

MINUTES OF SPECIAL BUDGET MEETING - MONDAY, MAY 12, 1986

FOR FISCAL YEAR 7/1/86 - 6/30/87

19th BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

A Special Meeting of the 19th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut was held on MONDAY, MAY 12, 1986, pursuant to a "CALL" issued by President Sandra Goldstein, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives, Second Floor, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut. The call was for 7:30 P.M.

The meeting was Called to Order at 8:55 P.M. after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION was given by Rep. Jeanne-Lois Santy, Deaconess of the Stamford Baptist Church:

"Let us join together in prayer. Dearest Heavenly Father, we thank You for our many blessings, to live in the greatest country on earth, to live in this, our beloved City of Stamford, the right to worship in the place that we choose, fill our hearts with love and caring tonight for those we represent, take away the burdens and the pain that so many of us share. Only You know that pain; only You can relieve it. We reach our hands to You for help. Fill us with Thy spirit. Take away the jealousy, the anger, so that tonight all our actions will glorify Thy name. Teach each one of us here to do the very best because we want to glorify You, our dearest Heavenly Father. And all of the Lord's people said "Amen"! Amen."

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

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said before she reads the CALL of the Meeting, she is asking everyone in the gallery first to find a seat; also she knows there are issues on the Agenda this evening that people care very strongly about and emotions run very high. She is asking that there be no comments from the gallery and all discussions will emanate from the floor of the Board. She requests the indulgence of everyone on that.

The "CALL" of the Special Meeting this evening is as follows:

"I, Sandra Goldstein, President of the 19th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, and pursuant to Section 202 of the Stamford Charter, hereby CALL a Special Meeting of said Board of Representatives at the following time and place:

Monday, May 12, 1986
Tuesday, May 13, 1986

The "CALL" of the Special Meeting (continued):

at the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor,
429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut,
at 7:30 P.M.

for the following purpose:

To consider and act upon the CAPITAL and OPERATING
BUDGETS for the Fiscal Year 1986/87, as transmitted
by the Board of Finance on April 21, 1986, pursuant
to provisions of Chapter 61 of the Charter.

AGENDA

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: President Sandra Goldstein

ROLL CALL: Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville

MACHINE TEST VOTE: President Sandra Goldstein

BUDGET PRESENTATION: Fiscal Committee Chairman Donald Donahue

Signed: Sandra Goldstein - President
19th Board of Representatives

ROLL CALL was taken by CLERK ANNIE M. SUMMERVILLE. There were 39 Present,
and 1 Absent. Absent was Rep. Thomas Burke, who was excused due to illness.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE requested that the members kindly position their micro-
phones in front of them as it affects the acoustics when another member is
talking. Rather than having it turned facing in some other direction, it
should be pointed at the member to whom it belongs.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

TEST OF THE VOTING MACHINE: President Goldstein asked each member to vote,
in turn, Yes, No, and Abstain, and declared the machine in good working
order, except for Station #21, that of Rep. Jeremiah Livingston, which
registers only Abstain, and therefore Rep. Livingston's vote will be recorded
manually.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN: "This evening's meeting, as is every budget meeting,
probably one of the most important of the year. There are certain ground
rules that we follow to expedite the evening. They worked very well in the
past and I certainly hope they will serve us in good stead this evening.
Mr. Donahue will proceed with a continuing motion. As all Board members know,
we can add nothing to the budget that was presented to us by both the Mayor
and the Board of Finance. All we can do is allow the line items to remain
the same, or to cut an item. Mr. Donahue's Motion will be to approve the
budget as passed by the Fiscal Committee. We will not have to vote on each
of the Fiscal Committee's recommendations individually.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN (continuing):

"The vote to be taken will be taken on any amendment to the Fiscal Committee's Report. In other words, any one on the floor can vote to change by reducing a Fiscal Committee recommendation and then the Board will take a vote. If the Chair sees no hands after the department total is given, we will proceed to the next department.

"I wanted to thank in advance Don Donahue, the Chairman of Fiscal, and his really extraordinary Committee. They have met for the last three weeks every night and for a good number of hours on Saturday. They deserve our vote of gratitude for a very good job, and thank you very much.

"With that, Mr. Donahue, the floor is yours."

MR. BLUM said there should be accolades for Bobby Valentine for bringing his Rangers into first place in the American League.

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee has met with most major departments over the last three weeks and culminated their deliberations on May 10th with Mr. Lyons, Mr. David Martin, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Esposito, Mrs. Begel, Mr. Mollo, Miss Rinaldi, Mr. Livingston and Mr. Donahue attending. Mr. Donahue said before the Board tonight will be the Fiscal Committee's recommendation for the Operating Budget, the Board of Education Budget, and the Capital Projects Budgets for the fiscal year 1986/87.

The Committee has worked hard to study each budget and Mr. Donahue feels it is important to note there is very little in this budget in the way of Program Expansion. The only things that stand out in his mind are four mandated positions in the Fire Department and three positions in Traffic and Parking which will hopefully lead to a cost reduction in this fiscal year. The Fiscal Committee in the last two years has usually recommended the use of the Budget Reduction Line to trim budgets back to a level which we thought was fair and will continue the delivery of services the taxpayers of this community deserve. It is ironic that it is that very Budget Reduction Line that has caused the Fiscal Committee some problems in reaching a recommendation to reduce this budget significantly, and he is talking basically in terms of the Operating Budget. There is a minus 2% in every budget that each department manager must find within their budget hopefully without reducing services to the public.

The Fiscal Committee will recommend very few reductions in the budgets this evening, and the only areas of concern raised were fuel oil, diesel, gasoline, and the Committee could not reach a consensus of what that amount should be basically because they did not feel they could predict over the course of a year what fuel would cost in July, what it would cost in December, etc. The announcement today of fuel going up 4¢ to 6¢ a gallon by July 1st is one of the concerns the Committee did have.

