

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 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, SEPTEMBER 9, 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. Rudolph V. Bailey, Pastor, El-Shammah Apostolic Church, 38 Adams Avenue.

"Will everybody say, Praise the Lord. Would you say it again. What I think I will do for keeping me waiting, I'll give you a sermon tonight. Praise the Lord. We bring greetings from the El-Shammah Apostolic Church family, and appreciate the Board inviting me to give the Invocation tonight. I'd like to quote the Psalm is David in the 127th Division of the Psalm, the first verse, he said, 'Accept the Lord, build a house, they labor in vain that build it. Accept the Lord, keep the City, the watchman weakith but in vain.' So tonight, we're glad that we're here to hatch the blessings of the Lord upon this Assembly tonight. Let's bow our heads in prayer. Our heavenly Father we give thanks unto You tonight, Lord, for the privilege that You have afforded us to be here in this meeting. We thank You for your blessings to us, Lord. You woke us up this morning; You guided us through the day from danger and accidents. Lord, we thank You today that you have gathered this Assembly together. We look to You tonight for direction. We come to You, Lord, we ask You to bless this meeting. We pray, oh Lord, that You will take charge of everything that will be said and done tonight. Lord, we pray for Your blessings upon everything that will be agreed upon tonight. We pray, oh God, that you bless the leaders of our City; the Mayor, and Lord, we pray that you will bless all of the Representatives here, Legislators not only in our City, but in our State; our Governor; not only in our State but in our Nation; the President and the Congress; the Governors; all around our Nation. Lord we pray today for our young people. We pray, oh God, that you will lead them out of destruction, Lord, into the plain path of righteousness because it's not Your will that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And, so tonight, Father, we come to You in prayer realizing that we can do nothing without Your help, and so we seek Your help. We pray, oh God, that You rebuke every evil force from this City.

INVOCATION: (continued)

"We pray, oh God, that You'll send Your angels encamp. We seek Your direction tonight and blessing, Father, for we ask You in the name of Jesus, and will everybody say Amen. The Lord bless you tonight in Jesus' name."

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 33 members present and 7 absent. Absent were Reps. Livingston, Signore, and T. Martin (all excused); Glover, Owens, Austin, and Santagata. (T. Martin came in later) Attendance now 34 Present; 6 Absent.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

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

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

For the late MICHAEL SABIA who died on August 29, 1985. Michael is survived by a wonderful wife, Betty, and a son who resides in Canton, Ohio. Michael, over the last seven years, meant a great deal to my family. He was the grandfather my three boys never knew. There was nothing that man would not have done for us. There was nothing we would not have done for him. Mike, as he would like to be called, was my best friend. He was 76 years old. Stamford has lost a wonderful man. The Austins have lost a grandfather. God bless you, Mike. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris on behalf of Rep. Robert Austin.

For the late ANGELIA PIA who has resided in my District for many, many years; whose son resides in my District—Tom Pia who is the present and has been four years, the Republican Town Committee man, and her grandson who resides in my District, Jerry Pia, who has been for many years on the Board of Education. She has been a good citizen of the City and a credit to our District. Submitted by Rep. Grace Guroian.

For the late JOSEPH F. POLTRACK, SR. Mr. Poltrack was the owner of Joseph Poltrack & Son Painting Company. He resided at 1435 Bedford Street in my District. He was a member of the Elks Club, the Lafayette Council and was a 4th Degree Member of the Knights of Columbus. Submitted by Rep. John Zelinski.

For the late RICHARD SCHMIDT of Chestnut Hill Road, who will be greatly missed by his neighbors and friends in Stamford. Submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock.

For the late SAMANTHA SMITH, of Maine. Lovely, young Samantha Smith touched the hearts of the world with her plea for peace. Submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN on behalf of the Board, she wished LATHON WIDER, a very Happy Birthday, whose birthday was this evening: "Happy Birthday, Lathon, and many more."

STANDING COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE: Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee report. Seconded. Carried.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on Thursday, August 22, 1985, in Conference Room II in the Board of Education Administration Building located on Hillandale Avenue. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m., at which time a quorum was present, by Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
John Boccuzzi
James Dudley
Scott Morris
Dennis White
Audrey Maihock
David Martin

Donald Donahue
Annie Summerville
Lathon Wider
Mildred Perillo
Alfred Perillo
Maria Nakian
John Zelinski

Terrence Martin
David Blum
Pat Wen, Advocate
Peter Koch
Sherry Dorfman
Anne Kachaluba

1. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five of the eleven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING were the names of Irving Blum for the Planning Board, Alvin Talifierro for the Planning Board, Alternate, George Helenese for the Sewer Commission, John M. Zimmerman for the Environmental Protection Board. Also, HELD was the Evaluation of Members of various Boards and Commissions. Appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda was one item which was HELD and that item was the Request for the Board of Representatives to initiate proceedings to remove Mr. Richard Vaught from the Fair Rent Commission.

2. FISCAL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were eight of the twelve items on the Tentative Steering Agenda and three items appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also, ORDERED ON THE AGENDA after Suspension of the Rules was approved was \$2,716.00 Transfer - Board of Recreation salaries to fund appropriate levels for two recreation leaders. ORDERED MOVED from Resolutions to the Fiscal Committee as Co-Committee with Education, Welfare and Government Committee, was the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution Authorizing the 18th Board of Representatives to hold a public hearing for the purpose of soliciting public input regarding the site for City Hall. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were the following items: \$6,000.00 Dept. of Public Works for cleaning rivers and streams; \$99,450.00 Dept. of Public Works for Railroad Station maintenance; \$18,500.00 Dept. of Traffic and Parking for salaries to fund signal systems engineer; and the proposed resolution and agreement concerning approval of the purchase of premises at 54 West Main Street from N. J. Downer and Ruth M. Downer to the City for \$350,000.00.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)3. LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were five of the ten items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING were four items: for final adoption, proposed ordinance Allocation of funds for works of art in municipal buildings carrying out provisions of CGS 7-122B; for publication, as amended, proposed ordinance concerning the abatement of taxes on structures of historical or architectural merit; for publication, proposed ordinance amending Ordinance No. 514 Supplemental regarding demolition Board to include a member of the Big Five Volunteer Fire Departments, and a member of an historical or architectural community group; and for publication, proposed ordinance concerning the problem of graffiti. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the item for publication, proposed ordinance amending Ordinance No. 550 Supplemental - Section 4(c) establishing financial policy with regard to proceeds realized from the sale of city land, buildings and improvements thereon. Also, ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was one item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was to Amend the 18th Board of Representatives' Rules of Order.

4. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were four of the seven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was the matter of Community Development employees being designated as classified employees per letter from Sim Bernstein to Catherine Trentini, Director, Community Development. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were two items: proposed resolution requesting staff analyst of the Board of Finance be included in benefits available to other city employees and the item regarding the staff researcher for the Board of Representatives be included in benefits available to other city employees. ORDERED ON THE PENDING STEERING AGENDA was the item for final adoption, proposed ordinance designating positions created or funded by a grant as unclassified.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

5. 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 Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that was the Clarification of street names in the Shippan area and also location of suitable sign at Magee Avenue, Shippan Avenue and Harbor Drive intersection. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was for publication, proposed ordinance concerning the sale of city-owned property to Smeriglio & Smeriglio, lots 27 and 28 on Carter Drive for \$108,000.00.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)6. PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were two of the five items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA were the following items: The matter of drainage problems and lack of city attention to Woodbine and Thornwood Road; the matter of Public Works trucks that do not pick up branches, debris, etc. placed on the curbside; proposed resolution authorizing the condemnation of sanitary sewer easements through and under property for sewer project known as Woodridge Drive.

7. HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one of the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED ON THE PENDING AGENDA was the Matter of litter per letter of 5/17/85 from Dr. Angelo Mastrangelo. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was the possibility of establishing an ordinance whereby people working in restaurants, private and public institutions be required to take a physical examination.

8. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the item of the preferred starting time utilized by E. Gaynor Brennan Golf Commission members. ORDERED OFF THE AGENDA was the matter of "freebies" and golf course operations at city golf courses and a request to hang a banner in the Edward A. Connell Heritage Park, requested by the Commission on Aging.

9. EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one of the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the item for reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses for members of the Board of Representatives and members of the Board of Finance. ORDERED MOVED FROM RESOLUTIONS to Education, Welfare and Government Committee, with Fiscal Committee as Co-Committee, was the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution Authorizing the 18th Board of Representatives to hold a public hearing for the purpose of soliciting public input regarding the site for City Hall.

10. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

11. URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

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

12. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT (continued)13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

14. HOUSE COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

15. CHARTER REVISION AND ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and the one item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda, which was for publication, proposed ordinance adopting and enacting a new Code of Ordinances, etc.

16. COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

17. LABOR CONTRACT LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

18. RESOLUTIONS

ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA under the Fiscal Committee and Education, Welfare and Government Committee, as Co-Committees, was the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution authorizing the 18th Board of Representatives to hold a public hearing for the purpose of soliciting public input regarding the site for City Hall.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Steering Committee, upon a motion made, seconded, and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

SG:ak

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRWOMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Mildred Perillo, Chairwoman

MRS. PERILLO said the Appointments Committee met on Thursday, September 5, 1985, at 7:30 p.m. at Hillandale Avenue. Present were Richard Lyons, Gabe DeLuca, Robert Austin, John Boccuzzi, Ann Summerville, Ruth Powers and Millie Perillo. Also, present were Sandy Goldstein, Ellen Bromley, Barbara McInerney, John Mallozzi, Terry Martin, Grace Guroian, and Len Gambino.

MRS. PERILLO Moved to the Consent Agenda item #2, Personnel Board of Appeals, Mr. John Graubard.

ZONING BOARDTERM EXPIRES

1. MR. JOSEPH A. FRATTAROLI (D) Replacing A. Wellington 12/1/88
70 Alton Road whose term expired.

MRS. PERILLO said that she would like to let the Board know that the Appointments Committee had a very long interview with the candidates that were on the Agenda tonight. They interviewed from 7:30 to 11 o'clock in the evening.

