dollars are placed in the coffers for studies. Let us make those emergency corrections to the stairway of the M.O.B. prior to placing another \$100,000 in the budget for further studies of site. This is not an unreasonable request; and until the issue of the emergency staircase, financial impact, neighborhood impact, are addressed, she cannot support this \$100,000 request at this time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER said there is not much left to say, but the poor people must be heard from, and he will speak for the poor people. The poor people have informed him they are tired of having Mr. Wider spending his nights in a place that is hazardous. If he had 50¢ for every hour they have spent here, they could build their own City Hall. A decent workplace is not too much to ask for and in which to come to pay taxes and other reasons. If this Board does not approve this \$100,000 tonight, the State may send a letter prohibiting even this one meeting each month in this building and return to the Board of Education Building. It is time to get off dead-center. If we don't use it, we may lose it.

MR. JACHIMCZYK agrees with all those who have spoken to approve this amendment. He wishes to add that the job of this Board is to legislate and take a long-term view and not just look at the here and now. The long-term view of this amendment is that the City has changed for the worse in many ways because of the short-term solutions to long-term problems. It is incumbent for the good of the City to approve this amendment and get moving. By approving this \$100,000, the Board is not picking a site but merely whittling it down from five choices to three choices, which probably is unnecessary if one read that whole conglomeration received originally. It is important to approve this money and get moving on a City Hall Complex after almost two years.

MS. FISHMAN is proud to live in Stamford, as she has lived here longer than probably any other place in the world. It is a lovely place. She feels we owe it to the people of Stamford to have a City Hall that represents this beautiful City. She was given a tour of this building recently for the first time, and she was horrified. She feels no one who works in the City elsewhere would put up with the conditions in the M.O.B. In one little room, there was a woman working with two computers and a terminal. She could barely get into the room to work. There were papers piled floor to ceiling, with no room to put file cabinets, apart from the hazards of fire.

Ms. Fishman works in Greenwich. Greenwich High School was an empty building, a beautiful building located downtown, not stuck up in a residential area. For those reasons, they chose that site for their City Hall. She said they get reams of paper in the mail but apparently nobody seems to read it all. It is there in black-and-white, the matter of the public hearing is listed as one of the things that have to be done. It has been intended all along that there would be a public hearing. She urges approval of the \$100,000.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said John Boccuzzi said something that moved him to speak, which was that this study would answer all the unanswered questions. While he agrees with things said by both sides of the issue, he feels the study does not answer the core issues or the core questions. He does not want the project to cease or desist. He is as able now to make a decision as if the \$100,000 had been spent. It doesn't mean they have answered the right questions. He feels too much of this issue has been a bunch of hip-shots; hip-shots by people who want one project or are opposed to another project, and no one side has had a monopoly on the hip-shots. He feels the City has not been served well. However, he feels at this point he must represent his District, and his District would ask what did they get for their \$100,000, and Mr. Martin is not certain he could tell them what it would be. For that reason, he must vote against the funding this evening.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MS. RINALDI Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote. She said Mr. Mallozzi has left the meeting, and there are 38 members present.

A Roll Call vote has been requested, and there are sufficient hands for that.

CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll and registered each vote.
(See tally sheet at end of minutes.)

THE PRESIDENT said two-thirds of those present voting in the affirmative is required for passage, or 26. The question is approving \$100,000 for the Government Center study.

The vote is 24 Yes, 13 No, 1 Abstention. The Motion has been DEFEATED.

- (2) \$ 10,000.00 - COMMISSION ON AGING - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR F/Y 1985/86 FOR PROJECT #114.136 DIAL-A-RIDE MINI-BUS REPLACEMENT. To be funded by grants from UMTA and Connecticut Dept. of Transportation. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 6/17/85. Planned Board approved 7/2/85. Board of Finance approved 7/11/85.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (3) \$ 35,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #341.3881 BUREAU OF SANITATION - HARBOR BULKHEAD, EAST BRANCH - Additional Appropriation to be financed by BONDS. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 5/9/85. Planning Board approved 6/4. Board of Finance approved 7/11/85.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO FILE APPLICATION FOR FUNDS ENTITLED "PAYMENT-IN-LIEU-OF-TAXES (PILOT) FOR STATE-FINANCED MODERATE RENTAL HOUSING in an amount not to exceed \$845,487.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/19/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (5) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO APPLY FOR A NEIGHBORHOOD REHABILITATION GRANT FROM THE COMMISSIONER OF HOUSING in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/19/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with three No votes: Reps. Conti, Maihock, and McInerney.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) \$150,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Additional Appropriation request for start-up costs for SOLID WASTE COLLECTION for condominiums and cooperative residences for service - OPTION #1 of the Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. Report. (Option #1 is twice-a-week collection provided by a combination of City forces and private contractors under contract to the City). Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/18/85. Contingent upon approval by the Board of Finance.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said there will be a joint meeting of the Public Works Committee and the Fiscal Committee and representatives of Booz, Allen, consultants, so this item is held for this month. A recommendation is expected in September.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on approval of Consent Agenda Items 2, 3, 4, and 5. Seconded. CARRIED. Reps. Conti, Maihock, and McInerney asked to be recorded as voting No on Item #5.

MR. DONAHUE Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the Agenda. Seconded. APPROVED on voice vote.

- (7) \$ 6,500.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - 5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS - Additional Appropriation for 1/2 of the \$13,000 cost for a study to restore the old City Hall now on Whittaker Place and move it to a suitable site. There is an Oct. 1st deadline to prevent demolition. Board of Finance has not acted on this, therefore approval is CONTINGENT OF BOARD OF FINANCE APPROVAL.

Mr. Donahue said the Fiscal Committee approved this unanimously. The other half of the \$13,000 will come from the private sector and donations and in-kind services.

MRS. CONTI said she is against this request as the over-all cost has been estimated to be \$250,000 after the study. That is a rough estimate, as the site has not been chosen for the final location of this building, should it be moved. Two sites have been recommended: Cove Island and Mill River. There is no guarantee this cost will be funded by donations. It might end up on the back of the taxpayers and she is opposed to that.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the \$6,500. APPROVED with 4 No votes: Reps. Conti, Maihock, Malloy, Livingston. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda, being a Resolution mentioned earlier this evening for the Board of Representatives to hold a public hearing on a site for a new City Hall. Seconded. The President asked if Mr. Zelinski had the text of the resolution and he said he was writing it at that moment. The President said in the absence of a written resolution, there was nothing to Suspend the Rules for, and suggested he write it up and propose it under RESOLUTIONS later on the Agenda.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

MR. SKOVGAARD said his Committee met Monday, July 29, 1985 at 7:30 P.M. in the Board of Education Administration Bldg. Present were Scott Morris, John Zelinski, Ruth Powers, Terrence Martin, Audrey Maihock, Maria Nakian, and Bob Skovgaard; also David Martin, Sidney Cholmar, and Greg Johnson, a local Boy Scout working on one of his badges.

- (1) REQUEST FOR A WAIVER OF DUMPING FEES FOR STAMFORD NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSING SERVICES, INC., on their West Main Street Project. Requested by L. Higgins-Biddle, Exec. Dir., SNHS, Inc., 295 West Main St. Stamford, 10/24/84. Returned to Committee 12/3/84, 1/7/85. Held on Pending Steering Agenda since 1/16/85.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 6-1 to recommend REJECTION of the request based on jurisdictional reservations and he so Moved for approval, based on traditional positive motions, bearing in mind that 1 was in favor and 6 were opposed. Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she could not attend the Committee meeting, but she finds the rejection unbelievable. She asked if the Chairman would be kind enough to give her some idea why the rejection was so overwhelming as this is a request not out of the ordinary.