Mr. Donahue asked every Board member to keep in mind, as they go through the budget tonight, that as was the Fiscal Committee's philosophy over the past few years, they want the department heads to be able to manage their ^{own} departments and set their own priorities. That is why they used the Budget Reduction Line. In past years they only used a maximum of .5% on that line, or possibly .75% in one department or another. There is a full 2% reduction on that line.

MR. DONAHUE thanked the members of the Fiscal Committee for their cooperation, their interest. He thanked Comm. Pacter and Mr. Harrison who were most helpful to the Committee. Anne Summerville again set up the provisions for Saturday and he thanked her. Scott Morris was also very helpful. He participated and kind of kept record of the events on Saturday and it was a great help, and it was a great help to have him at the Committee meetings. He also thanks all those who attended from time to time over the past three weeks.

MR. DONAHUE Moved to approve the Operating Budget for fiscal year 1986 /87 as amended by the Fiscal Committee. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT said they will go page by page and as amendments are made and passed, those tallies will be recorded by the secretaries and by members of the Board who are keeping individual tallies.

PAGE 12 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS

MR. DONAHUE said bottom line is on Page 13, \$293,215.00. No further reductions recommended.

THE PRESIDENT said if the Chair sees no hands at the end of a department, then she will just say they will proceed to the next department. Once they have left a department, that's it, unless a Motion to Reconsider is made and passed, they will not turn the page back.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to cut Line Item 101.3140 by \$18,000, bringing the bottom figure to \$30,000. Seconded. In the past there have been Primary Expenses and normally by State Law, we are required to make payment regardless, and we can adjust them in the future budget as a special emergency appropriation. Based on the fact that the original budget for 1985/86 was \$25,000 and the expenditure in the year prior to that was \$33,000, she felt that \$30,000 would be a fair amount for that line account in this budget.

MRS. MAIHOCK stated she agrees with Mrs. McInerney.

MR. DONAHUE said this is the first year the Registrars are attempting to budget the Election Fund at actual cost. Every year when there is a primary or an election, they have been forced to come back in for additional appropriations.

MRS. McINERNEY asked Mr. Donahue what the balance was in that account at the present time.

MR. DONAHUE said he does not have it before them, but Frank Harrison has gone upstairs to get the figure.

THE PRESIDENT said they would continue with this department if there are any other items to consider, and then go back to the Primary Expense matter when the information is secured.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked about 101.3120 Canvas and Voter List. That seems to have quadrupled and she does not understand that in view of the fact that the population has not quadrupled.

MR. DONAHUE said while the population has stabilized, the voter registration has increased. They used to have a system where each District was canvassed door to door to review the voting list to determine who is there and who is not. They pay the person \$200 to do the whole District. It is no longer feasible to do it at that amount. They are now attempting to use a new system to fully clean up the voter registration list, and that would involve purchasing of changes of address from the post office, and also a post card system by which they send you a post card and you return the card that yes, you are still living at that address and still wish to remain on the voter registration list.

MRS. MAIHOCK said if they are only using post cards, she cannot comprehend how they got it up to \$28,000. She made a Motion to cut that to \$10,000. There is no Second.

MR. DONAHUE said he now has the figure Mrs. McInerney wanted on 101.3140. Expended in that account was \$31,774.88.

MRS. MCINERNEY said she wished her Motion to remain on the floor.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the Motion to cut \$18,000 from 101.3140 to make it \$30,000. This is a machine vote. Motion is DEFEATED with 14 Yes, 24 No, 1 Non-Voting.

PAGE 14 - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

MR. DONAHUE said the bottom line is on Page 15, \$120,906, and no reduction is recommended.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved that 102.2750 GASOLINE a cut of \$55, to bring it to \$273. Seconded. He said he hopes even though he makes this cut against the Board of Representatives, and that Mrs. Goldstein and the rest of Leadership have prepared this and will not hold it against him, but essentially when the figures were prepared for gasoline and fuel oil and electricity throughout the City, there were certain budget assumptions which assumed increases in these items, and specifically he had the Board Researcher investigate this. Fuel Oil was budgeted at 90¢ a gallon, and gasoline at \$1.00 per gallon, and electricity was assumed to be at an increase of 12%. In fact as anyone knows who has gone to the gas pumps these days, the price of fuel oil, the price of gasoline, the price of all energy-related items has fallen and not gone up. The Board of Finance recognized some of this in their deliberations. They have cut back on the electricity accounts pretty much throughout the budget and made some of these cutbacks. For instance, they brought the electricity account back to the level which it should be, reflecting that the DPUC did not award any increase. However, they did not make cuts in fuel oil and gasoline accounts that are in any way commensurate with the reductions that we have seen in actual prices.

As he said earlier, fuel oil was budgeted at 90¢ per gallon. The actual price that the City is paying for fuel oil is 50¢. That is a 45% reduction in fuel oil. The budgeted price for gasoline was \$1.00 per gallon, reminding every one that we buy for the most part, gasoline wholesale and not at the pump.

MR. DAVID MARTIN (continuing)

However, there is some pump, and these reductions apply to that as well. We budget it at \$1.00 per gallon and what we pay is 64¢. That would be a cut of approximately 35%. He believes all the gasoline accounts should be cut alike. The cut that he proposes here, and the cuts he will propose throughout, do not reflect the full 35% or 45% reduction because he agrees with what Mr. Donahue said earlier and that is that we cannot expect a few cents of increase in gasoline prices, and as a result he is proposing cuts against the original budgets of roughly 30% on fuel oil and 25% on gasoline, and that is against the original budget and not after what the Board of Finance has done.

In this case, for instance, the Board of Finance has already cut \$36 from \$364 making it \$328. (A 10% cut) If you consider my number, \$328, the cut of \$55 is approximately 17% over the Board of Finance, that cut is exactly 25% versus what we originally proposed. The net amount left is \$273. That is the nature of his cuts throughout the evening; they will be either 25% in gasoline, and 30% in fuel oil; 25% in diesel fuel, all that is against the original budget.