Mr. Frattaroli has been a life-long resident of Stamford for 42 years. He went through the public school system. He graduated from the University of Maryland, and currently employed at Perkin-Elmer and has been for 20 years. He holds the position of Distribution Manager. Mr. Frattaroli received a vote of 5 yes and 1 no from the Appointments Committee. Mrs. Perillo Moved for his approval. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN seeing no further hands, proceeded to a machine vote for the confirmation of Mr. Frattaroli. CONFIRMED by a vote of 25 yes, 1 no, and 5 abstentions. (See page 8 for more information on votes)

PERSONNEL BOARD OF APPEALS

2. MR. JOHN GRAUBARD (D) Reappointment 12/1/89
1034 Westover Road

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

3. MS. THELMA KING (D) Replacing P. Kuczo whose 12/1/88
33 Settler's Trail term expired.

MRS. PERILLO said that Thelma King has been a resident of Stamford for 10 years. She presently is employed as a consultant in education. Her background is quite lengthy. Her background was received by all the Board members. The Appointments Committee had a list of questions for Dr. King and she answered them all to the satisfaction of the Committee. The Committee voted 6 yes and 1 abstention on Dr. King's appointment. Mrs. Perillo Moved for the approval of Dr. King. Seconded.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN stated that there was some problem with the printer on the voting machine and asked that the person voting no on Mr. Frattaroli, please identify him/herself. The no vote was Mrs. Maihock. The 5 abstentions were Mrs. Guroian, Mrs. Conti, Mr. Wider, Mr. Morris and Ms. Summerville. Members not voting were Robert Skovgaard and David Martin.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN call for a vote on the confirmation of Thelma King to the Environmental Protection Board. The voting machine could not be used for the vote. A Roll Call vote was taken by the Clerk of the Board Annie Summerville. Ms. King was CONFIRMED by a vote of 18 yes, 11 no, and 4 abstentions.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALSTERM EXPIRES

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------|---------|
| 4. <u>MR. RAYMOND SANBORNE</u> (D) | Reappointment | 12/1/89 |
| 12 Pell Place | | |

MRS. PERILLO said that Mr. Sanborne has been a resident of this City for 32 years. He employed by Pitney Bowes. Mr. Sanborne is a regular member of the Zoning Board of Appeals. During his tenure, there were 282 meetings and he has attended all but 14. Mr. Sanborne's policy is to visit all the sites presented in the applications in order to make fair and legal decisions.

MRS. PERILLO Moved for Mr. Sanborne's approval. Seconded.

MR. WHITE said that he likes Ray Sanborne and that Ray is a hard-working fellow and a personal friend of his. Mr. White said that he felt that he would have to vote against Mr. Sanborne's appoint because he felt that Mr. Sanborne as well as the others on the Zoning Board of Appeals has misread the mandate as to what their powers are and as what they can do. The Zoning Board of Appeals has been granting variances and exceptions beyond what Mr. White believes their authority is. Mr. White said that he was sorry but he would vote against Mr. Sanborne on that basis.

MRS. GUROIAN stated that she would like to underscore what Rep. White said. She has know Mr. Sanborne for a long time and considered him a friend, but she could not vote for him on the basis of what has gone wrong with the Zoning Board of Appeals, he has been a party too. Mrs. Guroian said that some of the decision made by the Zoning Board of Appeals, have been made out of their jurisdiction. For this reason, she felt that she could not support Mr. Sanborne for reappointment.

MR. BOCCUZZI believed that questions asked of Mr. Sanborne at the Appointment meeting, probably pertained to what Mrs. Guroian and Mr. White were talking about. Mr. Sanborne's answer was that the Zoning Board of Appeals vote or recommendations have to be within the guidelines set-up for that particular Board; variances are only given because of hardships. Mr. Sanborne admitted that at times he, personally did not feel comfortable about some applicants, but these fell within the guidelines of the Zoning Board of Appeals, and was a hardship on the person concerned.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI continuing said that according to the rules and regulations that that particular Board operates under, that's the way Mr. Sanborne voted. Mr. Boccuzzi personally feels that Mr. Sanborne is trying to do a good job, and Mr. Sanborne is attentive and is open-eared to the public. The answers given by Mr. Sanborne were the answers of a person that Mr. Boccuzzi would like to have sitting on the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Boccuzzi had no doubt that Mr. Sanborne has tried to do a good job and Mr. Boccuzzi said that as far as he was concerned, Mr. Sanborne would continue to do a good job.

MRS. CONTI said that she wished to speak against Mr. Sanborne's reappointment. She said she knew Mr. Sanborne and he was a nice man and a very personable man, but he was a party to a decision which was very detrimental to the people of the 7th District and to other districts in the city in that he voted to approve two additional microwave satellites in the Glenbrook area; something which we feel is injurious to the health of the residents. There was great opposition to this at the ZBA hearing. Mr. Sanborne was not attentive to the voice of the public in this matter. Mrs. Conti said that she would have to vote against him.

MRS. MAIHOCK wondered if Mr. Sanborne participated in any votes as an individual that might have been detrimental, but Mrs. Conti just answered that for her. Mrs. Maihock said that she almost had the impression from listening to the first explanations about Mr. Sanborne, that, perhaps he was part of a consensus, and not particularly his individual opinion was such that it could be considered not in the best interest of what this Board feels should be done there.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that when she looked at his resume, she did feel that he certainly is a fine person because she was particularly impressed with the fact that his attendance has been exemplary and also, that he has visited all the sites in order to make the fair and legal determinations. If his individual votes have been such as Mrs. Conti expressed, then she, too, would unfortunately have to vote no on his appointment.

MRS. GUROIAN stated that she would like to respond to some of the things Mr. Boccuzzi said. She said that Mr. Boccuzzi misunderstood what the applicant said because he did not say that he granted variance on the basis of hardship; because he clearly believes that variances do not entertain hardship arguments; that only special exceptions entertain hardship, and Mrs. Guroian discussed this with Mr. Sanborne after the meeting and he made it very clear to her that only special exceptions entertain hardships. Mrs. Guroian disagreed with him, but that is what he told her very clearly. Several statements made by Mr. Sanborne, which Mrs. Guroian took exceptions; some of which she knew were not very true. The arguments that Mr. Sanborne makes that the Zoning Board of Appeals has granted these variances on the basis of regulations that the Zoning Board has set-up is not necessarily true, because the Zoning Board itself does not interpret those regulations as the Zoning Board of Appeals has interpreted, and on a number of occasions, the Corporation Counsel's office has not interpreted those regulations as the Zoning Board of Appeals have interpreted them, which is the reason why the

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. GUROIAN continuing, Zoning Board of Appeals has now proposed to change the regulations to make them clearer as to define the jurisdiction of the ZBA vis-a-vis the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board and the Planning Board and the other land-use boards.

MRS. GUROIAN said she really did not think Mr. Boccuzzi understood what Mr. Sanborne was saying, and she said she would like to correct his impression.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a Point of Personal Privilege.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN permitted that.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that he has been around long enough to know what people were saying, and if Mrs. Guroian disagreed with what Mr. Sanborne said, that was her prerogative. If she didn't like the way Mr. Sanborne voted, that was her prerogative, but Mr. Boccuzzi did not want Mrs. Guroian to stand before the Board and tell the group that Mr. Boccuzzi did not understand what Mr. Sanborne was saying or that he didn't say that hardships were reasons for part of their vote. Mr. Boccuzzi was very attentive to what Mr. Sanborne was saying, and did not take land use Boards lightly. Mr. Boccuzzi is interested in land use Boards just as Mrs. Guroian is.

MR. LYONS wanted to set the record straight. He was also at the meeting. The applicant not only stated hardship at a question from Mr. Boccuzzi, what type of hardship—financial or otherwise; he gave an example. He said financial hardship could not be considered. A hardship case was such as if a person wanted to expand a living room, and as going back, ran into his septic system and his leech fields and he could not expand his living room going back, and if he needed a variance of 10 feet to go to the side, inside of the going to the back, that would be a hardship case. The question was raised, and the question was answered. It was hardship.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN proceeded to a vote by use of the machine for the confirmation of Mr. Sanborne for the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Sanborne CONFIRMED by a vote of 24 yes, 6 no and 2 abstentions; and 1 Non-Voting.

COLISEUM AUTHORITYTERM EXPIRES

4. <u>MR. PHILIP BOWLER</u> (U)	Replacing Betsy Rich who	7/14/87
562 Stillwater Road	resigned.	

HELD IN COMMITTEE - did not show for the interview.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the Chair would accept a Motion to approve Mr. Graubard on the Consent Agenda. Moved. Seconded. Carried.

FISCAL COMMITTEE - Donald Donahue, Chairman

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee met on September 4th with all members present; Mrs. Conti, Mr. Lyons, Mrs. McInerney, Ms. Rinaldi, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. David Martin, Mrs. Vos, Messrs. Donahue, Mallozzi and Livingston in attendance. A number of joint meetings were also held that night with Education, Welfare and Government and also with Public Works, and various members of those Committees were also in attendance.

MR. DONAHUE Move items 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, and 12 on the Consent Agenda. All Secondary Committees concurred or waived their Committee reports and made the proper Motions which were Seconded and Carried.

1. \$150,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 350.5510 Contract Refuse Collection - additional appropriation request for start up cost 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 Serrani 7/18/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85. Held in Committee 8/12/85.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE - Committee seeking additional information.

2. \$ 6,406.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 301.2923 Photocopy - additional appropriation request to cover cost of rental for a copier. Request by Mayor Serrani 7/30/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

3. \$100,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR A PROJECT TO BE KNOWN AS #340-015 PUMP REPAIR HURRICANE BARRIER - additional appropriation request - to be financed by bonds. Request by Mayor Serrani 7/29/85. Planning Board approved 8/13/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

4. \$ 26,630.00 - STAMFORD YOUTH PLANNING & COORDINATING AGENCY (SYPCA) CODE 205.7525 DIRECT SERVICE GRANTS - additional appropriation request for various youth programs. \$19,630.00 is to be received in the form of a grant from the State Dept. of Children & Youth Services, balance of \$7,000.00 to be assumed by the City. Request by Mayor Serrani 7/30/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said by a vote of 9 in favor and 1 opposed, the Committee recommended approval. Seconded.

MRS. NAKIAN stated that her Committee, E, W, & G, was in favor of this 4 to 0.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN seeing no hands, proceeded to a voice vote. APPROVED with 2 no votes; Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Maihock.

5. \$ 6,000.00 - STAMFORD YOUTH PLANNING & COORDINATING AGENCY (SYPCA) - CODE 205.7551 MEDIATION SERVICE - additional appropriation request for the development of mediation services for youth. To be reimbursed by a grant. Request by Mayor Serrani 7/30/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said by a vote of 9 in favor and 1 opposed, the Committee recommended approval. Moved and Seconded.

MRS. NAKIAN said that E, W, & G, concurred on this.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN proceeded to a voice vote. APPROVED with 2 no votes; Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Maihock.

6. \$ 1,430.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - COST SHARING GRANT - CODE 553.1110 SALARIES - additional appropriation request to cover reclassification of a Clerk typist I to Clerk typist II, effective 7/1/85. (Reclassified May, 1985; 1985/86 budget already completed) Request by Mayor Serrani 7/30/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH MRS. CONTI ABSTAINING.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

7. \$ 1,167.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - EARLY PERIODIC SCREENING, DIAGNOSTIC & TREATMENT PROGRAM - CODE 556.1110
SALARIES - additional appropriation request to cover reclassification of Clerk typist II to Secretary; substantial portion is reimbursed by a grant.
For fiscal year 1985/86. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA WITH MRS. CONTI ABSTAINING.

8. \$147,330.00 - SALARY INCREASES FOR NON-UNION UNCLASSIFIED ADMINISTRATORS - additional appropriation request for salary increases through fiscal year 1985/86.

Charge prior year salary accruals:

1982/83	9,785
1983/84	16,114
1984/85	38,451

1985/86 Salary expense Acct. 1110:

Dept. 201 - Mayors Office	9,917
Dept. 210 - Town Clerk	2,300*
Dept. 230 - Law	1,750
Dept. 240 - Finance	1,750
Dept. 301 - Public Works Administration	1,750
Dept. 271 - Labor Negotiator	13,102
Dept. 280 - Traffic	13,008
Dept. 410 - Police	21,000
Dept. 450 - Fire	15,000
Dept. 550 - Health	2,320
	<u>\$147,330</u>

*Correct figure should be \$3,383.