MR. SKOVGAARD said, to the best knowledge and recollection of the members of the Committee, it has never come before this Board in the history of any of the 18 Boards for a waiver of dumping fees. There is nothing in the Charter or Code of Ordinances that gives this Board the authority to waive these fees. For those reasons, they voted against this item.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked what reasons the presenters of the request gave to substantiate their request.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Director of the Neighborhood Services Leslie Higgins-Biddle was invited and did not attend.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said this item has been held several times and she asked if the Director never appeared even though invited.

MR. SKOVGAARD said Mrs. Higgins-Biddle appeared at one hearing since her request of 10/24/84.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked what was her discussion at that one hearing.

MR. SKOVGAARD said she was told by Public Works Commissioner O'Brien that that was the procedure.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said what was her reason why she should have it. She said if someone makes a request and is on the agenda, they must have a reason for asking what they want.

MRS. NAKIAN said she believes when they came before the Committee, it was at the time the townhouses were being built by various families on West Main St. It was held for so long because it was tied into the whole question of whether or not the City should be waiving any fees specifically building permit fees, or any fees. The Committee did not feel the Board had the power to waive.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. CONTI said regarding Ms. Summerville's question, any citizen or group of citizens can come to this Board and request anything, but it is up to this Board, based on the Ordinances and the Charter to determine whether we have the power to grant that request, and obviously the Committee felt that we did not have the power to grant that request.

MR. WIDER said as Chairman of the Housing and Community Development Committee of the City, they discussed this at length because of the cost of the housing. This dumping fee will add to the cost as these people will have to pay for the dumping as they are building as "sweat" for the down payment.

MR. LYONS said this is the position the Board puts itself in when they decide who will be approved and who will not be approved on fees. We waived a \$1,600 building fee, and now we are talking about a \$300 dumping fee. He cannot uphold the L&R Committee now, based on what this Board has done in the past on fees. We do not have a clear-cut ruling on what to do. He does not believe in being selectively prejudiced.

MR. BLUM Moved this be Held in Committee for one month and that the L&R Committee meet with the Housing & Community Development Committee to iron this out. Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE is against this Motion. The item has been held since December. It should be voted on tonight.

MR. BLUM withdrew his Motion, as did the Seconder.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

MR. BOCCUZZI (ACTING PRESIDENT) said keeping in mind that the L&R Committee recommended rejection of Item #1, waiver of dumping fee, the Motion was made in the affirmative vein as customary; vote Yes if you are in favor of waiving; or vote No if you agree with L&R and are against the waiver of permit fee.

Item #1 has been DEFEATED by a vote of 14 Yes, 19 No, 2 Abstentions, and 3 Non-Voting. Mr. Livingston is to be recorded as Abstaining.

- (2) FOR RE-PUBLICATION PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGULATING THE VISUAL DISPLAY OF OBSCENITY TO MINORS. Submitted by Rep. Dudley 3/11/85. Approved for publication 5/6/85. Held in Committee 6/3 and 7/1/85.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE. The Committee is still awaiting response to three questions submitted to the Law Department by Rep. Dudley, but it will be forthcoming shortly we have been advised.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING ADVERTISING ON CITY-OWNED PROPERTY. Submitted by Reps. Robert "Gabe" DeLuca and John J. Boccuzzi 4/17/85. Returned to Committee 5/6, 6/3/85. Approved for publication 7/1/85.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 4 in favor and 3 opposed to recommend approval and he so Moved. Seconded. After Moving for Final Adoption, he will be speaking against Final Adoption.

Mr. Skovgaard said he feels Mr. Burke put this item in perfect perspective. He was reading the Minutes, and Mr. Burke said we were out hunting mosquitoes with an elephant gun. It is precisely what is being done. This ordinance is overly broad, over-reaching, clearly unclear as to what the function of this Board is. Was the Board to approve each and every piece of "advertising" or just the concept proposed? This was instigated by a particular instance at a golf course, and that advertising has now been stopped. He urges rejection.

MR. DeLUCA disagrees. Many ordinances that are enacted are the result of a particular problem; a good example being the demolition ordinance recently enacted. Why did that come into being if not because the armory was torn down? The same thing applied when an ordinance was enacted to fence in swimming pools for the safety of small children and others, after a small child did drown. He urged voting in favor of the proposed ordinance.

MRS. MAIHOCK agrees with Mr. DeLuca on the merit of the proposed ordinance. It prevents visual pollution, and gives control over the kind of advertising. She also sees Mr. Skovgaard's point about implementation. However, she feels as Mr. DeLuca does, that it has merit and should gain approval of the Board.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote. APPROVED with 26 Yes votes, 8 No votes, 2 Abstentions and 1 Non-Voting.

- (4) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORD. #514 CREATION OF DEMOLITION BOARD AND ESTABLISHMENT OF RELOCATION/DEMOLITION FUND.
Submitted by Reps. Nakian, Morris, Skovgaard. Held in Committee 6/1 and 7/1/85.

MR. SKOVGAARD said Item #4 was approved by the Committee with 6 in favor, none opposed, and one abstention, and he so Moved. Seconded. The amendment done by this ordinance simply makes the Demolition Board responsible for sending out information concerning contents of the Agenda of the Demolition Board to people who request an Agenda of that Board.

On two occasions, the Demolition Board was invited to speak to the L&R Committee on why they did not want this, but the Committee was unable to get any response from the Demolition Board at all. It would not be an onerous burden to send out copies of agendas as requested, and certainly they must file with the Town & City Clerk's Office anyway. It is a good way of disseminating the information as to what is being proposed for demolition.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY suggests it would be more appropriate to hold this item in committee since there already is a request to place on the Steering Committee Agenda a suggested change regarding the membership of this Ord. 514. The Committee would then have time to look at the present amendment and the one that is to come next month, and publish it at one time instead of going through the procedure twice on publication, final adoption, etc. She Moved to Return to Committee. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD agrees with Mrs. McInerney's concept, but in this instance, the new proposal yet to come before the Board will take several months to finalize; and he feels the time should not be lost in the interim while the Demolition Board meets without the ability of interested parties to get notice of their dealings. He understands what Mrs. McInerney is saying, and generally, it is an excellent idea to consolidate such things.

MRS. GUROIAN agrees with Mr. Skovgaard at this time for the reasons that he stated. The change is needed and it is needed at this time. To postpone it for several months is to beg the issue. There is no relationship between the responsibilities of a Board and the membership of the Board. The two issues have nothing to do with each other except that they apply to the same Board. This is a public Board and refusing agendas is tantamount to acting in secret. It is needed now, and the other aspect can be handled later, even if regretfully it takes more time than we wish. I will vote for this item.

MRS. McINERNEY agrees with both Mr. Skovgaard and Mrs. Guroian. She preferred, from her viewpoint as Co-Chairperson of the Charter Revision and Codification Committee, to have this intact when it was submitted. She will withdraw her Motion. The Secunder withdrew also.

MR. BURKE wanted to know what happened to the Freedom-of-Information Act. Does this Committee find itself subject to that, and if so, why are these notices of Agendas and Minutes ^{not} published as they should be?

MR. SKOVGAARD said that due to the fact that the members of the Demolition Board were not responsive to the invitations of the L&R Committee, he does not know the answers to Mr. Burke's questions.

MR. DUDLEY Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #4. APPROVED with 3 No votes: Reps. Summerville, Malloy, and Santagata.

- (5) REVIEWING THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF HOW LEASES ARE NEGOTIATED BETWEEN THE CITY AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris, Vice Chairman L&R, 6/3/85. Held in Committee 7/1/85.