He believes it is important, even where there have been major budget reductions, that we get these accounts in line with actual expenditures. It is extremely important that we not build in any fat in any place in the budget anywhere.

THE PRESIDENT said then this ^{cut} would be indicative of the cuts that your motions to cut for the rest of the budget.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said, collectively, although this is a mere \$55, they will sum to some \$80,000.

MR. SIGNORE said he agrees with Mr. Martin on cutting these costs, but in the interests of saving time, is it possible to have a blanket cut for the budget as a whole on these items rather than nickel-and-dime it all the way through the budget. Could we not take a flat figure for the total budget as far as oil and gasoline is concerned?

THE PRESIDENT said if this request to amend passes, then all we need do is have Mr. Martin make a very quick Motion and we will have a voice vote for the rest. It will not take a tremendous amount of time because he has already done the mathematics. And since we are going to have to reflect departmental totals and section totals, we are going to have to do it this way. So the first vote will be the longest because it is going to be done by machine. And after that it will be a voice vote if this goes through.

MR. SIGNORE said some where along the line, there may be those who have favorite commissions and boards and they are going to fight some of this. He would prefer a blanket motion covering the budget as a whole.

THE PRESIDENT said it is really out of keeping of the Board rules. You would have to make this for every department, department by department.

MS. FISHMAN said she believes it is the right of the Board members to question each department as it comes along, and to make a blanket vote would go against the grain.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Line Item 102.2750 Gasoline, cutting it an additional \$55, bringing it to \$273. APPROVED with 24 Yes, 15 No.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked how many times Line Item 102.2940 Conferences and Training was used last year.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said approximately five times. No more than ten.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked for what purpose and where were the conferences held.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said one of the training sessions was held in Hartford and was sponsored by the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities. Some of the conferences are held all over the country but we generally only go to those in Connecticut.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked what would be the average amount if held in Hartford.

MS. SUMMERVILLE for one day, for registraton, materials, the average amount would be no more than \$25.00 generally.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to reduce 102.2940 Conferences and Training from \$1,000 to \$500. Seconded.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said with the new Board that we have, a lot of the new members have not gotten into participating in these conferences. No one has limited attendance to the State of Connecticut only. There may be, and have been, some very pertinent seminars held in Washington, D. C. where chairpersons of committees should be there although quite often City department heads are there, or commission or board chairpersons are attending. She feels it is important for Board members to get first-hand information. Mr. Zelinski has attended a few conferences and brought back reports. Out of 40 Board members, suppose seven wanted to go to one particular conference during a year, and you only had a total budget of \$500, it would be a virtually impossible situation. Conferences and seminars are held throughout the entire year.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she does not recall ever having any of the older members of this Board that she knows of, going on any of these conferences, which is why she suggested this. If any one wants to save money, perhaps we could economize on that.

MR. BLUM said he is Co-Chair on the Special Committee to Assess Priorities and he attended a conference with Mr. Wider, who is on Community Development and Housing, also Ms. Summerville who is on his Committee, and they went to Wallingford to a conference on housing. There you are, 3 people, \$75.00. This was on housing. Transportation is another vital, current issue and it is logical to expect that one or more may wish to attend conferences on transportation. The same thing may occur on other important issues facing this City and this area. We must keep informed if we are to deal with these problems intelligently and effectively.

MRS. McINERNEY supports Mrs. Maihock's Motion based on the fact that volunteer government public service employees such as Board members are, do have the right to deduct any items that you deal in the line of your government service, as an income tax deduction. Quite frankly, people have gone to meetings and have never brought back written reports to the rest of the Board members, so we could benefit from it, so she does not see the importance of having this item stay in. She is not in favor of Board members going to conventions, i.e.,

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing)

the National League of Cities in Washington, D. C. for three days on City expenses. If that is something we want to do, we should have the courage to do it because we want to improve our image and our own deductive abilities and we should pay for it ourselves and deduct it from our income tax.

MR. LYONS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on cutting 102.2940 from \$1,000 to \$500. DEFEATED with 8 Yes, 29 No and 2 Non-Voting.

MR. BLUM asked for the rationale of 102.1130 Part-Time. Budget for 1985/86 was \$9,360. Why is it going up to \$21,000 for a part-time worker.

MR. DONAHUE said that account pays for the Staff Researcher and there is also the possibility of bringing in a Clerk-Typist II part-time. The Researcher is already budgeted in this current budget, and the Clerk-Typist position would be effective by current levels of MEA salaries and such.

MR. BLUM feels if we have ^{two} part-time people, we should employ one full-time person. Therefore, he Moved to cut \$10,000 from the \$21,000, leaving \$11,000, Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE said this would be \$1,000 less than we budgeted for the Researcher.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said the part-time position is needed due to the heavy workload, and that it had previously been in the budget.

MR. BLUM said then we should again have a full-time employee.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said as Co-Chairman of L&R, he is using some of our part-time resources to investigate an issue before the Committee to find out what the fiscal implications are. He will not have his Committee just go voting on new ordinances that could cost great sums of money without knowing exactly what they are doing, and they are finding in this particular instance how to craft a bill in a way that would achieve their objectives without spending great sums of City money. It is important not to throw away that type of information and understanding that has not been used as well as they should have, and as often as they should have in order to save a few thousand dollars here.

MS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the Motion. DEFEATED with 2 Yes votes, 34 No votes, and 1 Non-Voting.

MR. DONAHUE said the bottom line total for Code 102 BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES is \$120,851.

Page 16 - BOARD OF FINANCE

MR. DONAHUE said bottom line is \$121,778. No reductions recommended by Fiscal.

Page 17 - PLANNING BOARD

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions are recommended by Fiscal. Bottom line \$429,044.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved for a reduction of \$45.00 on Line Item 104.2750 Gasoline. Seconded.

MS. POWERS said she cannot see cutting Gasoline from the Land Use Boards.