Request by Mayor Serrani 8/1/85. Personnel Commission approved 7/25/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to Personnel Committee.

MR. DONAHUE said the most important part of this item was that it, in fact, sets up a pay plan for 15 persons within the city not covered in any bargaining unit. It follows the concept that the Fiscal Committee and other committees have been following that there should be a pay plan in place in order to provide for a fair review and salary increases for all city personnel, especially those not covered in other ways. The Committee voted 8 in favor and 2 opposed, the Committee recommended approval of this amount. Moved. Seconded.

MR. DUDLEY said that the Personnel Committee concurred.

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. DeLUCA said that he was in favor of a pay plan to reward the people that do a good job, but if someone does a bad job, they should not be rewarded. He was against the increase for several reasons. He did not believe in retroactive increases and said he had a hang-up on people who have contracts, and the fact that this had to be voted on as a complete package. Past recommendations were that the Board vote on each individual item.

MR. DeLUCA made an amendment to the proposal before the Board. His amendment was based on the present salaries; a 7% increase, then take 7/12 of these increases to come up with a net figure. He recommended a cut of \$122,298.00 from the proposal, leaving \$25,032.00. The breakdown for the \$25,032 would be to delete the Charge prior year salary accruals shown in the proposal. On Dept. 201, the Mayor's office which was 9,917, Mr. DeLuca recommended \$1,837.00, a 7% increase based on the present salary, and cover the funds required for the next seven from 12/1/85 to 6/30/86. The Town Clerk would go from \$2,300 to \$1,325. The Law Department from \$1,750 to \$2,123.

(Note: The figure could not be raised) Mr. DeLuca said to leave the figure the same; the Law Department, Finance and Public Works to be left at \$1,750. The Labor Negotiator from \$13,102 to \$1,871. The Traffic Department from \$13,008 to \$1,515. The Police from \$21,000 to \$5,717. The Fire Department from \$15,000 to \$3,838, and the Health Department to stay as is, \$2,320.

MR. DeLUCA said the total appropriation would be \$23,673 which would cover 7/12th of 12/1/85 to 6/30/86. The Motion was Moved and Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE emphasized that the Motion would destroy the whole concept of a pay plan that affects these positions. That these individuals are treated fairly and do not fall through the cracks as has happened in the past and in some cases 4 to 5 years. Other employees received salary increases because of their bargaining units or contracts that the Board has agreed to or contracts that went to binding arbitration. These individuals were not afforded that. A number of these positions are contractual. Mr. Donahue stated that city employees should not have to take their employer to court to get what is due them.

MR. DONAHUE said that there was one correction that should be made on the original Motion and that was for the Town Clerk's office and that line should read \$3,383 which brings the total to \$147,330.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that he did not like to disagree with his friend on the other side of the aisle but at this time, he had to. Mr. Boccuzzi said that with the numbers given out by Mr. DeLuca, the head executive of the city would be getting paid less than his cabinet. Mr. Boccuzzi could not see giving 7% for one year and not make any adjustment for the years that they did not get anything. All pays are retroactive with union contracts. A pay schedule must be set up that reflects the office or position that the pay is attached to.

(Pages 1-14 transcribed by A. Kachaluba. Pages 15 to end by H. McEvoy)

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI also said that Mr. DeLuca's figures for a Chief Executive being paid less than his cabinet, cannot be justified. Nor does he feel that 7% can be given for one year, and yet the years for which no adjustments were made and no increases were given are just left. When a union comes in and the term of the contract is for several years, some of them back one or two years, the increases are retroactive with the union. That is the way they settle it. There are positions here that he knows have not been increased for three years or so. To give one 7% raise in three years is like giving $2\frac{1}{3}\%$ or $2\frac{1}{3}\%$ raise per year. At this point, he has to disagree with Gabe DeLuca. He feels a pay schedule should be set up which reflects the office, and he wished to emphasize the word "office", or position. These increases should not be given or given because of an individual.

As he has said before, and he wishes to reiterate that he cannot see any justification where an head executive gets less than his cabinet or subordinate officials. It is like a foreman in a shop getting less than the help, or the owner of the shop getting less than the foreman. Or a person say directly under the Commissioner of Finance getting more than the Commissioner does. You have to have that certain spread in-between in the salary levels. He is sorry but he just cannot agree with Gabe DeLuca much as he would like to. They will just have to be on opposite sides of the fence. (Mr. DeLuca interjected that he would still pitch for Mr. Boccuzzi.)

MR. BURKE ^{said} he has a couple of problems, one of which is probably a concept, due to the package nature of this proposition. Some of these positions are contract positions, and he was given to understand that some of them were supposed to get increases along the way, but did not get them. There apparently was a dereliction of duty on someone's part; yet, because of the package nature of this thing, people who did not do the job are being rewarded for not rewarding those who deserved it. It seems rather incongruous.

Secondly, he said it seems the same route was taken once before, taking individuals and setting individual salaries. Does this usurp the prerogatives of the Personnel Commission by setting individual salaries for non-contract jobs. He does not know the answer but it does bother him. He said the last time they got involved in this, they were told rather succinctly that they were doing just that.

MR. DONAHUE said this Board is not usurping anyone's authority. This was worked on by Mr. Pacter with Mr. Bernstein, but a letter of unanimous approval has been received from the Personnel Commission dated 8/1/85.

MR. BURKE said that is for the original, but he is referring to Mr. DeLuca's amendment.

MR. DONAHUE said they have not heard of that any more than this Board has before tonight.

MR. BURKE said then they could not vote on that as it would be usurping the prerogative of the Personnel Commission.

MR. DONAHUE said this Board has the power of the purse to reduce the amounts as they see appropriate, but the Personnel Commission has recommended this package unanimously. There could be a conflict there.

MR. BLUM agrees that a Pay Plan is needed for the non-union unclassified administrators. But he also agrees that they do not have to ratify back pay. When prior years' salary accruals are referred to, that is back pay. He does not feel that if this Board is going to ratify, or amend, this so-called "agreement" with the non-union unclassified administrators that they have to approve back pay. He goes along with approving increases for 1985/1986, but he does not agree with Mr. DeLuca's strategy of 7% as he feels those who supervise are entitled to a little more than those whom they supervise. This plan is incomplete as proposed and should be broken down into sections or separate plans, such as one with provisions for contract employees, another for elected and appointed officials, and possibly one for permanent but not classified, non-union administrators. This should be held and worked on further.

MRS. McINERNEY said she was one of the minority votes on the Fiscal Committee, and felt very strongly then and still does that the Plan given to this Board in effect appears to be a good, well-thought^{out} policy plan for the unclassified and elected officials of the City. However, she has great difficulty approving any plan which rewards retroactively employees of this City who are hired under contract. She feels that a more equitable plan could have been resolved. They were trying to correct the situation by raising the salaries to a level at which the people who have been compensated. It is not fair to take a contract employee and raise that salary to a particular level, and then on top of that come down on it with retroactive increases. She agrees with Mr. DeLuca that those should be excluded from the package. It is unfortunate that the package was involving so many various employees and could not have been voted on individually because, in many instances, most of these raises do deserve merit, and the people do deserve being rewarded. She will support Mr. DeLuca in his amendment Motion.

MRS. SANTY is, too, opposed to the way this was presented to the Board, as a package. Some of these people should be getting raises. She questions if this was a wise political move on the part of the Mayor, or what he hoped to gain from this. Not too long ago, a Finance Commissioner could not be approved because the salary was too low, and so it was increased at the Mayor's request. Now it is not too many months later, and he wants more money for the same people. It has to be said here that we cannot afford this. During the past few weeks, she has been knocking on some doors, and the people that she represents are saying "No, we just can't just keep on saying yes to these fantastic raises." During the 3 retroactive years, there were two different mayors and different cabinet officers. Are they included?

MR. DAVID MARTIN said he, too, had concern about the retroactive raises. His concerns were answered at the Fiscal Committee meeting. Many of the people on contract had clauses in their contracts that called for review after a certain time. Perhaps Mr. Donahue can fill in the details on that. The City failed to do that. The employee could sue the City for failure to review the salary and increase it, and have all sorts of big, messy type of procedures. It would be preferable to give the contract people say 6% if that is what the unionized people got. It pains him and it is unusual, but he feels the raises should be approved.

MRS. MAIHOCK said the City's failure to set salary ranges for its municipal employees has produced the imbalance that Mr. Boccuzzi spoke about. When we lump all these individuals together, we do exactly what Mrs. Santy said.

MRS. MAIHOCK went on to say that we end up paying some who already have been given raises, and once again, there you produce another imbalance. This is a very critical problem for this City, this constant raising of salaries, and accelerating this imbalance. She said we must sit back at some time soon and analyze this thoroughly, not in the heat of the moment; and not on the spur of the moment should we be discussing this. We should really have a thorough over-haul of this personnel compensation plan. She was very happy at that meeting to hear Mr. Bernstein say that he was thinking of Performance Evaluation. Now that is one thing that she has not heard anyone here say, exactly, tonight. It is very important to the City's productivity and to the image that the City gives to the public.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a five-minute recess. Seconded. Voice vote was not definitive, so the President called for a machine vote.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion to Recess was APPROVED with 21 Yes, 12 No.

RECESS PERIOD WAS FROM 9:40 P.M. to 9:55 P.M.

THE PRESIDENT requested the CLERK OF THE BOARD ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE to Call the Roll. There are 34 present and 6 Absent.

MR. BOCCUZZI made a Motion to Return to Committee. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote, with opposition by Reps. McInerney, Santy, Vos, Conti, Burke, Guroian.

Item #8 has been RETURNED TO COMMITTEE.

- (9) \$ 30,000.00 - PARKS DEPARTMENT - Code 610.2310 MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES - Additional Appropriation requested to repair the War Memorial in St. John's Park. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 8/12/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Mr. Skovgaard voting in opposition.

- (10) \$700,380.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS - Additional Appropriation requested to fund Police contract for fiscal year 1985/86. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 8/15/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #10 is to fund the contract recently ratified by this Board, and he so Moved for approval. The Committee voted 9-1. Seconded.

MR. DUDLEY said Personnel Committee concurred.

There being no speakers, the President called for a voice vote.

APPROVED, with Mrs. Conti voting No, and Mr. T. Martin and Mr. Skovgaard Abstaining.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (11) \$486,180.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - VARIOUS ACCOUNTS - Additional Appropriation requested to fund Firemen's contract for fiscal year 1985/86. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 8/15/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee recommended approval of Item #11 by a vote of 9-1 and he so Moves. Seconded.

MR. DUDLEY said Personnel Committee concurs.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #11, which was APPROVED, with Mrs. Conti voting No, and Mrs. McGrath Abstaining.