MR. SKOVGAARD said in light of the late hour, he will simply say they received a rather lengthy talk from Corp. Counsel Jay Sandak, and there is a synopsis of that discussion in his Committee Report that fully explains. All he would be doing this evening would be reading from his Committee Report and he will elect not to do that.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (6) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING AN HISTORIC DISTRICT WITHIN THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by The Historic District Study Committee 7/25/85, and Reps. Audrey Maihock and David Martin 7/24/85. Town Clerk PontBriant certified on 6/25/85 that all ballots were properly cast for Board to pass ordinance.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 6-0 to approve as amended for publication, Item #6 above. Prior to Moving its approval, he Moves two amendments. Everyone has a copy of Section 3 as it is amended. This amendment would be to delete everything after the first sentence and include in place thereof, the following language: "The members of the Commission shall be appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the Board of Representatives for initial terms as follows: One member, a term of five years; one member, a term of four years; one member, a term of three years; one member, a term of two years; and one member, a term of one year. Thereafter, each term shall be for five years. Five Alternate Members of the Commission shall be appointed in a like manner and for like terms." Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the amendment just stated by Rep. Skovgaard. APPROVED.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the second amendment is to Section 4. The Committee recommended that the Board approve this change: Add to paragraph after the first paragraph but before the second paragraph (which everyone has in their possession), read as follows: "The Commission shall submit minutes of its proceedings, Commission decisions, and copies of applications for certificates of Appropriateness to the Town/City Clerk of the City of Stamford. The Town/City Clerk shall maintain these records in a binder (as) "Old Long Ridge Village Historic District" and make them available to the public."

"The Commission shall render its decision on an application for Certificate of Appropriateness within sixty-five (65) days of the submission of such an application", and Mr. Skovgaard so Moved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the publication of the ordinance as amended. Moved. Seconded. APPROVED unanimously.

- (7) REQUEST FROM THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER FOR A WAIVER AND REFUND OF \$300.00 BUILDING PERMIT FEE paid by Barbara A. Pomerantz, Architect, for construction at The Jewish Community Center, a non-profit organization. Permit #63472, 6/13/85. Requested by Steven Friedlander, Exec. Dir., Jewish Community Center, P.O.Box 3326, Newfield at Vine Road, Stamford 06905.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 7-0 to HOLD IN COMMITTEE for opportunity to discuss with The Jewish Community Center whether the request conforms to the Board policy which has been newly adopted concerning the waiver of building permit fees.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY said his Committee met on Tuesday, August 6, 1985, following a public hearing on two items which were on their Agenda. Present were Reps. Dudley, Fishman, Burke, Morris, Blum, Jachimczyk; also members of the Labor Liaison Committee, and Peter Thor of AFSCME, Council 4, and Tom Barrett, Rita Hogan, Nancy Piazza, John Lynch, Alice Perry, Ellen Isidro, Len Gambino, Reps. Boccuzzi and Zelinski.

Item #1 was Held by the Committee and will be removed at next Steering meeting.

- (1) 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 a permanent part-time position. Requested by Finance-Board Chairman Michael Morgan 1/21/85. Held in Committee 3/4, 4/1, 5/6, and 6/3/85. Returned to Committee 7/1/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE DESIGNATING POSITIONS CREATED OR FUNDED BY A GRANT AS UNCLASSIFIED. Submitted by Asst. Corp. Counsel Wm. Hennessey 2/20/85. Held in Committee 4/1, 5/6, 6/3/85. Approved for publication 7/1/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. DUDLEY said Item #2 was also HELD IN COMMITTEE by the Personnel Committee. There is a court case pending and this item will be on the Pending Agenda. The Committee did not agree with an opinion they received from the Law Dept.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CREATING POSITION OF PART-TIME RISK REDUCTION PROGRAM SPECIALIST. This position is in a block grant program administered by the State, and position to be created by ordinance will be in unclassified service with a duration to depend solely upon duration of the grant involved. Current grant will begin on 6/1/85, and extend through 5/31/86. Submitted by Dr. R. Gofstein 5/28/85. Approved for publication 7/1/85.

MR. DUDLEY said Item #3 is also being HELD IN COMMITTEE as Dr. Gofstein was not available.

- (4) DISCUSSION REGARDING STAFF RESEARCHER FOR BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES BE INCLUDED in dental, health, hospitalization and major medical policies available to other City employees. Staff Researcher is an Independent Contractor by ordinance. Requested by Rep. Dudley, 6/6/85. Held in Committee 7/1/85.

MR. DUDLEY said this was HELD IN COMMITTEE for the same reasons as the Staff Analyst of the Board of Finance.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) FOR RATIFICATION - AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND THE STAMFORD POLICE ASSN. FOR A TWO-YEAR AGREEMENT EFFECTIVE 7/1/85 to 6/30/87. Agreement provides for a Seven Per Cent (7%) increase effective 7/1/85, and a Six Per Cent (6%) increase effective 7/1/86. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/15/85. Board has 30 days from 7/15/85 in which to accept or reject this Agreement. Board of Finance recommended approval 7/11/85.

Above also referred to LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. SKOVGAARD asked that the record show he has absented himself from the floor for this item.

MR. DUDLEY said Item #5 received the unanimous vote of the Committee (6 in favor, none opposed) and he so Moved.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the Labor Contracts Liaison Committee concurred.

MR. DeLUCA had a couple of questions. There is a provision that "Any employee injured in line of duty shall continue to receive his regular Shift Differential during his injury on Duty Leave." He can be out sick for a year or two years. under Unlimited Sick Leave. He believes this is a new item in the contract and Mr. DeLuca asked if the City got anything back in return for this concession. If one is home sick, why should the Shift Differential be paid, as it would also have to be paid to whoever replaced him even temporarily. Isn't Sick Leave basic Sick Leave for everyone, base pay? If it is a new item, what is the City getting in return for it?

MR. DUDLEY said he does not know. It is part of the negotiating process. And that would be to reach a compromise and perhaps this was part of that effort, but he is not sure.

MR. BURKE says you cannot take item for item in any labor contract and pinpoint it to a negotiating process and say we got A for giving B. You must take the whole contract. Perhaps it was part and parcel for going down to 6% for the second year of the contract.

MS. FISHMAN commented that we are asking these people to put their lives on the line and if anything happens to them while they are doing it, we should not begrudge them the money that is owing to them.

MR. DeLUCA said that was not the question; we are still going to be paying them. Everyone gets their base pay. This is not in the firemen's contract, but it probably will be next year. Both groups have hazardous duty. If everyone is going to get Shift Differential whether they actually work it or not, why isn't it in their base pay? For different types of extra duties, there is stipulated extra pay, but you would expect it to be paid only when actually worked.

Another item on Page 3, Item J, it states there will be an interpreter on duty. If the person is off duty, he can see him getting four hours' pay, but he finds it difficult to comprehend that if the person is on duty for instance in Office A, and the man in Office B says he needs someone to help serve as an interpreter he gets an extra hour's pay. Were there any give-backs of any kind in this contract at all? Does anyone know?

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LIVINGSTON said as he sees it, the financial amount is modest in all of these contracts. Incentives or increases such as a night differential are perceived to be a part of a person's regular salary if those are his regular duty hours. Why should he be cut, or nickel-and-dimed? It's a great sacrifice for a human being to work night hours. These contracts have been negotiated in good faith. The amount is modest, he feels. From what he understands in the Caucus Room, from what is happening in other municipalities with similar contracts, he thinks what we have gotten in return is a modest 6% increase.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he listened to the Labor Negotiator's presentation, and that particular item, the Differential, will not have unfavorable end results in comparison to the whole contract than if the 7% and 6% were larger, and that the one hour given to a person who has to be called in as an interpreter, which he did not realize was something new, as Mr. Boccuzzi thought it was something that was in the old contract. In order to get the 7% and 6%, these items were used as a giveaway because the State settlements in Binding Arbitration for some of the other towns, Manchester, the Police got 8%, 8%, and 8%; in Cromwell, they got, through arbitration, 10%, and 8.5%; New Britain, 7% and 7%; Munroe, 7.5% and 7.5%; Windsor, 8.5% and 8.5%. Weston was 10% and 10%. Wilton was 8% and 7.5%. East Hartford was 7% and 6.8%. Meriden was 8% and 7.75%. These two little points that Mr. DeLuca is bringing out are going to cost the City a minimum amount of money, and the City is going to gain much more in the over-all contract which is 7% and 6%. That is probably one of the reasons why they gave that in order to get something else. (Some of Mr. Boccuzzi's comments lost in flipping tape over.) He does not think the 3% that they saved would amount anywhere near what those two items would cost.