A machine vote was taken. DEFEATED with 15 Yes votes and 24 No votes.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to reduce Line 104.2940 Conferences and Training from \$4,000 to \$2,000, since \$2,000 is the current amount budgeted. Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE said, in general, concerning Conferences and Training, he went into this six or seven years ago, and the entire budget had a total of some \$87,000 allocated to that account. Because of the Budget Reduction Line, 7905 in each departmental budget, he can safely say that no unnecessary or not mandated conferences will be attended and no unnecessary travel will be taken. Those are the first places they look to absorb some of that reduction money.

A machine vote was taken. Motion DEFEATED with 3 Yes votes, 34 No votes, 2 non-voting.

MR. DONAHUE said bottom line on Page 18 is \$429,044.

Page 19 - STAMFORD ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE CORPORATION (SEAC)

MR. DONAHUE said a cut is recommended, \$3,500, leaving a bottom line of \$60,000.

MR. SIGNORE Moved to amend that and make an additional cut of \$5,000, leaving a balance of \$55,000, same as current budget. Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE said it is important to note that the private sector donations to SEAC are projected to go to \$493,950 this year, up from \$197,000 in 85/86. The benefits we receive through contributing to SEAC have more than paid for themselves over the years, and the Committee felt \$60,000 was appropriate.

MR. WIDER said SEAC is looking over the Collins Projects planned for the South End and the waterfront. We are trying to have someone stay on top of that development to see that the shorefront is protected. We cannot expect them to do something without money.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if any other towns participate in the support of SEAC, or is it just Stamford.

MR. DONAHUE said it is totally within the City of Stamford.

MRS. McINERNEY said she recalls that SEAC was begun with seed money from the City of Stamford in hopes of it eventually being funded in its majority by outside corporations. She feels we are getting deeper and deeper into SEAC every year, and she will support Mr. Signore's Motion. She is also concerned about the authority or the areas of operation which SEAC has undertaken with some of its newest projects. She refers to the Shuttle Bus service that was proposed from the Trizec Area into downtown Stamford, most especially since the

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing):

City does have its own Transit District and it operates under the auspices of the Traffic and Parking Authority and she certainly feels that is going a little bit behind their parameters. She would support the proposed cut.

MR. LYONS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

A machine vote on the Motion to cut an additional \$5,000 over and above that proposed by the Fiscal Committee, leaving a net of \$55,000. DEFEATED, with 13 Yes, 26 No.

MR. DONAHUE said the bottom line on Page 19 for SEAC is \$60,000,

Page 20 - ZONING BOARD

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions were recommended for the Zoning Board and the bottom line on Page 21 is \$74,981.

MRS. MAIHOCK said ^{on} Item 107.4140 Professional Consultants for \$3,000, how many consultants were hired?

MR. DONAHUE said they expended \$2,400 in this account for Fiscal 1984/85. What this account does is allow the Zoning Board to do is bring in persons with certain expertise on a per diem basis. They review the Zoning Regulations before they are published, or before at least before final adoption. Hopefully by doing this, they will avoid us from being involved in long and protracted court experiences as in past year. It is not one person, or one consultant. It is just bringing one maybe ten or fifteen days in the course of a year, as demand dictates.

MRS. MAIHOCK since the 1984/85 budget was \$2,400 and the 1985/86 was \$1,500, she feels that the diminishing of the \$3,000 request for next fiscal year would be in order. She Moved a cut of \$1,000, leaving \$2,000. Seconded.

A voice vote - DEFEATED Mrs. Maihock's Motion.

MR. DONAHUE the bottom line on page 21 is \$74,981.

Page 22 - ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

MR. DONAHUE said there is no change -- bottom line is \$34,111.

Page 23 - BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS

MR. DONAHUE said no change - bottom line is \$98.00.

Page 24 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

MR. DONAHUE said there are no changes. Bottom line on Page 25 is \$183,210.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved for a reduction of \$200.00 in the Gasoline account 112.2750, leaving a total of \$992. Seconded.

He feels this is a very, very important Board and those people are in their cars if they're doing any good looking for specific instances. However, gas prices have declined. There is excess monies in this particular account, as there are throughout this budget. He believes the gas should be controlled. He does not want any slack that will lead people to controlling the amount of gas that is pumped at the pump, or the price of gas, etc., and that is why he

MRS. MAIHOCK wanted to report that when the Environmental Protection Board is involved in an issue, they do not go out one time only. She knows from experience that they go out time after time after time, and they have had problems where it is necessary to do that. There might be something else in this budget that might be more deservedly cut. She would hesitate to support this cut as it is necessary to have gasoline to perform their duties.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he does not think Mr. Martin is not cutting what they could do when he is cutting the Gasoline line item. He believes the money is there to continue doing what they have been doing. The cost per gallon is cheaper than what it was provided for in the budget. He is just trying to bring the same amount of gallons of gas back to the cost of what it is going to be. He is not going to prevent them from doing anything less than they did before.

MR. ESPOSITO said he understands the justification of Mr. Martin's suggestion. However, this cut would be slight relative to the over-all budget and they have already gotten a cut of \$3,822 and they must absorb that somewhere. We should let it stand.

MR. WIDER appreciates what Mr. Martin's intent is, but gas has gone up 5¢ in the last three days, and we do not know how many times and how much it might be going up between now and the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1987. We may then need more money for gasoline than we now are appropriating by these cuts. He does not like to see penny-pinching on this gas as it is moving up.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on cutting the EPB gasoline account by \$200. DEFEATED by a vote of 14 Yes, 25 No.

MR. BLUM said he must ask the same question about Permanent Part-Time employees. Why is there such a jump in 110.1135 from the original budget \$8,537 to \$15,485?

MR. DONAHUE said it reflects the contract, the arbitration award of the MEA. There are no new positions. As a matter of fact, the department wanted to take a part-time Clerk-Typist and make it full-time, but that was deleted already in the budget and it stays the same as one part-time person.

The total for the department is on Page 25, \$183,210.