- (12) \$ 2,716.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Request to TRANSFER from Code 655.140 Fee - Support - Seasonal to Code 655.1110 Salaries - which amount is required to place salaries of two Recreation Leaders who started at entry level at appropriate levels commensurate with similar previous experience as specified in MEA contract; pursuant to Ordinance 535. Requested by Recreation Chairman Thomas A. Pia, 8/13/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA with Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

- (13) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION authorizing the 18th Board of Representatives to hold a public hearing for the purpose of soliciting public in-put regarding the site for City Hall. Submitted by Reps. Zelinski, Nakian, Dudley, Burke, Vos, Conti, Guroian, DeLuca, Maihock, McInerney, Santy, Signore, David Martin.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE as a Joint Committee.

MR. DONAHUE said some wording has been changed but everyone was sent a copy. Instead of saying "a new City Hall", it now says "a new ^{or} renovated City Hall for the City of Stamford." It was the unanimous vote of those present and voting that this be approved, and he so Moved. Seconded.

MR. LYONS Moved to amend the resolution to read that the public hearing will be held November 12, 1985 at a location to be determined later by the Committee Chairmen. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI said when he proposed this resolution for the public hearing he did not propose a date because it would be contingent upon the availability of one of the public schools, which is the logical place to have a meeting of this large size. He wonders if this will be tying themselves down in case of Nov. 12th not being available as far as a place is concerned. He is against setting a date at this time.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BURKE asked in front of whom is this public hearing to be held, the Committee of the Whole, as a Board, the two committees only of the Board, or exactly in front of whom should it be held.

MR. DONAHUE said this was discussed and will be discussed further at a future hearing of the two committees to outline and create a format for the public hearing. This will be done in a week or so.

MRS. SANTY asked why does the exact same item appear in two places on the Agenda for tonight, #13 under Fiscal and #2 under E.W.&G., as she has never seen that before on a Board agenda.

THE PRESIDENT said it is before two committees who share the responsibility for the item. Steering voted to do it this way.

MRS. SANTY said then if this is defeated now, we can vote on it again when it comes to E.W.&G.

THE PRESIDENT said no, that would be taking up the same matter twice.

MRS. SANTY said it is somewhat redundant to put it under two committees on one agenda, especially when we have a place at the end of an item for referral to another committee, as it does now state. E.W.&G. could have given their report now.

MRS. McINERNEY is against the amendment to hold the public hearing on Nov. 12th. She feels this issue has been battered around for several months. Last month this Board was accused of holding the money for political motivations. She does not feel a public hearing is a political motivation. If we sincerely want to get started and plan for a future City Hall, it should be held as soon as possible, or at least next month, in October. Nov. 12th appears to be a safe date as it is after the Election, and the public may not be quite as interested at that time. When Mr. Zelinski proposed the resolution, she assumed the results of the public hearing would be available for the October meeting of this Board. Putting it off to Nov. 12th is not very fair to the public. It should be held sooner.

MRS. MAIHOCK concurred with Mrs. McInerney. She was under the impression also that when the resolution was brought forth, that it would not take until Nov. 12th to effect a public hearing. She does not think it is necessary to wait that long. She feels the public should address the problem now. It is an issue now. It may not be as effective later.

MR. DeLUCA said he is not concerned if this is going to be an issue for any particular party, Democrat or Republican. Due to the fact that some people are already saying that the Board of Representatives wants to wait until after the Election before they vote on the funds so they won't be considered big spenders, the hearing should be held in October at the latest. It is akin to the Charter Revision proposals that went down the drain because they were presented to the public at a Special Election rather than the General Election with the attendant low turn-out of voters, below the statutory requirements. Consequently, some very important corrections to the Charter were lost, and have not been re-proposed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DeLUCA went on to say the public should know that we want their in-put on whether they want a new or renovated City Hall, and if so, where, etc. If they want it, the Mayor can put forth his request for funds and we can vote on it at our October meeting. If they don't want it, we will not provide the funds. To delay until after the Election would really give the public the impression that we are playing political games.

MRS. CONTI agrees that the public hearing should be held within the next month. This is Sept. 9th, and there are 3 weeks left in September, so certainly during October is plenty of time. November is too late, and we get into the winter weather.

MRS. FISHMAN said we should have an informed public at the hearing, after they have had time to read material which we will have for them at the libraries. We should not rush into things.

MR. SKOVGAARD said Mrs. Fishman accurately stated his sentiments.

MRS. SANTY said when the Republicans who signed the proposed resolution, it was the intent that the public hearing be held as soon as possible. A month from today is certainly plenty of time for the public to be informed. They already know what is going on as this has been publicized and discussed for some time now. We would be making it political if it is held Nov. 12th, more than two months from now, and it is a wrong maneuver, and the people should be heard from before November.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the amendment. APPROVED with 23 Yes and 11 No votes.

A machine vote was then taken on the Resolution as amended. APPROVED with 32 Yes votes, 1 No vote, and 1 Non-Voting.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for adoption of the Consent Agenda Items #2, 3, 6, 7, 9, and 12. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote, with other than Yes votes indicated at the item to which they apply.

MR. ZELINSKI made a Point of Personal Privilege since his name was over-looked to speak on the Main Motion of Item #13, the Resolution which he proposed, he wished to go on record that his intention was when he sponsored the Resolution, to have the Board meet as a Whole, and that the President conduct the meeting similar to something like around budget time where the public would be allowed to speak, each for 3 or 5 minutes. He did write a letter to all Board members this evening, and he is a little distressed to learn that now it is going to be run by two sub-committees of the Board and that they are going to decide on how the meeting should be run. Would it be germane to discuss this now, or wait until it comes before the next Board meeting, or when would be the time to discuss it, as he has strong feelings on the way his intent was to have it run, and he sees somewhere along the way it has already been re-shuffled. It was also moved from RESOLUTIONS on the Agenda to the Fiscal and E.W.&G. Committees.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Zelinski should discuss this at the meeting that is to be held shortly as mentioned by Mr. Donahue.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Legislative and Rules Committee met on Monday, August 26, 1985, at 7:30 P.M., in Conference Room II, at the Board of Education Bldg. Committee members present were Robert Skovgaard, Scott Morris, John Zelinski, James Dudley, Maria Nakian, Ruth Powers, Terrence Martin, and Audrey Maihock. Representatives also in attendance were Claire Fishman and David Martin. Also attending were Eve Cholmar and John DeForest from the Historic District Study Committee concerning Old Long Ridge Village; Steve Friedlander, Exec. Dir. of Jewish Community Center; J. Ralph Murray, Chairman of the Stamford Demolition Board; Peter Koch of the Comprehensive Public Affairs Service Company; Diane Erickson of Mem's Cafe, who is also representing the Restaurant Division of the Downtown Council; Carl Magnotta who will soon be the proprietor of the Davenport Restaurant in the Davenport Hotel; WSTC reporter Kathy Muscuff. He received a call from the Law Department on the day following the meeting to explain the reason Corporation Counsel or his designee was not in attendance at the meeting was because the office received the notice late Monday morning, did not in fact have even an opportunity to review the notice of our meeting until the morning after the meeting, so there was no one from the Law Dept. who was actually aware that the meeting was being held.

Item #1 was not on the Consent Agenda contrary to his Committee Report. No items were on Consent this month. An amendment was recommended and everyone has a copy of it. The Committee voted 7-0-1 to amend the ordinance to read as was mailed to all and he so Moved. Seconded.

- (1) FOR RE-PUBLICATION, AS AMENDED - 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, 7/1, and 8/12/85.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #1 as amended, for publication. APPROVED with six Abstentions: Reps. A. Perillo, M. Perillo, Summerville, Rinaldi, Maihock, and Blum.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 8-0 to Hold this item and instructed the Chairman of the Committee to write a letter to the Mayor requesting the Mayor to institute a request for funding for the Demolition Board due to the fact that there are no operating funds for them in the budget which makes it impossible for them to even mail out notices of their meetings. Accordingly, the letter was written, and as stated, this item is being Held.

- (2) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORD. #514 SUPPLEMENTAL CREATING A DEMOLITION BOARD AND ESTABLISHING A RELOCATION/DEMOLITION FUND. Submitted by Reps. Nakian, Morris, Skovgaard. Held in Committee 6/3 and 7/1/85. Approved for publication 8/12/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. SKOVGAARD said on Item #3, the Committee voted 3-4-1 to approve this request and he would so Move. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said this Motion is framed in the positive, although the Committee voted disapproval.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) REQUEST FOR WAIVER AND REFUND OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE for the Jewish Community Center paibby Barbara A. Pomerantz, Architect, for construction at the Jewish Community Center, a non-profit organization. Bldg. Permit #63472, \$300.00 paid 6/13/85. Requested by S. Friedlander, Exec. Dir., Jewish Community Center, P.O.Box 3326, Newfield at Vine Rd., 06905. Held in Committee 8/12/85.

MR. LYONS said his position is unchangeable until this Board passes an ordinance saying that no one under any circumstances, can get a waiver of a building permit, and that is he will vote for them even if he is against them. We passed a poorly-worded resolution. Now we sit here and say this one will, and this one won't. We do not have the wisdom of Solomon.

MR. SKOVGAARD said this Board passed a resolution setting up strict guidelines as to when a building permit fee should be waived and when it should not. Only in cases of extreme hardship, or if it was for low-income housing or subsidized housing would waivers be considered. This is the first case to apply that resolution. If one voted for the resolution and now votes for the waiver, he/she will be contradicting himself/herself.

MR. ZELINSKI feels this waiver should be approved and he stated the reasons for so recommending.

MR. WIDER also feels this waiver should be approved and he will vote in favor of it.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Item #3, reminding the Body that the Committee recommended disapproval. APPROVED with 28 Yes, 4 No, and 2 Abstentions.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the Committee voted 6-0 to amend the ordinance to include the words as indicated by Law Dept. Staff Counsel Richard Robinson, that the Historic District Commission would also comply in any other fashion that the Freedom-of-Information Act, as amended, may provide from time-to-time. That was received by everyone. He Moved that amendment be approved. Seconded. The Committee voted 7-0 to approve for final adoption as amended. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on final adoption as amended. CARRIED.

MR. SKOVGAARD said the final item on his agenda was #5 and the Committee voted to hold this item pending further information.

- (5) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE REGARDING SIDEWALK CAFES. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/31/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MR. DUDLEY said the Personnel Committee met on August 28, 1985. Item #1 was Held.

- (1) 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 is to be created by ordinance in the unclassified service, with a duration to depend solely upon duration of the grant involved. Current grant to start 6/1/85 and extend through 5/31/86. Submitted by Dr. Gofstein, Health Director, 5/28/85. Approved for publication 7/1/85. Held in Committee 8/13/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION CONCERNING MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF COMMISSION ON AGING. The 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:
1 Office Manager; 1 Driver; 1 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 8/12/85.

MR. DUDLEY said the Committee voted 6 in favor, none opposed, to approve, and he so Moved. Seconded.

He said before going any further, he would like to Move Item #4 to the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Dudley said on Item #2, this is a position that we have been paying benefits for currently and we have no resolution and that is what is being voted on tonight.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if these were Civil Service positions, or were they created by this Board by ordinance.

MR. DUDLEY said they normally are created by resolution, as in the past, but since we do not have such a resolution, this the reason for this being submitted.