MR. DeLUCA said Mr. Boccuzzi's statements led him into another question. He read off some impressive figures. He asked if the people who got 8% and 7%, or 10% and 10%, do they also get step increases as our police do?

MR. BOCCUZZI said he has no idea of the other terms of their contracts.

MR. DeLUCA said step increases amount to as much as 3% or 4%. In order for the community to know what is going on, they are entitled to hear some accurate figures. In addition to the across-the-board per cent increases, there are step increases. He has no qualms about the 7% and the 6% but he would like more information than seems to be provided to this Board when comparisons are made between current contracts and the new ones, and what may cost more and what may cost less to the taxpayers who reside in this City.

MR. BOCCUZZI said his figures do not mention step increases in the data he has on the other cities. Going by the track record of the arbitration for this City regardless of the step increases or not that were built-in, the numbers that came down from the State Arbitration Board were much higher always than the ones we signed for the next two years for both these unions. The Arbitration Board never seemed to have taken into consideration the step increases when they decided on the percentages across the board. They probably never will.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA wished to comment there seemed to be new ^{items} compared to the firefighters' contract and he only brings these up because the question of parity always arises. Everyone received copies of the data that Gabe got from Chiefs Considine and Vitti on how many on the force, number that retired and their ages. In the last five years, about 36 people left the Police force, either due to retirement, death, etc. Nineteen retired under the age of 50, such as 42, 43, 44. The firefighters had 2 who retired under 50, one being 49 and one was 48. A few years ago, the firefighters agreed to a retirement age of not less than 48. Mr. DeLuca will vote against both contracts. He feels our Labor Negotiator is not doing the job he is supposed to do, or perhaps he just can't do it for some reason or other, but why can't there be a clause in the contract stating from the date the contract is signed, any new police officers coming on Board cannot retire unless they reach the age of 55 or 50. Give the taxpayers a break. Municipalities all over the country are hurt by this. Men get on the force at 20, retire at 40, at 50% pay. There are no changes in the pension provisions.

MR. WHITE said to give another dimension to Mr. DeLuca's remarks, if by step increases, he means increments, those are base pay. That is not a raise. That is base pay. If you signed a contract that the first year you work for this, and you automatically go the second, third, fourth, and fifth year, say for 5 or 10 years, to another step, that is not an increase, it is an increment. It is not part of your base raise. Teachers were murdered during the 1970's when they were put in the position of calling the increments as a raise, and the result they ended up with real raises of 2%, 3%, or 4%.

It is not fair to add that increment and figure it as part of the total percent of increase. The working man gets murdered that way.

MRS. GLOVER made the observation that just this evening as she left her home, there was an incident in the neighborhood and she saw two police officers jumping fences and running after someone. She doesn't think a 58 or 60-year-old policeman could have done what these officers were doing.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on ratification of the police contract. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, 2 No votes, 2 Abstentions, and 2 Non-Voting.

- (6) FOR RATIFICATION - AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND LOCAL 786, INTERNATIONAL ASSN. OF FIREFIGHTERS for a two-year Agreement effective 7/1/85 to 6/30/87. Agreement provides for a Seven Per Cent (7%) increase effective 7/1/85, and a Six Per Cent (6%) increase effective 7/1/86. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani. Board has 30 days from 7/15/85 in which to accept or reject this agreement. Board of Finance recommended approval 7/11/85.

Above also referred to LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA with Rep. McGrath Abstaining, and two voting in opposition, being Reps. Conti and DeLuca.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (7) FOR RATIFICATION - FACTFINDER'S REPORT BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND AFSCME, COUNCIL 4, LOCAL 1303-191, whose unit members are Assistant Corporation Counsels of the City, covering period from date of execution to 6/30/86, except salary increases will be retroactive to 2/15/84. The Board and Asst. Corporation Counsels have sixty (60) days from 6/27/85 in which to accept or reject this Report. If neither party rejects the Report, it becomes a valid contract. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/3/85. Board of Finance recommended denial of the Report 7/11/85.

Above also referred to LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. DUDLEY said the Committee's recommendation is to reject the FactFinder's Report. There seemed to be some discussion as to how this should be put out on floor of the Board, therefore they requested an opinion of Corporation Counsel. He Moved that the FactFinder's Report on the Assistant Corporation Counsels be rejected and the Union be notified by registered mail by the Board, of said rejection. Seconded.

MR. BOCCUZZI said the Labor Contracts Liaison Committee by a vote of 2-1 agrees with the Personnel Committee.

MR. DUDLEY said the Labor Negotiator asked to be notified of the decisions on all these contracts as well.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said this Motion is differently framed from the way this Board normally considers a Motion, and it is being done at the request of the Corporation Counsel and the Labor Negotiator. The Motion is being framed in the negative. The Motion is that the FactFinder's Report on Assistant Corporation Counsels be rejected and that the Union be notified of this by registered mail. Those who are in favor of rejecting the FactFinder's Report, vote Yes. If you are opposed to rejecting it, vote No. Use the machine.

The Motion has CARRIED and the FactFinder's Report on Assistant Corporation Counsels has been REJECTED. The Union will be notified by registered mail of said rejection and so will the Labor Negotiator.

- (8) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE COMMISSION ON AGING. Following full-time employees of the Commission on Aging shall be included in group life, dental, hospitalization, and major medical policies available to other City employees: one office manager, one driver, and one office worker. Due to a long-standing oversight, these positions have never been formally authorized to receive these benefits. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/16/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE. (Mrs. Kilgrow to appear at next Committee meeting)

- (9) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CREATING A POSITION OF RESEARCHER FOR THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR. This position has already been funded for fiscal year 1985/86. This will be an independent contractor. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/18/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Rep. Summerville Abstaining; and six in opposition: Reps. Conti, Santy, Maihock, Vos, Guroian, McInerney.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DUDLEY Moved for approval of Consent Agenda Items #6 and #9. APPROVED with Rep. McGrath Abstaining on #6 and Reps. Conti and DeLuca voting No on #6. On Item #9, Rep. Summerville Abstained; and there were six votes in opposition: Reps. Conti, Santy, Maihock, Vos, Guroian, and McInerney.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

MR. WHITE said the Committee met on Monday, August 12, 1985, in the Republican Caucus Room, at 6:50 P.M. Present were Reps. Donahue, Guroian, Vos, White, and Wider. The subject under consideration was Ord. 546 amendment, Item #1. The Committee concluded the amendment as written, adequately protects the City, while citizen homeowners are allowed to hold the town responsible for damages done to their property during repair of unaccepted thoroughfares. By a vote of 5-0, the Committee recommended approval and he so Moved. Seconded. They also voted to Waive Publication and vote for Final Adoption. He Moved to Waive Publication. Seconded.

MR. DeLUCA asked the Board to vote for Waiving Publication so they could then vote for Final Adoption. The amendment is a good one.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Waiving Publication. APPROVED with Mr. Skovgaard Abstaining.

MR. WHITE Moved for Final Adoption, as amended. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Final Adoption of Item #1. APPROVED, with Mr. Skovgaard Abstaining.

- (1) FOR-PUBLICATION--- FOR FINAL ADOPTION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE #546 CONCERNING UNACCEPTED STREETS AMENDING CHAPTER 18, ARTICLE III OF CODE OF ORDINANCES. Submitted by Rep. Gabe DeLuca 7/15/85.
- (2) REFERRAL OF ZONING BOARD APPLICATION #85-001 WESTOVERMID-RIDGE/NORTH STAMFORD concerning Zoning Board's Comprehensive Rezoning, pursuant to Section 552.3 of the Charter. Petitions received from landowners in the area. Received from Norman F. Colé, Principal Planner, Zoning Board 6/21/85.