Page 26 - SEWER COMMISSION

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom line is \$59,433.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved for a reduction in Line Item 112.2750 Gasoline of \$45, leaving \$225. If he were to reduce to what the actual level of what prices are presently. He would not be asking for \$45 cut, but he would be asking more like \$90 cut. There is still a lot of fat built in here. Many others do not want this Board of Representatives to be considered as a rubber stamp that leaves fat in certain budgets to compensate for others. He has to stand for bringing these budgets in line and putting in proper controls. He feels that is important.

MR. WHITE appreciates Mr. Martin's point of view, but he has a prediction to make and it is not a very happy one and he does not like to make it, but he will bet his bottom dollar that by Fall, OPEC comes back, unfortunately. And in this budget we are not talking about the price of gasoline today, but for the period July 1, 1986 to June 30, 1987.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Mr. Martin's Motion to cut \$45. DEFEATED with 13 Yes, 21 No, and 5 Non-Voting.

Page 27 - HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom line is \$126,090.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved for a reduction in Line Item 113.2750 of \$120, leaving \$600. Seconded.

A voice vote was not definitive and the President called for a machine vote. DEFEATED with 15 Yes votes, 20 No, and 4 Non-Voting.

Page 28 - COMMISSION ON AGING

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$319,373 on Page 29.

MRS. MAIHOCK noticed Line Item 114.1220 Car Allowance has increased considerably and she would like to know why.

MR. DONAHUE said that is required contractually.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said the Board will be happy to know that he will not continue this all night long. On this particular item, 114.2750 Gasoline, he Moved for a \$75 cut, leaving \$225. Seconded.

This is part of an over-all reduction that would include \$25 for Fair Rent, \$1,750 in Dial-A-Ride, \$360 in Chief Executive, \$105 Law Dept., \$360 in Commissioner of Finance, \$105 on Controller, \$150 in Purchasing Dept., \$90 in Central Services, \$360 in Assessor's Office, \$50 in Tax Collector, \$1,620 in Dept. of Traffic, \$810 Dept. of Traffic and Parking, \$80,280 for Fuel in Bureau of Highways & Maintenance Division, \$1,250 for Gas in same division; and \$675 for Fuel in Bureau of Sanitation; \$400 in Diesel Fuel there; City Fire Dept. \$2,100 in Fuel and \$3,500 in Gas and Diesel; \$105 in Harbor-master; \$50 in Welfare; \$18,000 in Fuel for Smith House, and \$450 and \$75 in Gasoline and Fuel accounts; \$5,230 in Fuel at Smith House Residence; \$190 in Gasoline; \$675 in Gasoline at Health Dept.; \$400 in Code Enforcement Task Force; \$10 in TB Control Grant; \$300 in Public School Health Program; \$165 in Health Program for Parochial and Private; \$800 in Fuel for Parks Dept.; \$3,750 for Gasoline for the same Dept.; \$270.....Mrs. Goldstein interjected here that the Board got his point. Mr. Martin went on to say that came to a total of \$80,000. That money is there. It should be taken out and since it appears we will not, so he will not continue making all these Motions for the rest of the evening, as it will do no further good.

MR. SIGNORE said he disliked saying "I told you so", but if they had taken it as one figure, they would have been through it and forgotten it by now.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on cutting \$75.00 from Line 114.2750 Gasoline. DEFEATED with 14 Yes, 22 No, and 3 Non-Voting.

MRS. MCINERNEY Moved to cut Line Item 114.3644 Busing from \$1,950 to Zero. Seconded. She has great difficulty funding \$1.00 or \$1,950 for 18 out-of-town trips for senior citizens when, in fact, senior citizens who live in the northern areas of town are still not being serviced. By serviced, I mean trips to the doctors, trips of importance to their health. This is ridiculous that the bus service, if it is to be extended at all, should be extended to all senior citizens within the community and not just singled out and give 18 bus trips out-of-town that are not of an emergency nature, and deprive other senior citizens who need the medical care which they deserve.

MR. LYONS said he sympathizes with Mrs. McInerney's plight on what is happening in the north country. It is kind of parochial to deprive these other people of that because of what is going on. We should work to correct the other area.

MR. JEPSEN can appreciate Mrs. McInerney's concern but he thinks her point is illogical and irrelevant to the funding that is being discussed at hand, and if she wants to add money, although obviously cannot now, but in the budget process in the future add money for that purpose, she can, but he does not see why it should be taken out on the bus trips for these other people.

MR. WIDER finds it unbelievable to hear someone say 18 bus rides for senior citizens from downtown should not be funded. This was discussed several times in the past about senior citizen busses being available to all senior citizens anywhere in this City. He thinks the neglect is on the part of the people who do the scheduling of the busses and the District Representatives that those people do not get that service. It is available to them if they want to take advantage of it. We should not cut it off for some if others do not take advantage of it.

MR. DUDLEY Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

MRS. MCINERNEY requested a Point of Personal Privilege and clarification. This is mainly built out of frustration because although Mr. Jepsen is new on the Board and perhaps Mr. Lyons wasn't on the Board, we did try to work with the Commission on Aging to provide services for seniors in the northern sections of town for medical and related trips, and even though more busses and staff and drivers have been added, there have been no....The President interjected here that this was enough. Mrs. McInerney added for Mr. Wider's benefit that she spoke of in-town trips, not out-of-town trips being denied.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on cutting \$1,950 from Line Item 114.3644. DEFEATED with 3 Yes, 31 No, and 5 Non-Voting.

PAGE 30 - FAIR RENT COMMISSION

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$84,415.

PAGE 31 - PATRIOTIC OBSERVANCES AND SPECIAL EVENTS

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$26,407.

MR. DUDLEY asked for an explanation of the totals for Memorial Day versus July 4th and Veterans' Day and Other Observances.

MR. DONAHUE said July 4th includes a concert at Cove Island, a concert at Mill River gazebo dedication, and the Mayor's Trophy Game were paid for out of there. Veterans' Day is the Veterans' Day Parade. And a program at St. John's Park where they re-dedicated the memorial. Memorial Day is just the Memorial Day Parade.