MR. ZELINSKI said it was his interpretation that all Civil Service employees are eligible for fringe benefits. What concerns him is that the Commission on Aging was formulated by an ordinance by a previous Board of Representatives and of course the positions therewith. However, Mr. Zelinski does not believe that that Board had in mind paying for additional costs and expenses for positions that were not Civil Service. Needless to say if they intended that one or more of these positions were to be Civil Service, they would have so indicated and the fringe benefits would be automatic. If one or more of them were unclassified, such as the part-time Dial-A-Ride drivers they had some years ago, (now full-time), they would have provided by resolution any benefits, if any, they wanted to give them. Their personnel and job titles have changed a lot during the past several years. Mr. Zelinski said he could not rationalize giving benefits to non-Civil Service employees, and perhaps the Personnel Committee Chairman could expand upon that.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DUDLEY said he is going through his notes to locate a response for Mr. Zelinski.

MR. BURKE said he could answer part of it. Actually, this is by way of housekeeping. In the process of trying to balance the books, the Risk Manager found that she had been paying all along for three people for benefits and did not have a resolution. This is to get the housekeeping up-to-date and putting the resolution in for what we have been doing for these many years, making them equal with every other position in that department.

MR. ZELINSKI asked does that mean that all the employees presently at the Commission on Aging do receive fringe benefits.

MR. DUDLEY said that was correct.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he understands the Commission has been paying these benefits for quite a few years (Mr. Dudley said that was correct), and that the budget they gave this Board under which they are now operating, are these funds in that budget?

MR. DUDLEY said that was correct.

MR. BOCCUZZI said then they will not come in next month and say they need X number of dollars.

MR. DUDLEY said the funds are already there.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Item #3. APPROVED with Mrs. Conti voting No.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CREATING A POSITION OF RESEARCHER FOR THE MAYOR'S OFFICE. This position has already been funded for fiscal year 1985/86; and would be on an Independent Contractor basis. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 7/18/85. Approved for publication 8/12/85.

MR. DUDLEY Moved for approval of final adoption of Item #3. Seconded.

MRS. SANTY said she is glad Serrani and spender both start with an "S", because, boy, are they related! She read his description of his researcher; and in the last page, it appears to her as though the duties are the same as those of the Executive Aide to the Mayor. She asks when is this going to stop? What benefits is he/she going to get; what is it going to lead to? The maximum is \$11.00 per hour for two years. Once in a while, we are going to have to say no to these requests. She feels she is batting her head against a stone wall with only 9 on this side of the aisle, and 31 on the Democratic side, but she must reiterate that we must consider who is paying the bills in this town. The taxpayer must be considered, regardless of party affiliation. This request is outrageous.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said it does not indicate the number of hours to be worked.

MR. DUDLEY said not to exceed 17 hours per week.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked if this were not approved, since it states it is already funded for this fiscal year, what would happen to the funds?

MR. DUDLEY said he believes it would return to the General Fund.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he had a very long conversation with Mrs. Isidro on this particular position as he would not want to find out later on that it became an union position, and now becomes so permanent that it can't be gotten rid of. Mrs. Isidro assured him that it would be based on a two-year contract. In reference to what Mrs. Santy said, and her name is so close to Serrani and spend, all "S", the position was requested by the Mayor's Aide who feels the office needs it. It will help relieve other people in the office so they can do other, more meaningful work. This job will be 17 hours per week or less, certainly not more, and no benefits will be attached thereto. He told Mrs. Isidro he will hold her to it as long as he is on this Board, and he will be on this Board for the next two years. You don't have to worry about civil service, fringe benefits, or how much time is involved. The hourly rate is not in excess of what this type of person can get on the outside, if you look around. He feels the position is needed. He will vote for this item and he is asking the people on this side of the aisle to vote for it, if they so choose to do.

MRS. FISHMAN said in response to Mrs. Santy's remarks, she understands her concern about spending money, but Mrs. Fishman gets the impression that all the money that comes into her house is never spent because she does not want to spend anything. It is the same thing with the City. We collect taxes from the people albeit some time everybody doesn't want to pay their taxes. And we are given a budget, we are given money to spend for the good of the City. You cannot keep saying no, no, no, we are not going to spend any money. We are given money to spend and we have to spend it wisely. And if there is a need, that is what we have to do. It has to be spent wisely, and she feels this is a wise choice.

MRS. MCINERNEY said she would disagree with Mr. Boccuzzi that we, in effect, have an agreement which requires this position to remain as an independent position without any entitlement to benefits in the future. If that were truly the case, we would not be entertaining other items that have come before this Board requesting benefits for very similar positions with other Boards.

She remembers that Community Development in 1974 had only a life expectancy of two years. It is close to 11 years, and now we are making some of those employees civil service people. It is not always what we intended it to be at the moment of its inception, and is something we must truly guard against. She cannot support something which could blossom and explode into being a large expenditure in the future, no matter how small it starts.

She said it does not follow that if we are given a budget, or given a contingency, that it is our inherent right to continue to spend taxpayers' money. The taxpayers have become disillusioned; they do not come to public hearings any more; but they are having a problem making their own ends meet. Many are on fixed incomes and do not get 7% or 9% and certainly not retroactive.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LYONS said that responding to Mrs. McInerney on Community Development, when he came on this Board, the SCDP was quite large, and the economy in that Department was made by this Administration. It has been outstanding.

MR. DeLUCA asked what are the qualifications and other requirements. It should be stated in the contract that there will be no benefits accruing to this job, that it is for no longer than two years, and the specifications should be part of the contract. The Zoning Board Analyst was supposed to be on for one year and she lasted five years. He Moved that this be returned to committee so they can insert the qualifications, that no benefits will be given, and it will be for no more than two years, and the maximum rate is \$11.00 per hour, and the minimum rate should be stated. We don't have to give \$11.00 just because it is mentioned. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion to Return to Committee. DEFEATED with a vote of 7 Yes, 24 No, 1 Abstention, and 2 Non-Voting.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Item #3. Mr. Perillo will be recorded as voting Yes. The Motion has been APPROVED with 25 Yes votes, 7 No votes, 1 Abstention, and 1 Non-Vote.

(4) FOR RATIFICATION - AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF STAMFORD AND TEAMSTERS' LOCAL #145; this agreement applies to 4 contracts:

Public Works - Parks Dept. - Traffic & Parking Dept. - and
E. Gaynor Brennan, Sr. Golf Course.

Agreement provides for wage increases of 6% effective 7/1/84;
6% effective 7/1/85; and 6% effective 7/1/86. Clothing allowance
is eliminated as a separate item and added to wages The Board
has 30 days from 8/12/85 to accept or reject the agreement.

Above also referred to LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE.

MR. DUDLEY said he Moved his one Consent Item for approval, which is Item #4. Seconded. (See Page 30 of these Minutes for further regarding Item #4.)

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Consent Agenda. CARRIED.

MR. DUDLEY thanked Mr. Jachimczyk for sitting in on part of the Committee meeting in Mr. Dudley's absence.

(5) MATTER OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EMPLOYEES BEING DESIGNATED AS CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES as per letter from Sim Bernstein, Personnel Director to Catherine Trentini, Director, Stamford Community Development dated 6/27/85. Submitted by Rep. Robert DeLuca.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. DUDLEY said Item #5 has been Held in Committee.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

- (1) REQUEST TO REVIEW CERTAIN ACTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF ZONING BOARD BOARD ENFORCEMENT OFFICER. Submitted by Wm. H. Dolan, 44 Windsor Road, Stamford 06905, 4/28/85. Held in Steering 5/15 and 7/14/85. Held 7/1/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. WHITE said the Planning and Zoning Committee met on Thursday, Sept. 5th, in the office building of the Board of Education. Present were Committee members Donahue, Guroian, Vos, White, and Wider. Also Rep. Mallozzi was there but had to leave early to attend other Board business. Reps. Goldstein and T. Martin were also present. Invited guests and general public representation were also in attendance including Finance Comm. Paul Pacter, SEAC Dir. David Anderson, Chuck Ringel, of the Downtown Council; also Len Gambino of the radio station.

Regarding Item #1, investigation of this matter by the Committee revealed the problem was not one of enforcement but rather concerned a decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Basically, the ZBA in a R-5 Multi-Family Low Density District soon to be zoned as R-7½ as a part of Comprehensive Rezoning, granted a variance. The application was for a five-unit structure. Such variance was given on the basis because the applicant was some eleven inches short of the front line width, and a denial would constitute unreasonable limitation of property use. Overwhelmingly, the vast majority of residents in the area were and are single-family housing. It was also widely understood that the area was to be rezoned R-7½ as a part of Comprehensive rezoning. Since that time, because of the complete support of the local community, it has been so rezoned, but not, unfortunately, before the variance and construction made their appearance.

The Planning and Zoning Committee disagrees with the decision of the ZBA on two levels. First, it is, in our opinion, an egregious example of the ZBA Land Use atrocity. The entire neighborhood is single-family housing, with few exceptions, and they are two or three-family homes not on Windsor Road. The fact that they put certain conditions and restrictions in the variance is not significant use-wise, and in the practical realm, they are unenforceable except for the constant effort on the part of the neighbors. Secondly, the Planning and Zoning Committee believes the ZBA is over-stepping by far, the parameters of its authority by such decisions. It does not have the power to grant Variances and Special Exceptions, except by provable hardship. Moreover, such hardship is narrowly defined and has little to do with personal finances. It relates to the topography of the land, e.g., you hit a rock ledge while digging a cellar for your home and must move the foundation ten feet over so technically it is too close to your neighbor's side yard boundaries. This would constitute a legitimate hardship. The inability to construct your home because of geologic and topographical features would therefore warrant some sort of a variance. The Planning and Zoning Committee believes that meeting with Corporation Counsel to discuss these issues is in order.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. WHITE said that on Item #2, the P&Z Committee invited Mr. Pacter to give a presentation of the project concerning the sale of City-owned property on north side of Broad Street. Basically, this is an attempt to save the Lounsbury Building, an 100-year-old structure and a remnant of older downtown Stamford. It is also an attempt to prevent development to the limits allowed. This could be accomplished by selling the developer vacant public property on Broad Street in front of the Bedford Street Garage, allowing them to keep the Lounsbury Building, using the air rights over the two sites, and to roll the properties together under one ownership.

In exchange for the public property, the developer is to pay some \$597,000 to the City, and restore the Lounsbury Building, and to design his new office building with materials and architecture harmonious and consistent with the newly-refurbished building.

These and other provisions as well, e.g., another parking level will be placed on the Bedford Street Garage, and a parking level will be built on the roof of the developer's new Broad Street structure, both at the developer's expense. Further, as a part of the general up-grading of the place, the property to the rear of the Lounsbury Building in Bedford Street shops is to be landscaped into a unified parking plaza area. At present it is an obstacle course of irregular properties and parking lots, largely quite useless and totally unsightly.

The Committee is not entirely happy with the plan, largely because it underscores the failure of Stamford's downtown development planning to remain manageable and humane. Without proper planning and zoning, the City becomes, in these situations, a supplicant. The questions before the full Board are is the Lounsbury Building worth saving, and is the plan of improvement what it could be. The P&Z Committee believes the answer is Yes to both questions.