Petition #1: RA-1 to RA-2, East Side of High Ridge Road (Laurel Reservoir)

Petition #2: RA-1 to RA-2, Leeds Property, West Bank of Mianus River.

Petition #3: Designed Business (B-D) to Neighborhood Business (C-N), High Ridge Road, extending from the Merritt Parkway South to Turn-of-River Road.

MR. WHITE Moved to divide Item #2 into ^{its} 3 component parts. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Motion to divide Question #2 into its three component parts. APPROVED unanimously.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WHITE said on Wednesday, July 31, 1985, in the Board of Education Main Board Room at 7:30 P.M., hearings were held on the three petition referrals listed on Item #2 on our Agenda. Present were Reps. Donahue, Guroian, Jachimczyk, Mallozzi, Signore, White, Wider, and Vos. Also present were Terrence Martin, Barbara McInerney, and Maria Nakian.

The first petition, commonly referred to as the Laurel Reservoir referral, was found to be invalid, i.e., improperly before us as it did not have the required number of signatures. A more complete site reference and description is before you labeled Petition #1, which I will not read.

THE PRESIDENT said if they did not have the proper number of signatures, it would not be necessary to read the entire material or action to take.

PETITION #1 - INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF SIGNATURES. NO ACTION TAKEN.

MR. WHITE said the second referral commonly referred to as the Leeds petition, West Bank of Mianus River, was next handled. The property was changed from RA-1 acre zoning to RA-2 acre zoning. The petitioner argued that he had been, among other things, unfairly handled, as this site of land on the west end of Old Mill Lane was the only property in the area that had been rezoned to RA-2. All the properties around such had been left RA-1. An examination of the maps by the Committee reveal that was technically so. It was not in the larger zoning context accurate. All property like the Leeds site west of Mianus River had been up-zoned to 2 and in some instances indeed to 3-acre zoning. The only reason this segment of land seems singular is that it is partially encircled by municipal open space, i.e.. The Mianus Glen, The Mianus River Park, which is the new special zone of parkland. Leeds Property is separated from the rest of RA-1 zoning by the Mianus River. Like all property in this area west of the Mianus River, it was re-zoned RA-2 or RA-3.

The petitioner also contended that contrary to the Zoning Board's assertion, much of the land was level and suitable for one-acre development. Examination of aerial photographs and topographical maps, as well as physical examination of the land revealed that while some of the property was reasonably level, there was some already developed, that is to say where the petitioner had built his home, swimming pool, and various out-buildings. The rest of the land seemed very much hill-and-dale quality. The Zoning Board and the Environmental Protection Board testified to the point that the land was largely hill-and-dale quality, was of soil quality not easily drained, formed a critical part of the Greenwich Water Co.'s reservoir, water-shed supply area, and was over an aquifer. This type of aquifer was the crystalline rock variety that homes in the general area drew their water from wells sunk into the bedrock. Such a topography is easily in danger of being over-developed. If there is some suitable place for one-acre development in this area, the Committee felt that they should be reviewed by the Zoning Board on a site-by-site basis. The Committee voted 8-0 to uphold the Zoning Board and to deny the petition. The Motion is that the proposed amendment of the Zoning Board to the Zoning Map of the City of Stamford be changed from RA-1 one-acre zoning to RA-2 two-acre zoning in the general area of West of Mianus River and north of the east and south of the Mianus Glen and Mianus River Park, as more specifically shown on the attached map which is one of the proposed amendments in the Application #85-001 Westover/Mid-Ridge/North Stamford Neighborhood be approved. Seconded:

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on approving the amendment of the Zoning Board to the Zoning Map of Stamford to change from RA-1 one-acre zoning to RA-2 two-acre zoning in the general area West of the Mianus River and northeast and south of Mianus Glen. A Yes vote will uphold the Zoning Board. A No vote will reject the Zoning Board's proposed amendment. Furthermore for this Board to take action, 21 votes are required. The Motion has been APPROVED by a vote of 36 Yes, 1 Abstention, and 1 Non-Voting. The Zoning Board has been sustained on this application.

PETITION #2 - ZONING BOARD UP-HELD. PETITIONER DENIED.

MR. WHITE said the third petition was the referral concerning the change from B-D Design Business District to C-N Neighborhood Business south from the Merritt Parkway both sides of High Ridge Road. The basic content of the petitioner was the Zoning Board's reasons for change, i.e., that the area would eventually become one of office development was exaggerated and ill-founded. His major assertion in effect was the fact that B-D zoning was in place for years, and allowed office construction, but little such development had taken place. He maintained that the area was still largely mercantile, that the same merchants had been there 5, 10, and 15 years, since its original development. Further, even if the area should develop into offices, the restrictions of the B-D zone are so stringent that the effect would not be so massive and over-powering as that of Summer Street.

On the other hand, the Committee felt, backed by the Zoning Board testimony, that the question was not that how many merchants were presently there, but how many would be there five, ten, fifteen years from now. Moreover, these merchants are not owners of the property or buildings; hence they have little say whether their business goes or stays. Should offices develop, these merchants would be out literally in the cold. Thus the zone change is not a case of preventing a long-term merchant-owner from making a large cash earning. Given the way demand for office space has recently escalated in Stamford, the Committee has no doubt that this area as a retail commercial place will largely disappear if it remains in the B-D Zone. This would, among other things, force the people from North Stamford to do their shopping in the center of town, thus creating even greater traffic than presently exists.

As for restrictions on office development, there is a question in the minds of the Committee, if the enforcement apparatus is in agreement as to what constitutes a story. At any rate, offices on stilts with surrounding parking would create an actuality as well as an impression of much greater density than now exists. It should also be noted that despite the petitioners' implication to the contrary, this zone on both sides of High Ridge Road backs up into a very nice R-10 residential neighborhood. To have the area transformed into office development would be disastrous for these neighborhoods.

Beyond this, the zone itself represents two mistakes. First, it is strip zoning which all Land Use studies now almost universally condemn; secondly, by the Zoning Board's own admission and testimony, they are unable to design and control the area as originally intended. Consequently, by a vote of 8-0, the Committee voted to deny the petition and up-hold the Zoning Board. Pursuant to that, he makes the Motion that the proposed amendment of the Zoning Board to the Zoning Map of the City of Stamford to change B-D Design Business district to C-N Neighborhood Business in the general area along both the East and West sides of

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WHITE (continuing):

High Ridge Road, extending from the Merritt Parkway south almost to Turn-of-River Road on the East Side of High Ridge Road and South of the Merritt Parkway on the West Side of High Ridge Road almost to Cedar Heights Road, as more specifically shown on the attached map, which is one of the proposed amendments in Application #85-001 Westover/Mid-Ridge/North Stamford Neighborhood be approved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion as articulated by Mr. White. There are no speakers. A Yes vote is to sustain the Zoning Board. A No vote opposes the Zoning Board's decision. The Motion has CARRIED by a vote of 36 Yes and 2 Non-Voting.

PETITION #3 - ZONING BOARD UP-HELD - PETITIONER DENIED.

MR. WHITE said Item #3 on his Committee's Agenda is the Louis DeBeradinis appeal from the Zoning Board's decision. On Thursday, August 1, 1985, in the Main Board Room of the Board of Education Building at 7:30 P.M., a hearing was held on Item #3 of the Agenda, that of the DeBeradinis petition, i.e., to change R-MF Multi-Family Residential to C-G General Commercial District. Present were Donald Donahue, David Jachimczyk, John Mallozzi, Mary Jane Signore, Dennis White, and Lathon Wider. Also present was Rep. Terrence Martin.

The property in question is more specifically sited and located on the attached map before you. Basically, the petitioner contended that with this type of zoning, a portion of his property was rendered unusable. Not only could he not use it for desired construction, but he could not even use it to figure his floor area ratio for the rest of the property. The petitioner also pointed out that the sliver (his words) was too small an area to even be used as it was zoned, R-MF, as it did not provide the necessary residential space. Those of the Committee who tended to agree with the petitioner, also felt the zone lines ought to coincide with the lot line, that indeed much damage and confusion had occurred because zone lines in many areas cut through building lots, setting the stage for much controversial development, i.e., Summer St. The granting of this petition would, they believe, bring about a more orderly situation here.