MR. DUDLEY asked how these figures were arrived at. The July 4th figure is \$5,280....The President interjected here that it is the Mayor's budget not Mr. Donahue's. Mr. Dudley said he did not mean to sound that way. On Veterans' day it is \$5,280. And that the \$3,025 for Memorial Day is just for the parade? And what are the "Other Observances" for \$7,860 for?

MR. DONAHUE said July 4th, Veterans' Day, championship banquet for all Stamford teams that won state championships, Flag Day, Memorial Day, other activities, jazz concert at Smith House, 350th anniversary concerts at Latham Park, Cove Island, Town Center; West Point cadets performance Center for the Arts, presentation of Bronze Star to Jerry Rambo, arrival of Santa Claus at Landmark Square, assist the Statue of Liberty Committee, and assist the Miss Connecticut Pageant.

MR. DUDLEY said he would not vote against Santa Claus.

MR. ZELINSKI asked about the last four or five items that Mr. Donahue mentioned, were they dealing with Memorial Day, or 4th of July, or Veterans' Day, or which one? And the items mentioned, were they spent for 1985/86 or is that what is planned for 1986/87 - the same events each year? To discuss this, does he have to make a Motion? He Moved to cut \$3,000 from Line Item 116.3250 Other Observances leaving \$4,860. There is no Seconding Motion.

MR. DONAHUE asked that it be noted there is already a 2% cut of \$538 on the Budget Reduction Line. Also the City is planning a committee for the 350th Anniversary of Stamford, Connecticut.

Page 32 - DIAL-A-RIDE GRANT

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts recommended. Bottom line is \$154,564.

Page 33 - BOARD OF TAX REVIEW

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts recommended. Bottom Line \$6,985.

Page 34 - PERSONNEL BOARD OF APPEALS

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts recommended. Bottom Line \$392.
He said the wife of the chairman of this Board takes their minutes.

MRS. McINERNEY said this Board should write a letter of thanks to Heidi Rosecrans for saving the City all that money which would probably be \$15 per hour, because when Mr. Rosecrans' term expires, you will see this budget jump up quite a bit. She should be thanked for her civic-minded efforts.

THE PRESIDENT agreed and said she would take care of it.

MR. MORRIS said the Section Total is \$2,094,947, to which figure the others agreed.

Page 36 - OFFICE OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE - GROUP 20

MR. DONAHUE said the Committee recommended a cut of \$500 to Line Item 2910 Official Notices, leaving a Bottom Line figure on page 38 of \$372,361.

MRS. MAIHOCK said on Page 38, Line Item 7551 SYPCA MEDIATION SERVICE, she Moved to deduct \$6,000, leaving Zero. Seconded.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said this experimental program is completely funded by the State.

MR. DONAHUE said that was true. The City has applied for the grant and it has been awarded to the City.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said that cutting this would mean losing the grant and it would have been no cost to the City, being a grant.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she understood we were giving the SYPCA people various amounts.

THE PRESIDENT asked is this a grant or is it not a grant?

MR. DONAHUE said it is a grant for mediation services.

THE PRESIDENT asked if Mrs. Maihock still wished this cut made.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she wished to cut it, but apparently there is not support for it, so she will withdraw the Motion.

MR. ZELINSKI said Line 1130 PART-TIME had no appropriation for 1984/85 or for 1985/86, and now they are up to \$11,724. What would be the rationale or justification for this?

MR. DONAHUE said approval has been given to hire a Researcher within the past year, and it reflects that increase. There are also four internes working in the Mayor's Office and they receive a flat stipend of \$500 for their work.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved for a cut of \$3,000 from Line Item 2914 ANNUAL REPORTS, leaving \$7,000. Seconded. In last two years this account has been in the neighborhood of \$6,500. Why is another \$3,500 needed? With a tax increase imminent for the City's taxpayers, the Mayor's Office, as well as other departments, must tighten their belts. Perhaps we can have a less expensive report, with just pertinent information inside, and no color or costly papers used. Most of them get thrown away. He hopes his colleagues go along with this.

MR. DONAHUE said this account has already been reduced from \$15,000 to \$10,000. This is not for a pretty report. It is for an adequate report.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Mr. Zelinski's Motion to cut \$3,000 from Annual Reports. DEFEATED with 10 Yes, 26 No, 3 Non-Voting.

MR. ZELINSKI commented that on Line Item 2942 TRAVEL EXPENSES, the expenditures have been for the last two years \$2,032 and \$2,416 respectively. It has now gone up to double that, \$4,645. What is the explanation for the large increase in that Travel Expense item?

MR. DONAHUE said basically there is an increase in there for inflation. However, because there is a Budget Reduction sum of \$10,324, there will be no unnecessary Conferences and Training attended, nor unnecessary travel. Those are probably the first places they will have to cut back in, he would assume. This includes hotel expense and such.

MR. ZELINSKI asked on Line Item 2951 COMMUNITY RELATIONS for \$2,500. which is a new item, not having been on the last two years' budgets; what is it for specifically?

MR. DONAHUE said it is just what it says, to provide a service for funding various community activities for the Mayor, and to expand the ability to deal with community groups and such.

MRS. SANTY Moved to cut \$2,100 from Account 2942 TRAVEL EXPENSES. Seconded. This would leave \$2,545. The rationale is that \$2,032 was expended in 1984/85 and \$2,416 was appropriated for 1985/86. Let's not blame inflation for everything. Air, hotel, food, conferences and other out-of-town trips. Plane fares are lower and quite competitive, and they are even advertising trying to get people to fly. She feels this is one item that could be cut without impairing the Mayor's ability to travel to all his various places he wants to go. He should be able to live within the increased amount that is left.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on Mrs. Santy's Motion. DEFEATED, with 12 Yes votes, 24 No votes, 3 Non-Voting.