There are also questions of parking, i.e., will the expansion of the parking garage provide enough space to absorb the increase in cars created by the two office buildings, or the new office building. The Committee got no definite answers on this last. Notwithstanding these reservations, by a vote of 4 Yes and 1 Abstention, the Committee recommended to the full Board that the ordinance/agreement publication be approved, and he so Moves. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said we are talking about publication, although the Agenda does not say that, it is publication of an ordinance that has been Moved by Mr. White.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked if the City had the right to sell property without bidding.

MR. WHITE said yes, it did. Is Mrs. Maihock talking about holding a general auction?

MRS. MAIHOCK said not exactly that, but she wondered if it was really the privilege of the City to sell without the bidding process being followed.

MR. WHITE said yes, theypresumably can. This is part of a study that is being done at the present time. Really, when it comes to handling property, there is no real set procedure for handling any of this. There are certain conditions, etc., but that's about it.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. LYONS asked whether the Chairman said the developer would pay for the new parking. (Mr. White said Yes.)

MR. ZELINSKI brought up some questions on the appraisal of the property: who ordered it, who paid for it, etc. He wanted to know if any liability would be incurred by the City in the event there should be problems with the garage that the developer is building on top of the City's parking garage. This could involve all sorts of problems, large and small, from catastrophic on down to construction. And has it been determined whether the existing garage ^{can} bear the load of another floor safely?

MR. WHITE said, in response to the President's remark, that he has all the questions, but he doesn't know about the answers, but he will try. The City has a new policy on appraisals, and now the City orders the appraisal but the developer pays the appraisal fee. The City gets the money first and then releases or passes on the appraisal.

As far as structure goes, Mr. White said he assumes that if the parking garage fell in, that since it is the City's garage, they would be liable. This would be like the situation at the transportation center. The contracts and agreements would spell out liabilities and who was responsible for them. Now if the parking floor on top of Mr. Jaffe's building caved in, he thinks Mr. Jaffe would be responsible for it. That is an assumption, and probably not a very satisfactory answer.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if a public hearing would be held on this proposed ordinance.

MR. WHITE said that his Committee was planning on holding a public hearing.

MR. ZELINSKI trusts then that there will be time for a second appraisal. He questions future ramifications about some developer going on City-owned property and building on it. At the Aug. 5th meeting when this was discussed, he mentioned that this project would eliminate some of the parking behind the stores on Bedford St. which are used by many City residents when they shop. He has determined that 20 parking spaces will be eliminated if this project goes through. He would like to see an historic building remain, but not at the expense of much-needed parking currently in use.

MR. WIDER said the parking behind the stores on Bedford St. is quite raggedly as he does go there on occasion. He favors this plan because it ties in the old and the new. It is exciting; it is beautiful. When you look at the beautiful building on the left hand side of Broad St. and the disaster we have on the right hand side, some beauty is needed to be put in there.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on publication of ordinance of City-owned property on Broad St. APPROVED with 27 Yes, 5 No, and 2 Non-Voting.

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE FOR THE SALE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY ON NORTH SIDE OF BROAD ST., ADJACENT TO BEDFORD ST. PARKING GARAGE to ELLIOTT JAFFE at the appraised value of \$597,000, under terms and conditions outlined in "The Lounsbury Building - A Unique Survivor" booklet. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 8/12/85. Planning Board approved 8/30/85. Board of Finance approved 8/21/85.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE (continued)

- (3) CLARIFICATION OF STREET NAMES IN SHIPPAN AREA; also location of suitable sign at the intersection of Magee Avenue, Shippan Avenue, and Harbor Drive, as per letter from Arthur Collins, Pres., Collins Development Corp. 7/1/85. Submitted by Corp. Counsel Jay Sandak 8/21/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MR. WHITE said Item #3 is being held pending further investigation.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (additional):

THE PRESIDENT said they would have to go back to Item #4 under PERSONNEL COMMITTEE, since this involves 4 separate agreements, so there will have to be 4 separate votes taken. She asked Mr. Dudley to make the proper Motions for the ratification of these union contracts of the Teamsters.

MR. DUDLEY said that Mr. Barrett had advised him that four separate votes were required; however, since Mr. Dudley's Committee took 4 separate votes and approved all of them, and then the item was put on the Consent Agenda, only the one vote taken for approval of the Consent Agenda was required.

Note: See Page 26 for detail on this item.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

MR. PERILLO said the Public Works Committee met on Sept. 4, 1985, jointly with Fiscal Committee. Committee members present were Betty Conti, Tom Burke, Ron Malloy, John Zelinski, Joe Santagata, Al Perillo. Absent was Roger Taranto. This joint meeting was to consider the report of Booz, Allen, Hamilton, Solid Waste Collection. Mr. Donahue, Fiscal Chairman, chaired this meeting, went around the table to the members of both Committees as to who had questions on this matter. He also recognized other Board members for the same reason. The meeting went on for almost two hours. Many questions were asked, and it seems the answers were the same as those in the report. Public Works Committee members were not quite satisfied. Mr. Homer, who represented Booz, Hamilton, said the report they presented is what they were hired for, nothing else.

After the joint meeting was over, the Public Works Committee met in the Main Room of the Board of Education Bldg., and reviewed everything that went on. Still not satisfied with the report, a Motion was made for non-acceptance of the Booz, Hamilton Report by a vote of 5 against, and 1 Non-Voting, the Motion carried for non-acceptance of the report.

THE PRESIDENT said the entire matter was Held in Committee in Fiscal.

- (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 8/12/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BLUM asked why was the Public Works Committee against the report.

MR. PERILLO said there were many reasons. One was staff recommended for this operation of 10,000 private condos, apartments, etc., calls for nine people. The City now picks up more than 14,000 stops with only six people to do the whole job. We feel that is too much staff to be involved. Condos now pay privately around \$500,000 for garbage service. If the City takes it over, it runs over \$1 Million. Mrs. Conti objects to the fact that if this operation becomes a reality, the cost for the private operation will be passed on to "A" and "B" District taxpayers. There are many more reasons if you want to question the other five members of the Committee and get their viewpoints.

THE PRESIDENT said the matter was held, and Mr. Perillo outlined some of the reasons, so she cannot permit discussion. The discussion can take place at the Fiscal Committee when it meets again regarding the matter.

MR. BLUM said the condos and cooperatives are in the "A" District and are paying "A" taxes, but are not getting the same services as other "A" district taxpayers. When are they going to get the services they are paying for?

MR. ZELINSKI said the matter that was held by the Fiscal Committee was a request for \$150,000 from the Public Works Department for the funding to start up the solid waste collection. However, under the Public Works Committee, this item is not for an appropriation but is the matter of the Booz, Allen, Hamilton Study of Solid Waste Collection and the funding alternatives for the City. It is the whole report. The Committee, as Mr. Perillo said, and Mr. Zelinski is a member of that Committee, rejected the Report which was discussed...(end of tape, rest lost).

THE PRESIDENT is saying on the start of the next tape "...that the Board is ready to take a vote on the Booz, Allen Report, if that is what Mr. Perillo is intimating by the way his Committee voted." Mrs. Goldstein said she interpreted it quite differently, and she does not want to project her feelings on this, so she will allow Mr. Perillo to speak.

MR. PERILLO said the Committee's position was for non-acceptance of the Booz, Allen Report. He talked to the Commissioner on this and he is going to re-submit the request again to the Committee in a different form, just how, Mr. Perillo does not know. They are waiting for that to come through. There is no vote needed on this point right now, as far as Mr. Perillo can see.

THE PRESIDENT said there is no vote needed, but she is going to allow members to ask questions if they wish.

MRS. SANTY said there is an item on the Agenda, and the Public Works Committee met and voted for non-acceptance. They did not vote to hold it. To her, that would mean it was to be brought to the floor for the vote of the entire Board. It would have to be brought forth in a positive move, understanding the Committee voted not to accept the report. It is on the Agenda. He did say to return it to committee, unless some one wants to make such a motion. It is here for action so we should act.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved this item back to the Public Works Committee. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI said they are talking about apples and oranges here. The Fiscal Committee held an item which was an appropriation request by the Public Works Department "for \$150,000 to start the funding of a possible solution to the collection of garbage by condominiums, cooperatives, and rentals." Now, here under a different Committee, not Fiscal, the item is not worded the same at all, and Mr. Zelinski said he is either reading English or not, and he does not want any twisting and turning things around. At Steering this item was put on the Agenda. It was not on the Steering Agenda, not on his copy, so it was apparently put on by the Steering Committee and given to the Public Works Committee to handle, and Mr. Zelinski feels the members of the Steering Committee who were there can speak for themselves. The Report had been sent to all members of this Board. It contained four options and Option #1 was recommended. The Mayor then requested funding for Option #1.

If this Board, upon studying the Report, did not like Option #1, they could so state; they could choose one of the other options; or could make their own recommendations or amendments. It is like when we get a report to raise the salaries of the administrators, and we can approve, reject, or amend. The report was the back-up material for the funding request.

Mr. Zelinski is against returning to committee and feels this should be discussed tonight. The Fiscal request is a separate item. We got the report in July. It is now September, which should have been sufficient time for questions to be answered, and alternatives recommended. The garbage must be collected. A court case is pending, waiting upon our action. It should not go back to Committee. These condo taxpayers are paying taxes twice for the same thing: it is included in the City property tax and they pay a separate monthly fee to the private collectors.

THE PRESIDENT said speakers can speak only to returning to committee. She will not accept the merits of Booz, Allen.

MR. BURKE said when the Public Works Dept. considered this particular thing, they chose their words very carefully. They did not vote to accept it; they did not vote to reject it. They voted to non-accept it, pending further information.

MRS. CONTI said she sees this very clearly as she sits on both Committees. Actually, Fiscal was charged with an appropriation to cover one Option in the Report. The Public Works Committee was charged with studying all four Options and the entire Report. They are two separate items on the Agenda, and it would be out-of-order not to allow it to be discussed.

THE PRESIDENT said that is not before the Board now, only sending it back to committee is before the Board.

MR. DUDLEY Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, with 6 No votes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote to Return to Committee. APPROVED with 27 Yes, 6 No, 1 Non-Voting.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION CONCERNING CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS TURNED OVER TO CITY BY BOARD OF EDUCATION. Submitted by Reps. Audrey Maihock and Betty Conti 8/5/85.

MR. PERILLO said on the desks tonight is a resolution two pages long, and he Moved for approval. Seconded.

MR. SKOVGAARD is opposed to this resolution. To support his opposition, he brings to the Board's attention two schools which are no longer in use. One is in his District and the other in his parents' District. The first is Franklin School. He would be loathe to pass any resolution that required the City to maintain Franklin School in a condition comparable to the surrounding buildings and grounds of that particular neighborhood, which is currently in utter disrepair. There is debris in the lawns, and there are things hanging from trees. There are buildings with no insides whatsoever. All windows are broken, interior walls broken. That is clearly not the intention of this resolution, but in fact, we would be requiring the City of Stamford to go and wreak havoc if the Franklin School were still the property of the City. Mr. Skovgaard believes it has been sold.

The other school near his parents' house is the Riverbank School. Stretching this resolution to the extreme, or just a little bit, he asks if this would require Stamford taxpayers to spend thousands and thousands of dollars on professional landscaping to keep the grounds up to the quality of the grounds of the surrounding neighborhood, which is of a very high quality, residential, expensive homes with immaculately kept and groomed grounds. He does not feel this Board should be passing resolutions to maintain a school in a run-down neighborhood in a run-down condition, and to maintain a school in an excellently-kept neighborhood in a condition equivalent to the surroundings.