Others on the Committee, however, asserted that Comprehensive ^{Re-}Zoning had not yet been completed in this part of town, and that any zoning changes ought to wait its completion. A zone change now, they asserted, however small, might prejudice the situation for the current zone, i.e., C-G for this parcel. The Zoning Board might, conceivably, decide to re-zone the entire parcel for a somewhat less intense zone than the present C-G category. Some of the Committee also pointed out the petitioner's contention that the referral site was unusable was somewhat self-serving. Nothing prevents the petitioner from using all or part of the property, along with the subject parcel, for housing. What the petitioner really means is that he cannot use the land the way he wants to. A house on the property partly in the C-G zone was recently torn down by the present owner. It was also pointed out that the sliver of land could be used for a four-story parking garage; such an event would loom over the adjacent residences. Most of the Committee, however, felt that by the time Comprehensive Re-Zoning handles the area, C-G type of development would already be in place.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WHITE (continuing):

Given the small parcel involved, no great social issue was at stake, and the non-congruent zone and lot lines ought to be eliminated. Hence by a vote of 5 in favor and 1 opposed, the Committee voted to recommend to the full Board that the petition be granted and that the parcel be re-zoned C-G.

- (3) REFERRAL OF ZONING BOARD APPLICATION #85-016 - LOUIS DeBERADINIS CONCERNING ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, R-MF to C-G, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE to GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT FOR PROPERTY LOCATED ON SOUTH SIDE OF DIVISION STREET, pursuant to Section 552.3 of the Charter. Received from Norman F. Cole, Principal Planner, Zoning Board 7/2/85.

MR. WHITE said the Motion is that the proposed amendment of Louis DeBeradinis Application #85-016 to the Zoning Map of the City of Stamford requesting that a triangular-shaped piece of property consisting of 0.03 acres extending South from Division Street and abutting a C-G Zone to the East and South and an R-MF Zone to the West, be changed from R-MF Multi-Family Residence to C-G General Commercial, as more specifically shown on the attached map, be approved. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for^a machine vote on Item #3 as per the Motion articulated by Mr. White. If you are in favor of Mr. DeBeradinis' request, vote Yes. If you vote No, you are agreeing with the Zoning Board's decision.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that to the best of her knowledge, no residents in that area have objected to this particular proposal of Mr. DeBeradinis. She urges voting in favor of Mr. DeBeradinis.

THE PRESIDENT asked the members to vote. The Motion has CARRIED by a vote of 33 Yes, 3 No, and 2 Non-Voting. The Zoning Board's decision has been over-turned, and Mr. DeBeradinis' application and request have been sustained.

Several compliments were paid to Mr. Dennis White for his handling of these various zoning matters on the Agenda of the Planning and Zoning Committee.

THE PRESIDENT noted that Mr. Livingston and Mr. Blum have left the meeting, and also Mr. Taranto, and there are now 35 members present.

PUBLIC WORKS and SEWER COMMITTEE

- (1) MATTER OF THE BOOZ, ALLEN & HAMILTON STUDY OF SOLID WASTE COLLECTION AND FUNDING ALTERNATIVES FOR THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/18/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. PERILLO said the Committee met on July 31, 1985 at the Board of Education Bldg. on Hillandale Avenue. Present were Betty Conti, Tom Burke, Joe Santagata, John Zelinski, and Al Perillo. Absent were Roger Taranto and Ronnie Malloy. Also present were Reps. David Martin and Claire Fishman. Also Researcher Dorfman, DPW Commissioner John O'Brien and City Engineer Frank Soldano. The ADVOWATE and WSTC were also represented.

He said that for the same reason the Public Works Committee Moved to Hold the \$150,000 as part of this matter, the Public Works Committee Moved to hold this item for a joint meeting with Fiscal and Booz, Allen & Hamilton representatives.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MS. RINALDI said her Committee did not have the proposed fire alarm ordinance this month; they cancelled the Committee meeting and there is no report.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORD. #206 CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES FOR FIRE ALARM TIE-IN SERVICE TO THE CITY OF STAMFORD FIRE DEPARTMENT. Submitted by H.C.Oefinger, Communications Director, 1/18/84. Held in Committee 3/12, 4/24, 6/4, 11/7 and 12/1/84. Approved for publication 5/7/84. Held in Steering 6/18, 7/26 and 12/19/84. Held on Pending Steering Agenda 8/22 and 9/19/84, and since 1/16/85. Held in Committee 5/6/85. Held on Pending Steering Agenda since 5/15/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

MR. DeLUCA said the Parks and Recreation Committee met on Monday evening, August 5, 1985, at 8:00 p.m. in Conference Room II in the Board of Education Bldg. in Hillandale Ave. Attendees were Committee members Rybnick, Skovgaard, Gabe DeLuca; also Rep. Lyons, Polly VanderWaart, Parks Commission Chairperson, Parks Supt. Bob Cook, Dean Pomeroy, Terry Conners Rink Manager, Tom Pia, Chairperson Bd. of Rec., Bruno Giordano, Supt. Rec., E. G. Brennan, Mgr., Ralph Vitti, Commission members of Brennan Golf Course Colucci, Malloy, and Bankowski. Also Frank Colucci and James Malloy, who were concerned with the Rink fees. Also John Pirre and Charles Mazzola, concerned with preferred starting time utilized by the E. Gaynor Brennan, Sr. Golf Commission members.

On Item #1 re the preferred starting time, since this was not acted upon by the Commission as yet, the Committee voted to hold this item for one more month with the recommendation that the Commission take action at their August 20th (1985) meeting.

- (1) SUBJECT OF PREFERRED STARTING TIME UTILIZED BY E. GAYNOR BRENNAN, SR., GOLF COMMISSION MEMBERS. Submitted by Reps. Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Parks and Recreation Committee Chairman, 6/6/85. Held in Committee 7/1/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE for one more month.

- (2) REVIEW OF FUTURE PLANS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COVE ISLAND TO BE DISCUSSED JOINTLY BY THE PARKS COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF RECREATION. Submitted by Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Parks and Recreation Committee Chairman, 6/24/85.

MR. DeLUCA made a brief report regarding future plans for the development of Cove Island. Briefly stated, the stumbling block here seems to be the Planning Board. It seems every time the Parks Dept. or the Parks Commission appear before the Planning Board to get funds, especially to modify the entrance-way to Cove Island which is very dangerous, the Planning Board rejects the matter and the funding. However, on a positive note, the repair of the Bulkhead on the Island side of the Marina, as well as the grass area on the Island side, it is expected to be completed by the Spring of 1986.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER STREET from Oct. 9th to Oct. 23, 1985, to publicize the Holiday Potpourri. Requested by Beth Eaton-Koch, The Junior League of Stamford-Norwalk, Inc., 43 Davenport Drive, Stamford 06902, 7/8/85.

MR. DeLUCA said the Committee voted 3 in favor, none opposed, and he Moves for approval. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on this item. APPROVED unanimously.

- (4) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF PROPOSED FEES FOR THE TERRY CONNERS RINK for the 1985/86 fiscal year. Submitted by Ed Condon, Business Mgr., Parks Dept., 7/18/85. Parks Commission approved 7/2/85.

MR. DeLUCA said the Committee voted 3 in favor, none opposed, for approval with one exception. Item #10, Ice Rental for an hour, should have another section included stating "Stamford Youth Assn. \$65.00 per hour" and he Moved for approval of this amendment. Seconded. CARRIED unanimously, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #4 as amended. CARRIED unanimously, after being Seconded.