MR. BLUM said he believed the Mayor was cutting out all PROGRAM EXPANSIONS. On Item 7901, there is \$12,315.

MR. DONAHUE said that would be partially refunded, at least 50%. It is for a part-time OUTREACH Co-ordinator for SYPCA, Stamford Youth Planning and Co-ordinating Agency. Maryellen Chambers attended the Fiscal Committee meeting and did an excellent job of making a pitch for this person. She gave them a three or four-page summary of all the activities that SYPCA is now involved in. A few years ago we could not really get a handle on what they were doing, but they are the Youth Services Bureau for the City. Of the nine largest Connecticut cities and towns, we rank eight out of nine for funding for youth services. Danbury, for example, funds allow almost \$8 per year per young person. We fund about \$1.75.

MR. RUBINO asked for a brief explanation of item 5610 U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS.

MR. DONAHUE said that is the membership fee, on a per capita basis, for the U. S. Conference of Mayors.

MRS. SANTY asked for explanation on Account 2950 MAYOR'S EXPENSE ACCOUNT, \$2,400. She understands it is discretionary funds used by the Mayor for official City-related incidental expenses. What does that mean?

MR. DONAHUE said there has always been an expense account for the Mayor. It is used for many items such as providing for small gifts and things, tokens, for people when they come to the Mayor's Office. These are just expenses that he does not have to pay for out of his own pocket for City business.

MRS. SANTY said those items just listed by Mr. Donahue are under Account 9300 MISC. CONTINGENCY for \$4,385, which lists City employees holiday parties, keys to the City, City directories, awards, etc. Is Mr. Donahue referring to the same items in both accounts: 2950 and 9300?

MR. DONAHUE said he believes in the Mayor's Expense Account are items such as he mentioned. There is a separate account for the plaques and for those types of things that are outlined, but it is just the day-to-day expenses of being around Stamford and being the Mayor of the City. They are business-related expenses.

MR. DONAHUE said the bottom line for the Mayor's departmental Budget is \$372,361 on Page 38.

Page 39 - TOWN AND CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 40 is \$404,978.

Page 41 - PROBATE COURT

MR. DONAHUE said no change here and Bottom Line is \$11,074.

MR. ZELINSKI asked about item 2911 RECORD BOOKS. What is the reason for the \$1,000 increase?

MR. DONAHUE said that is due to increased microfilming rates, and increased volume of cases handled by the Probate Court.

Page 42 - LAW DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes, and Bottom Line on Page 43 is \$640,383.

MR. CLEAR asked that the record show that on Pages 42 and 43, due to a possible real or perceived conflict-of-interest, he is abstaining and will not participate in this departmental budget of the Law Department.

Page 44 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. On Page 45, the Bottom Line is \$419,698.

Page 46 - GROUP 24 CONTROLLER

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 47 is \$655,306.

MR. DUDLEY asked what is the increase due to on Item 2940 CONFERENCES AND TRAINING.

MR. DONAHUE said this is for micro-processing and training due to the increased use of micro-filming and modern methods of keeping records.

MR. DUDLEY said are the figures correct for 1984/85 \$480.00, and for \$3,785 for 1986/87.

MR. DONAHUE said it is for ^{increased} training for the Controller's Office. They have to learn to use modern methods of record-keeping and they have to attend courses in micro-film processing.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked how many employees get involved in this.

MR. DONAHUE said he does not know how many persons do the micro-filming. He thinks the Clerks and Clerk-Typists do it. There is also money here for the Office of Accounting to attend accounting and computer applications training. Bottom Line on Page 47 is \$655,306.

Page 48 - BUREAU OF PURCHASES -

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 48 is \$230,369.

Page 49 - CENTRAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 49 is \$185,275.

Page 50 - DATA PROCESSING BUREAU

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$814,772.

MR. ZELINSKI asked for details on Line Item 245.5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS \$83,000, and Zero for 1984/85 and 1985/86.

MR. DONAHUE said this is an increase in staffing. The Data Processing Dept. has absorbed complete control of the Luis Mapping System. This is the person who is the Luis Mapping Coordinator, an on-going program, and he will be located from now on in Data Processing.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if the person's ^{total} salary was \$83,000. Is the entire amount for salary for one individual? Also is it not policy that all salaries are to be shown in the 1110 salary account, other than contract?

MR. DONAHUE said no, the entire amount is not for salary. It includes outside programming and consulting services related to Luis Mapping; that makes up for the difference. We are in Phase III of the Luis Mapping System funding and this is to complete the \$2 Million to \$3 Million project.

MR. ZELINSKI asked about Line Item 245.5160 PROFESSIONAL COMPUTER SERVICES asking for \$40,000, with no funding the previous two years. What is that for? It's a large expenditure.

MR. DONAHUE said they are under-going a five-year plan to manage the Data Processing Systems better. They will bring people in to help them do that along the way. We have relied upon outside computer persons to come in from time to time in the past. This just puts it in a line item where we can begin Phase II, and III, recommendations II, III, and VI of a five-year plan to upgrade the Data Processing System.

MRS. McINERNEY said she would like to go back to 245.5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS. Is the Luis Mapping consultant's salary of \$45,000 in the up-coming budget? Mr. Donahue said that is correct. Mrs. McInerney asked if the outside programming and consulting services, 245.5160, are related to the LUIS MAPPING for \$38,000, and would Mr. Donahue elaborate on that.

MR. DONAHUE said LUIS MAPPING consultant and outside persons are all working to complete and to revise the work that has already been done on LUIS MAPPING. That is what it is for. It is a combined effort at this point in time. You also have to remember that we are bringing other departments on line finally to use LUIS MAPPING. The Planning Board will be brought on line, ^{and} other departments such as the Assessor's Office so they can actually put this program to use.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if this had been put out for bid for the consultant services, or are we absorbing the person who was formerly a City employee as consultant services?

MR. DONAHUE said the consultant has been on board for a number of years now. He is the original person who put LUIS MAPPING together and has walked it all the way through, the same person, until this date.