The boarding up of an unused school should not be prohibited. Boarding up prevents or at least discourages vandalism. The provision for an adequate security system is not specific as it does not state adequate for what. For the prevention of vandalism, there is no such thing. To alert people that vandalism has occurred, what use?

MR. DAVID MARTIN said he did not want people to misinterpret Mr. Skovgaard's remarks. In the 19th District, no one would propose that large sums be spent to professionally landscape Riverbank School. At the same time, that school was not mowed or taken care of in any way, shape or form throughout the entire summer. To address that problem even once required considerable time from the Public Works Dept. Time should have been scheduled so that the school would have received minimum attention from the time it was turned over. All schools turned over to the Public Works Dept. should have an inspection and maintenance schedule. It should not be an eyesore to the community, nor should any other City-owned building or equipment, for that matter, receive benign neglect, because in the end it is far more expensive to make corrections.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she and Betty Conti wrote this resolution because they were very upset by the unsightly appearance and the lack of maintenance of these buildings that the City has been taking over. It was not expected that Riverbank School would be maintained like Rockefeller's estate.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK (continuing): However, a reasonable amount of care is essential if the property values of the neighbors are to be upheld, and that is the reason she and Betty Conti did this. They do not want run-down neighborhoods in the community. There are many forces in this community that are spending millions and millions of dollars to make this City one of the greatest cities in Connecticut. Yet if you go and look at Burdick School, you are horrified. It is all boarded up; it is not kept up; there is debris around it; it is unsightly because it has never been mowed or taken care of. These are valuable real estate properties of the City and someone should be accountable for their care and maintenance until proper disposition is made of them. A modicum of care is not asking for too much, and should be budgeted, if not already done so.

When you have buildings that are not taken care of properly, you immediately find people who will come in and try to occupy them. There are, after all, a lot of homeless in this area looking for shelter. As Mr. Dudley pointed out, some of the habits of some people are objectionable to the neighbors in those areas. Public officials have an obligation to take care of the City's properties, and she is sorry if Mr. Skovgaard thinks we don't, but we really do.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. Voice vote taken, but the Chair was in doubt and requested the members to vote by machine. CARRIED by a vote of 23 Yes, 9 No, 2 Non-Voting.

MR. SKOVGAARD made a Point of Personal Privilege.

THE PRESIDENT asked if he had been insulted and Mr. Skovgaard said he had.

MR. SKOVGAARD said he takes exception to what Mrs. Maihock says in her characterization of his feeling that the City does not owe a responsibility, or an obligation to keep up the buildings. He said nothing of the sort. His name was used and the content of what he said was completely misconstrued. And yes, that is an item of Personal Privilege.

THE PRESIDENT said she is sorry, but it really is not.

She called for a machine vote on Item #2, the Sense-of-the-Board Resolution. APPROVED with 27 Yes, 1 No, and 6 Non-Voting.

MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO TAKE UP AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.

MR. PERILLO Moved to Suspend the Rules and take up an item not on the Agenda, being amending Sec. 8-14 Landfill Operation Fees. Seconded. Voice vote was not definitive and the President called for a machine vote. APPROVED with 27 Yes, 3 No, 4 Non-Voting.

At the present time, the City is charging private contractors to dump debris at the landfill site at a rate of \$1.00 per cwt. This is now to be increased to \$2.00 per cwt., or \$40.00 per ton for debris.

Mr. Perillo Moved to waive publication of ordinance ^{amending} Sec. 8-14 of the Code of Ordinances. Seconded.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. MALLOY said this is for the transfer site only, not for garbage collection. There is a big difference. This is the stuff that has to be taken away.

MRS. GUROIAN made a Point of Order, asking for clarification. Does the ruling of the Chair mean the motion is to waive publication of an ordinance, and then amend that ordinance?

THE PRESIDENT said the question before the Board is on the publication of an ordinance to amend Sec. 8-14 of the Code. Because Mr. Perillo wishes to waive publication, that is why that is the first motion.

A machine vote was taken on the Waiving of Publication which requires 27 affirmative votes for passage. APPROVED with 30 Yes, 1 No, and 3 Non-Voting.

The next vote will be on the Final Adoption of the ordinance to amend 8-14.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if the provision remains that the homeowner gets the first 100 lbs. free.

MR. PERILLO said this increase is only for the private contractor. The homeowner remains the same, first 200 lbs. free, and after that \$1.00 per cwt.

MRS. CONTI said the only words that are being deleted are "the dumping fee required herein shall be \$1.00 per cwt." Nothing else is deleted. Actually, Stamford's dumping fees are lower than any of the neighboring communities. People from the outside come here to dump because it is cheaper. Stamford taxpayers should not be subsidizing profit-making dumpers.

- (3) FOR FINAL ADOPTION, WAIVING PRIOR PUBLICATION, PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SEC. 8-14 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES to change the dumping fee for private enterprise from \$1.00 cwt. to \$2.00 cwt., or \$40.00 per ton.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Final Adoption of Item #3. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote, unanimously.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MS. RINALDI said the Committee met on Thursday, Sept. 5th, at 7:30 P.M. Present were Committee members Ruth Powers, Thomas Burke, and Mary Lou Rinaldi. Also present were Chief Vitti, Steve Heilner, Fire Commissioner John Keenan, and Bob Reid. She said the Committee voted unanimously for the publication of the proposed ordinance which is Item #1.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING ORD. #206 CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES FOR FIRE ALARM TIE-IN SERVICE TO THE FIRE DEPT. OF THE CITY. Submitted by Communications Director Hawley Oefinger 1/18/84. Held from 3/12/84 to 8/12/85. Approved for publication 5/7/84. (Held in Steering, in Committee, on Pending Steering Agenda.)

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MR. ZELINSKI asked if the vote is on the proposed ordinance including the changes mentioned in the Aug. 20, 1985 letter from Richard Robinson, Staff Counsel.

MS. RINALDI said Mr. Zelinski will have a copy of the ordinance with the changes in it.

THE PRESIDENT said what will be published will be the ordinance as amended by Mr. Robinson.

MS. RINALDI said the only changes they will see will be the establishment of an Appeals Board. What he suggested was to have the Fire Commission act as the Appeals Board.

MRS. McINERNEY said she has had some complaints in the past about the Burglar Alarm ordinance. The rules and regulations of that alarm ordinance allow the Police Dept. and the regulation authority, being Mr. Oefinger, to raise the fees without any kind of approval from this Board. Her question to Chairwoman Rinaldi is whether that same posture ^{will} be taken with the fire alarm system.

MS. RINALDI said what the change in fee will do will be to put it in parity with the burglar alarm, but now there will be an Appeals Board that the citizens can go to if they feel that they have been charged wrongly.

MRS. McINERNEY said then is she to assume that this Board is going to amend the police burglar alarm ordinance to also require an Appeals Board.

MS. RINALDI said that may be at some point down the road, but that is something that was not considered. It was not what they were charged to do; it was just the fire alarm.

MRS. McINERNEY said the reason she is concerned is that initially when they passed the burglar alarm ordinance, the annual fee was \$100.00. It has since doubled. And she does not believe that the intent of the Board was to keep raising the rates. It was intended or hoped to discourage some of the false alarms and correct the problems without going over-board and becoming a revenue-generating source to a particular department. Mrs. McInerney asked who the Appeals Board would be.

MS. RINALDI said it would be people who would be appointed, such as people who will install security alarms, who would have some technical knowledge of how the alarms would work and what would cause a false alarm to occur. A member of the Fire Commission would probably sit on that as well. The membership would be dictated by Chief Vitti and some other people.

MRS. McINERNEY said that is not going to be spelled out in the body of the ordinance, then?

THE PRESIDENT said that could happen at a public hearing.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MS. RINALDI stated that if you look at the first page -- you don't have this yet as she just got it today -- but they designate that the Fire Alarm Appeals Board will consist of five members: the Chief of the Stamford Fire Department or his designee, a person elected by the Chiefs of the Volunteer Fire Departments who operate in Stamford, and three persons appointed by the Mayor, one of which should be from the fire alarm industry. Again, the changes to the ordinance have not been distributed yet to the Board members.

MRS. MCINERNEY said the rules provide that when an ordinance is being considered, or voted upon, a copy should be in the hands of the members or on their desks. She, therefore, Moved that this item be returned to committee until everyone has a written copy to study.

THE PRESIDENT asked the Chairwoman of the Committee if the ordinance had been provided to each member.

MS. RINALDI said the Board members have a copy of the version that was submitted by the Volunteer Fire Depts., which is almost exactly the same ordinance that is up for publication tonight.

MRS. GUROIAN made a Point of Order said the Charter provides that if the Board members do not receive to be voted on at the meeting twenty-four hours before the meeting, then the complete ordinance as it is being presented has to be read to the Board members.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion made by Mrs. McInerney has been Seconded; that is, to return to committee.

MRS. CONTI said since the text is not before the Board members, it would be advisable to return to committee so all the Board members may see the final text that has been recommended by the Health and Protection Committee, including the Law Department's suggested amendments.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion to return to committee. DEFEATED with 13 Yes, 14 No, 6 Non-Voting.

MRS. GUROIAN said the entire ordinance should be read in compliance with the Charter.

THE PRESIDENT asked if there is an ordinance before the Board.

MS. RINALDI said if the President is asking about the one that came from Corporation Counsel today with a cover letter by Mr. Robinson, that is not the ordinance that is going to be published. There have been some changes to that.

THE PRESIDENT said it would be in order to move the changes, and then the entire ordinance would not have to be read.

MRS. GUROIAN said the Charter provides the members should have the ordinance twenty-four hours before. Therefore, now it is going to have to be read in its entirety. What is being amended?

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

THE PRESIDENT asked the Chairwoman if the changes are minor changes that can be worked on through amendments, or how extensive are they.

MS. RINALDI said the only change is the replacement of what would have been the Fire Commission as the Appealing Board to a five-member Fire Alarm Appeal Board. That is virtually the only change.

THE PRESIDENT said then there is an ordinance which requires an amendment, for publication, if the Board chooses to publish. She suggested that Ms. Rinaldi Move that amendment and advise what page it is on. This is a seven-page ordinance.

MS. RINALDI said the first change is on Page 6, seventh line down from the top, the line reads "...file a written appeal with the Fire Commission." The change would read: "Fire Alarm Appeal Board".

THE PRESIDENT said it has been Moved to delete "Fire Commission" and substitute "Fire Alarm Appeal Board". Seconded. A voice vote was taken. CARRIED.

Now it would be proper to expatiate who this Appeal Board is.

MS. RINALDI said on Page 1, there is a list of definitions. Under #1, Definitions, this would become letter "A", and everything else would drop a line down.

THE PRESIDENT said it would be better to use letter "F", which would simplify it.