- (5) MATTER OF NO LIGHTS BEING PUT ON IN VETERANS' PARK DURING THE NIGHT TIME. Submitted by Rep. Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, Parks and Recreation Committee Chairman, 7/23/85.

MR. DeLUCA said the Parks Department advised the culprit here was an \$1.95 part, which has been purchased, and the lights should be on by now. That concludes the Report on his Agenda.

IMPORTANT BALL GAME AUGUST 21, 1985

MR. DeLUCA said the main part of his report has to do with the big, up-coming game on August 21st. He is confident that the Board's team will emerge on the top again, as they did last year. John Boccuzzi has been keeping his fine pitching arm warm and is practicing at home. He was told not to over-do that. This Thursday at 6:30 p.m., the practice will be held at NEWFIELD SCHOOL, as he was informed this morning that Roxbury Field has a Little League game going on there. This is the main event between Sandy's Sluggers and Thom's Team. at 6:30 P.M. at Cubeta Field on Wednesday, August 21st. There will be hot dogs, diet soda, and other stuff. The refreshments will not be at the practice game, only the Main Event. Ted Santy will be the Chef again this year. Curley Perillo will furnish the hot dogs. Bob Goldstein will be the Official Photographer, and turn out the same superb pictures that he did last year. There will be no "ringers", for the record. Get rested up over the weekend, so you can all do your best at The Ball Game on Wednesday night. We do have to have braggin' rights for next year, so stay sober and keep healthy over the weekend.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MRS. NAKIAN said her Committee met on Wednesday, July 31, 1985 at 8:00 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Committee members Powers, Rinaldi, Fishman, Maihock, and Nakian. Item #1 is the bi-monthly report on the Skilled Nursing Facility at Smith House.

On July 25th, she toured the Smith House with Jim Santangelo, who is the Director of Maintenance. It is her very great pleasure to announce to this Board that the air-conditioning is completed and has been turned on, is working and everything is fine there. Also the new boiler for the hot water system is totally completed and that is functioning. The floor tiles are 98% installed, and the sprinkler system is 95% complete. She asks that with this report, this item be taken off the agenda.

- (1) MATTER OF BI-MONTHLY REPORT FROM SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY.
Submitted by Pres. Sandra Goldstein 12/2/83. Held in Committee 12/13/83. Referred for further study 1/9/84. Reports made 2/6, 3/12, 4/2, 9/12 and 12/3/84. Held in Committee 5/7/84 and 5/6/85. Held on Pending Steering Agenda 6/18, 7/23, 10/17/84, and since 12/3/84. Report sent to members 5/6/85. Held on Pending Steering Agenda 5/15/85.

MRS. NAKIAN Moved to Suspend the Rules to take up an item not on the Agenda. It is a Resolution authorizing the City to become a member of the Interlocal Risk Management Agency known as CIRMA. This is a pool of municipalities which is providing Workmen's Compensation Insurance to the City of Stamford. It has been doing this since July 1st, and a Resolution is needed to make this official. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Motion to Suspend. CARRIED.

MRS. NAKIAN said the Committee was requested to put this on the Agenda the day before their meeting. They did not have the proper information at that time, so a second meeting was scheduled and held on Wednesday, August 7th, at 8:30 p.m., again in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Nakian, Fishman, Rinaldi, Powers. Finance Commissioner Paul Pacter attended to provide detailed information on the City insurance and the Workmen's Compensation provided.

The cost of City insurance at this point has risen drastically. It is now at the point where Stamford is paying much more money for much less insurance. The reason is not peculiar to Stamford but because it is a very tight insurance market, and insurance companies are no longer interested in providing insurance to municipalities because losses have been great. The Risk Management Consultants who were putting together the insurance package for the City did a great deal of investigation and concluded that this was the best deal in the field of Workmen's Compensation that the City would be able to get.

For example, at the moment the City has been self-insured for the past three years. Last year the City paid out \$800,000 in Workmen's Compensation claims, plus paying \$71,000 for a premium for a policy which would cover catastrophic losses above \$2.5 Million. When they went back to this insurer for the quote for this coming 1985-86 year, they were told that the premium would rise to \$1 Million, and would only cover losses above \$5 Million. That was a great jump. The consultants felt this was not in the best interests and they found CIRMA.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN (continuing):

The quote from CIRMA is a premium of \$551,648 and that is for first dollar insurance. In other words, the City is no longer self-insured, but all Workmen's Compensation claims will be paid for this premium, which actually is less than the City paid out in self-insurance last year. She Moved that the Resolution authorizing the City of Stamford to join CIRMA be approved. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI asked how long would the City be tied to this arrangement. Is this on an annual renewable basis.

MRS. NAKIAN said it is.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if there is a maximum amount that this policy would pay.

MRS. NAKIAN said she does not believe so, but she will ask Mrs. Powers to answer that.

MRS. POWERS said Workmen's Compensation in the State of Connecticut is statutory, and there are statutory benefits. This will cover the statutory requirements of the State.

MR. ZELINSKI said is there a maximum which they will pay. Is there a million dollar limit, or what is the State statute provision.

MRS. NAKIAN said she believes there is no cut-off on this particular coverage. The rates would go up the following year, but there is not the cut-off that there was with the self-insurance.

MR. ZELINSKI said in other words if the City had claims of \$2 Million, the policy would pay it.

MRS. NAKIAN said according to Mr. Pacter, they investigated the City very thoroughly, took into account that there were two workmen who died last year and several firefighters who were injured in the Polycast fire. Still, taking all this into account, they still wrote a policy to our benefit. There is no upper limit because they did not feel this kind of situation would happen again.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Resolution for the City to join CIRMA. APPROVED.

MR. BOCCUZZI observed that Mrs. Nakian is to be congratulated for the fine job done at the Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, which is appreciated by all of us, including especially the people up there who have been waiting so long for relief. It is nice to have it done with and off the Agenda.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MR. WIDER said the Committee met on June 19th and had a public hearing for the Neighborhood Assistance Program. There were 40 people who applied and 86 applications came in. Then there was another meeting on July 27th to review and had before them Mrs. Gilbane and Mrs. Sadowsky. Unfortunately, they did not have a quorum and could not vote on it. Mr. Blum was in the hospital and Ms. Summerville was on vacation. He Moved to take this out of committee.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WIDER (continuing):

The Motion was Seconded. CARRIED with Mrs. Conti in opposition.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION APPROVING SUBMITTAL OF LIST OF PROGRAMS TO THE STATE COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE P.A. 82-469. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/18/85.

MR. JACHIMCZYK Moved that the Resolution be approved. Seconded.

MRS. CONTI said upon looking through the list, she finds no group that is not already being funded from some other source. There is no service that is not already being provided. She feels it is a waste. If we are going to get new money, let us find new recipients for it.

MRS. McINERNEY is very much in favor of this Act. It does give businesses the option to donate to certain neighborhood projects which they deem are important throughout the community. Her understanding was that the groups were to be domiciled in Stamford and she finds eight groups listed from Bristol, Middletown, Cos Cob, South Norwalk, Norwalk, Bridgeport, and Fairfield. Are these permitted to be in the program as a community organization?

MR. WIDER said the legislation does not limit the area from which applications may emanate because some of those towns do not have a program in their town or city. They do have programs and industries in their areas who would be glad to fund them. In fact, there is one agency here in Stamford which has been accepted by a business in Stratford. This is given to programs, not agencies.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on this item. APPROVED with Mrs. Conti in opposition, and Mr. Skovgaard abstaining.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

- (1) UP-DATED REPORT FROM THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION. Submitted by Rep. John Mallozzi, URC Chairman, 7/12/85.

NO REPORT.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING PROPERTY LOCATED AT 191 BELLTOWN ROAD, OWNED BY JOSEPH FRANCHINA - requiring removal from the waterway on this property, all debris, wreckage or other similar material which prevents or tends to prevent the free discharge of flood waters. Pursuant to Section 7-146 C.G.S. Submitted by EPB Dir. Mark Lubbers 6/25/84. Reports made 8/13/84, 4/1/85 and 6/3/85. Held on Pending Agenda since 8/13/84. Held in Committee from 1/7 to 7/1/85.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK: "A meeting of the Environmental Protection Committee was held Wednesday, July 31, 1985, in the Board of Education Bldg. at 7:20 P.M. Present were Audrey Maihock, Terrence Martin. Dennis White also appeared between Committee meetings. A Motion was made to approve the draft resolution written by Barry Boodman of the Corporation Counsel's Office. It passed 2-2-0. We also discussed the information that was given us at the July 24th Steering Meeting by one of the Representatives that the owner of the property had sold the property about three weeks ago. I checked at the Town Clerk's Office and there appears to be no change in ownership up to July 22nd; and as of today, I checked again, and as of August 9th, at least none had been recorded. I had been instructed by the President of the Board at the last Board meeting to request the Corporation Counsel's Office to prepare a letter on which the members of the Board could vote, which I did the following day. I relayed the message to Mr. Wm. Hennessey, who said he would refer it on to Mr. Boodman. The day after the Steering meeting, I inquired if Mr. Hennessey had had the letter prepared. He indicated that it had not as yet been prepared. I then asked what changes, if any, would be needed if the property might have changed owners. A letter dated July 31, 1985 from Atty. Barry Jay Boodman, which was distributed to all Board members, answered my question. It essentially advised us that all that was necessary for procedure by the Board was the vote by the Board on the Resolution that he was submitting to us. We would not have to involve ourselves in other legal procedure. If the Board should vote affirmatively, the Corporation Counsel's Office would do the rest. The final Resolution was submitted to all Representatives on August 8, 1985. It embodies the appropriate wording requested by Mark Lubbers, Director of the Environmental Protection Board. The Environmental Protection Committee, consisting of Audrey Maihock, Terrence Martin, and Dennis White met for a brief, scheduled meeting this evening, August 12, 1985, in the Main Room of the Board of Representatives, to approve the final Resolution with one amendment. In No. 1, Line 5, after the words "or other similar material", the words "including fill" were added to make the phrase consistent with the said phrase in other parts of the Resolution. The Motion to approve the Resolution as amended was 3-0. You have all received a comprehensive report giving the historical chronology of the efforts of the Environmental Protection Committee to insure that every opportunity was given to the owner to present his opinion to Mark Lubbers and the EPB, and to have his questions, those of his attorney, and those of Mr. DeLuca and Mr. Boccuzzi and Mrs. Perillo researched and answered. The Corporation Counsel's Office issued to our Committee an opinion that the State Legislature intended to include all natural waterways, including wetlands, in its reference thereto in Section 7-146. The Environmental Protection Committee now presents to the Board the procedure to be used in future cases of this nature. It would seem that the Committee's aim should always be to give sufficient opportunity for the owner to first possibly resolve any such matters without the necessity of implementing this procedure. In this case, the situation could not be resolved; therefore, our Committee voted to up-hold the request of the Director of the Environmental Protection Board that the material be removed. The Resolution is now submitted to the full Board for its consideration and its vote on this matter."

THE PRESIDENT said then Mrs. Maihock's Motion is to approve the Resolution as amended as stated by Mrs. Maihock. Seconded.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI asked how many cubic yards were planned to be taken out of this particular piece of property.

MRS. MAIHOCK: "This was submitted to the owner by Mr. Mark Lubbers and I don't have that at my fingertips at this moment, but I believe that it was presented to the Board through Mr. Lubbers' letter."

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if anyone on the EP Committee knew how many cubic yards.

MR. MARTIN said the figure he has is 300 cu. yds.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Item #1, as amended. APPROVED with 21 Yes, 10 No, 2 Abstentions, and 2 Non-Voting. Mr. Santagata is recorded as voting No.

- (2) REQUEST THAT THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES INITIATE ACTION FOR REMOVAL OF FILL UNDER AUTHORITY OF SECTION 7-146 OF THE C.G.S. CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WETLAND AND WATERCOURSE AREA ON LOT #41, ON THE NORTH SIDE OF CANFIELD DRIVE. (Property of Mr. S. Jovic, 135 Waterbury Ave., Stamford 06902.) Submitted by EPB Dir. Mark Lubbers 5/6/85. Held in Committee 7/1/85.

MRS. MAIHOCK: "The second item on our Committee Agenda was the item of S. Jovic, obstruction of wetland and watercourses, which was referred by the EPB to the Board of Representatives. It appeared on the Board of Representatives' meeting agenda of July 1, 1985. This had been a matter which had been before the EPB for a considerable time due to non-compliance by the owner to remove this sited material creating the obstruction. I asked Mr. Lubbers if he would advise the owner that we would like permission to visit the site for observation purposes as it was difficult to contact him. The owner then decided to comply with the EPB directive. We received a copy of a letter written by Richard H. Talamelli, Environmental Enforcement Officer, stating that "This is to confirm that regulated areas on Lot #41 Canfield Drive have been restored to the satisfaction of the EPB staff." By copy of this letter, he was advising the EPB and the Board of Representatives that this matter has been satisfactorily resolved, and that no further action is required. Therefore, the Environmental Protection Committee is pleased to announce that since this matter has been so expeditiously resolved, it can now be taken off the Agenda."

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MR. DAVID MARTIN said there was no meeting, and hence no report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE

MR. RYBNICK said there is no report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES (continued)CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE(1) REPORT.

MRS. MCINERNEY said she has placed a written report on everyone's desk this evening. They have not had an opportunity to finish their detailed research on codification, she had to cancel the August 7th meeting, and it will be re-scheduled for later in the month.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

- (1) MATTER OF RECENT TRANSACTION REGARDING THE SALE OF LAND BY F.D.RICH COMPANY TO THE STAMFORD CENTER FOR THE ARTS FOR \$2.5 MILLION. Submitted by Rep. Robert "Gabe" DeLuca, 14th Dist. Rep., 7/25/85.

MR. LYONS said his Committee met on Thursday, August 1, 1985 at 7:30 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. Invited to attend were Finance Commissioner Paul Pacter as Director of the Coliseum Authority and members of the Coliseum Authority Advisory Panel. (The tape is faint and inaudible and most of Mr. Lyons' comments did not come through.) He said that Mr. Pacter agreed that the sale transaction was conducted at the highest ethical standards. Mr. DeLuca Moved and was Seconded by Rep. Fishman that a Committee Resolution be approved, which was within the Committee and not for the whole Board of Representatives. The money representing the difference between the purchase price and the selling price is being donated to the Coliseum Authority by Mr. Rich, and the Committee wished to express their appreciation for this action.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. BOCCUZZI said they gave their report earlier this evening.

RESOLUTIONS

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to Suspend the Rules to take up the Resolution which is now on everyone's desk regarding the public hearing on the new City Hall. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said the voice vote was not definitive, and called for a Machine vote. The Motion was DEFEATED to consider a Sense-of-the-Board Resolution regarding the public hearing on the new City Hall. The vote was 22 Yes, 8 No, 2 Abstentions, and 3 Non-Voting. Two-thirds are needed for passage, and with 35 members present, 24 votes were required.

The President advised Mr. Zelinski that it would be perfectly in order for him to request that this be placed on the next Steering Agenda. He can just do it by writing a letter as usual asking that it be put on that Agenda.

PETITIONS

None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESMay 13, 1985 Special Budget Meeting Minutes

Moved, Seconded, and CARRIED by voice vote with Mr. Skovgaard abstaining.

July 1, 1985 Regular Board Meeting Minutes

Moved, Seconded, and CARRIED by voice vote, with changes as will be submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock in writing. She said her report was not presented verbatim.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS - None.

NEW BUSINESS - None.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon Motion duly Moved, Seconded, and APPROVED, the Meeting adjourned at 12:15 A.M.

By

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

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President

18th Board of Representatives

SG:AK:HMM

Encls.