MS. RINALDI said "F" would therefore read: "The Firm Alarm Appeal Board shall consist of five members as follows: The Chief of the Stamford Fire Department or his designee or alternate; a person elected by the Chiefs of the Volunteer Fire Departments who operate in Stamford; and three persons appointed by the Mayor, one of which should be from the fire alarm industry." Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the Motion to amend as stated by Ms. Rinaldi. CARRIED, with Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Maihock abstaining.

MS. RINALDI said again on Page 6, the line below the line we just changed, which said "written appeal to the Fire Commission", and that will be changed to "Fire Alarm Appeal Board" instead of "Fire Commission." Moved. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote, with Mrs. Conti and Mrs. Maihock Abstaining.

MS. RINALDI said there is one final change, that same paragraph, the line above the last line of that paragraph, again it says "Fire Commission" and again it should be changed to "Fire Alarm Appeal Board". So Moved. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote, with Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

MRS. CONTI said Page 7 mentions it again and that should be amended.

MS. RINALDI said that should be amended, too, and she Moved for approval of an amendment on Page 7, next to the last paragraph, Section 9, change from "Fire Commission" to "Fire Alarm Appeal Board". Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said there is another change required on Page 6, at the end of probably the eighth or ninth line, again it states "Fire Commission" and should be amended to "Fire Alarm Appeal Board". Moved. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote, with Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

MRS. CONTI asked who is the person who is called the "Fire Alarm Ordinance Administrator"? Is this somebody already on staff, or is this going to be a new position?

MS. RINALDI responded that it was someone already on staff. It may be Mr. Oefinger, or in fact it may be Chief Vittti himself, but it would not require hiring an additional person.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the publication of the ordinance, as amended. APPROVED, with Mrs. Maihock and Mrs. Conti Abstaining.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

MR. DeLUCA Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the Agenda. It is a request from the Stamford Ambulance Corps to hang a banner. Seconded.

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

MR. DeLUCA Moved for granting the Stamford Ambulance Corps permission to hang a banner on Summer St. from Sept. 15th through Sept. 29th. Seconded. CARRIED by voice vote.

- (1) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER ST. FROM SEPT. 15th to SEPT. 29th from the Stamford Ambulance Corps.

MR. DeLUCA said he had some good news and some bad news. The bad news is that the Board lost the ball game to the Mayor's team; and the pitcher has been reprimanded for pitching two nights in succession. The good news is that Mr. Taranto has given us a date of Dec. 8th, which is a Sunday, at 6:00 P.M. for the Christmas Party. This would be a good time for any newcomers who have been elected to the 19th Board, and for the old-timers who have not been elected, to say good-bye and hello. The price will be worked up and you will get further details.

THE PRESIDENT said perhaps one of the reasons the Board lost the ball game by such a close score was because the manager was ill and the team just wasn't the same even though the substitute manager was excellent. However, Mr. DeLuca was missed and she thanked him for the work done in planning the event. Even though they had a bunch of losers here, they were terrific. They played a very, very good game. It's just that the other team cheated.

MR. BURKE said he would like to correct an issue that has been spread about this town and is going like wild fire. His daughter's name is Darby, not Diane. For the first time in her life, she gets some ink, and they do her like this! It is DARBY.

THE PRESIDENT said that should be taken up with the ADVOCATE. Mr. Burke's daughter was quite a wonderful player. There were some excellent players on the team, in addition to the Board members.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MRS. NAKIAN said that her Committee met on Thursday, August 29, 1985, at 7:30 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Committee members Powers, Fishman, Maihock and Nakian. Also in attendance was Rep. Dick Lyons.

Item #1 is the investigation into the feasibility of duplicating important City records, and then to be housed in another location. Rep. Claire Fishman reported on her tour of the Municipal Office Bldg. to investigate the storage of important City documents. She discovered that these documents had never been duplicated, and that they are stored so that there is a danger of their being destroyed by fire, flood, or any kind of disaster one can think of. These are the only copies of many records and if they were destroyed, could never be replaced. She discussed the situation with the Mayor, and also with Comm. Pacter, who felt that the most important records for immediate preservation would be the Tax Assessor's records. If they were lost, that would cause Government to really come to a standstill. He estimated that it would cost approximately \$12,000 to duplicate the records by microfilm, have one copy that could be used by the public, and another that would be stored at another location which would be for safe-keeping.

The Committee agreed that they would write a letter to the Mayor, expressing their concern over the situation and requesting that this be taken care of as soon as possible, and the Committee is in the process of doing that.

- (1) INVESTIGATION INTO THE FEASIBILITY OF DUPLICATING IMPORTANT CITY RECORDS, AND THEN TO BE HOUSED IN ANOTHER LOCATION. Submitted by Rep. Claire Fishman, 12th District, 8/5/85.

MRS. NAKIAN said Item #2 has already been covered, and that the Committee voted unanimously to accept the Resolution, as amended.

- (2) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE 18th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PURPOSE OF SOLICITING PUBLIC IN-PUT REGARDING THE SITE FOR CITY HALL. Submitted by Reps. John Zelinski, Maria Nakian, James Dudley, Thomas Burke, Cadie Vos, Betty Conti, Grace Guroian, Robert DeLuca, Audrey Maihock, Barbara McInerney, Jeanne-Lois Santy, Mary Jane Signore, David Martin.

Above also referred to FISCAL COMMITTEE as a Joint Committee.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MR. WIDER said there is no report this month.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

- (1) UP-DATED REPORT FROM THE URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION. Submitted by Rep. John Mallozzi, Chairman, Urban Renewal Committee 7/12/85. Held in Committee 8/12/85.

MR. MALLOZZI said there is no report this month.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MRS. MAIHOCK said this Committee has no report.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MR. DAVID MARTIN said no report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE

MR. RYBNICK said no report.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

MRS. McINERNEY said due to lack of a quorum, this Committee was unable to conduct any business on August 29th, therefore Items 1 and 2 are being HELD. A meeting has been re-scheduled for Thursday, Sept. 12th, at 7:30 P.M., in Conference Room II at the Board of Education Building. She urged as many Board members to attend as possible; but they will not be able to truly complete this entire project without a quorum present to take action.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she was one of those not present, causing the lack of a quorum. She suggested contacting the Committee members to set up a mutually satisfactory date that would not conflict other meetings already scheduled. She, herself, has several conflicts on the night that has been picked for the next meeting. She would appreciate being consulted on the date selection in advance. She cannot be in attendance on the 12th, regretfully, due to a previous engagement.

- (1) REPORT. - HELD IN COMMITTEE.

MRS. McINERNEY said Ms. Summerville's comments are noted, and the next meeting after Sept. 12th will be Sept. 26th. Thursday, if they have not been able to complete any business on the 12th.

CHARTER REVISION and ORDINANCE COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND ENACTING A NEW CODE OF ORDINANCES FOR THE CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT; ESTABLISHING THE SAME; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF CERTAIN ORDINANCES NOT INCLUDED THEREIN; EXCEPT AS HEREIN EXPRESSLY PROVIDED FOR; PROVIDING FOR THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF SUCH CODE AND A PENALTY FOR THE VIOLATION THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER OF AMENDING SUCH CODE; AND PROVIDING WHEN THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE. Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney, Co-Chairperson, Charter Revision and Ordinance Committee 8/22/85.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. LYONS said no report.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. BOCCUZZI said no report.

RESOLUTIONS - None.

PETITIONS - None.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTESAugust 12, 1985 Regular Board Meeting

MR. BURKE said on Page 3, Moments of Silence, one of the words has to be eliminated as it is a double negative. "It was not without one ounce of guilt" so delete the word "not".

MRS. McINERNEY said on Page 15, the second line, the second word, should read "and" instead of "an" (a typographical error).

MR. LYONS said under Parks and Recreation, under Ice Fees at Terry Conners, it reads "Stamford Youth Assn.", it should read "Stamford Youth Hockey Assn."

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she wishes the Board would work with her in trying to trim down the Minutes. We had a person come before the Appointments Committee who served on one of the Land Use boards. Sometimes because these Minutes are verbatim (comments lost here due to flipping tape over). It seems as though on the last Minutes, all debate was practically verbatim, but only the Committee Chairpersons' reports should be. If members wish their comments to be verbatim, please do not contact the office, but contact Ms. Summerville. We seem to be unique in that there is no other legislative body that does their minutes verbatim. Let us try to trim them down a little bit. Some of these things could be deleted.

A Motion was made and Seconded to accept the minutes as corrected. APPROVED.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS and INDIVIDUALS

MS. SUMMERVILLE wished to enter into the record that a communication was received from Finance Commissioner Pacter dated 9/9/85 that it be made a part of our minutes for reasons. It is on the desks tonight.

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 12:07 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

Pages 1-14 transcribed by A. Kachaluba
Pages 15-end " " H. McEvoy

SG/AK/HMM
Encls.

(44)

SEAT NO.	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.	SEAT NO.	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	ABSENT	REPRESENTATIVE	PARTY DIST.
1.		✓			MCGRATH, PATRICIA	D-14	21.				✓	LIVINGSTON, JEREMIAH	D-5
2.	✓				NAKIAN, MARIA	D-20	22.		✓			HALLOY, BRIEN	D-11
3.		✓			MAIHOCK, AUDREY	R-19	23.			✓		FISHMAN, CLAIRE	D-12
4.	✓				WIDER, LATHON	D-3	24.	✓				DONAHUE, DONALD	D-8
5.		✓			TARANTO, ROGER	D-15	25.	✓				PERILLO, MILDRED	D-9
6.	✓				LYONS, RICHARD	D-1	26.				✓	SIGNORE, MARY JANE	R-10
7.		✓			BURKE, THOMAS	R-13	27.				✓	GLOVER, KATIE	D-2
8.	✓				RYDNICK, GERALD	D-4	28.				✓	MARTIN, TERRENCE	D-10
9.	✓				MALLOZZI, JOHN	D-16	29.	✓				MORRIS, SCOTT	D-17
10.		✓			DeLUCA, ROBERT	R-14	30.	✓				SKOVGAARD, ROBERT	D-10
11.		✓			SANTY, JEANNE-LOIS	R-18	31.	✓				ZELINSKI, JOHN R., JR	D-11
12.			✓		MARTIN, DAVID	D-19	32.			✓		DUDLEY, JAMES	D-6
13.		✓			GURDAN, GRACE	R-7	33.	✓				POWERS, RUTH	D-8
14.		✓			CONTI, BETTY	R-7	34.				✓	SANTAGATA, JOSEPH	D-17
15.			✓		VOS, CADIE	R-13	35.				✓	AUSTIN, ROBERT W., JR	D-15
16.		✓			WHITE, W. DENNIS	D-1	36.	✓				JACHIMCZYK, DAVID	D-4
17.		✓			McINERNEY, BARBARA	R-20	37.	✓				RINALDI, MARY LOU	D-5
18.	✓				BLUM, DAVID	D-12	38.				✓	OWENS, BOBBY	D-3
19.	✓				PERILLO, ALFRED	D-9	39.	✓				BOCCUZZI, JOHN J.	D-2
20.	✓				SUMMERVILLE, ANNIE M.	D-6	40.	✓				GOLDSTEIN, SANDRA	D-16

(45)

Mrs. King -
EPB apt #3

TALLY: 18 YES
11 NO
4 ABSTAIN

ABSENT: _____
PRESENT: _____

DATE: 9/9/85