MRS. McINERNEY wondered why the other people haven't been walked through it also, and why it hasn't been of more benefit to the City as it was supposed to be two years ago.

MR. DONAHUE said it is of tremendous use to the City and is already being used by some departments. They are going to be tying in more and more departments, and more and more work stations into LUIS MAPPING. The Planning Board training money is for graphics work station that is going to have to be brought in line. Stuart Shydlo is the Project Manager. He will direct the computer consultants who come in on what steps are to be taken next, so he supervises what they are going to be doing in the next year.

MRS. McINERNEY is that Project Manager a permanent City employee, or is it a consultant?

MR. DONAHUE said he is a consultant and not a permanent City employee.

MR. BLUM said he has been trying to figure this whole thing out about Data Processing. There is a line for Maintenance of Equipment which means we maintain our own equipment. We also rent equipment. If we have a rental, that is being taken care of by the rental agency from whom we rent, why has maintenance gone up from \$45,000 to \$65,000, Line 245.2610, when you are renting equipment totalling \$180,771 when we have a contract with the rental agency who will take care of their own equipment?

MR. DONAHUE said we have added to our computer system during the course of the past year. We purchase some pieces of computer equipment, when that is appropriate; and we lease when that is appropriate. In the equipment rental account, you have software, and hardware, rental costs. The budget decrease of approximately \$30,000 is due to the City buying some disks, and at the end of a five-leasepurchase plan, on an optical character reader, we now own that piece of equipment.

MR. BLUM Moved to delete from 245.2610 MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT the sum of \$20,044 bringing it back to the current year's budget of \$45,242. Seconded.

Mr. Blum has worked in a data computing service, and he did not see people every day coming to maintain the equipment. Generally the equipment does work and you hope the electricity will not come down and cause a shutdown.

(Mr. Martin's dialogue incomplete due to putting in new tape cassette.)

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. Blum's Motion to cut \$20,044.
DEFEATED, voice vote.

MRS. SANTY said she would like to go back to the PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT, 245.5150. It could only happen here in Stamford, that we have a professional consultant for \$45,000, and then right into that, we have to have an outside program and consulting service relating to the same thing for \$38,000. I don't know why we couldn't just hire one person for \$80,000 who could do the whole thing. We also have data processing personnel under Line Item 245.1110 such as programmers, etc. Originally when this came before us, and I remember I was very enthusiastic about it; I think we needed it, and I still do, but I never dreamed we would have a consultant full-time and also have to hire a consultant to help the consultant. I have said over and over that Stamford is known for the fact that we hire consultants for anything.

MR. DONAHUE said the department total is \$814,772.

Page 51 - FINANCE DEPT. - GRANTS ACCOUNT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$73,321.

Page 52 - RISK MANAGEMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$76,450.

Page 53 - TAX ASSESSOR'S OFFICE

MR. DONAHUE said no reduction. Bottom Line is on Page 54, \$553,073.

MR. ZELINSKI asked for the reason on Line 250.1130 PART-TIME being almost doubled over the current year? Is it contractual obligation on our part?

MR. DONAHUE said the Part-time position would be affected by the MEA salary increases. He believes that account is used to bring in individuals during peak periods to help with the work of the Assessor's Office. There are a few like the Tax Collector's office also that don't need part-time help all year around and just have to bring them in when they have to get work done by certain deadlines.

MR. ZELINSKI has the same question on the next line 250.1201 OVER-TIME. This goes from \$7,500 for the current year to \$19,795 for 1986/87. Is there any reason for such a large increase?

MR. DONAHUE said it is the exact same rationale. The MEA contract settlements and they bring people in during peak periods to help complete the work of the Assessor's Office. Certain deadlines have to be met periodically.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if the Line Item 250.1220 CAR ALLOWANCE is contractual. He notes it has jumped from \$8,000 this year to \$18,360 for 1986/87.

MR. DONAHUE said it is contractual.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked on Line Item 250.2940 CONFERENCES AND TRAINING, what kind of conferences would the Assessor's Office go to and where they might be?

MR. DONAHUE said they are required to go to various conferences in the State of Connecticut. There really is no leeway here. This has been known for quite some time. The Assessors are mandated to go to certain conferences within the State of Connecticut. As new laws are passed, whether relating to property tax assistance to the elderly, handicapped, and other State-mandated legislation, they directly affect the Assessor's Office operations. Federal laws mandating that the State do certain things, are passed on to the local governments through the State. If there might be any leeway at all in this account, it is logical to assume it would be used to make up for the money deducted via the Budget Reduction line which, in this department, is \$11,292.

The Bottom Line on Page 54 for the Assessor's Office is \$553,073.

Page 55 - TAX COLLECTOR'S OFFICE

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$320,867.

Page 56 - PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 57 is \$499,318.

MR. ZELINSKI asked on Line Item 270.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT, what is the additional \$2,140 over the current year, from \$1,400 to \$3,540.

MR. DONAHUE said they are seeking to replace a typewriter. They need a wheel chair, they have CPR mannekins coming in for training City employees in cardiac pulmonary resuscitation. There is money for a desk chair and four armless chairs, sidechairs.

MR. ZELINSKI noted that Line Item 270.5320 CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS went from \$26,000 for this year to \$61,000 requested and cut to \$51,000 by the Mayor. What is the reason for an 100% increase?

MR. DONAHUE said the testing that will go on to provide for new Police and Fire Department lists, and also for filling Captains', Sargeants', and Lieutenants' positions will take up most of this. There are some 800 applicants for the four openings in the Fire Department, all of whom have to be tested.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved that, given the rationale of increased personnel, he does not think it warrants an increase of 100%, a cut be made of \$5,000. Seconded. If the taxpayers of Stamford have to tighten their belts, some of the City departments should find a way to effect savings in their budgets. Is the eligibility list exhausted so they cannot fill four vacancies? If the lists are only good for two years, perhaps consideration should be given to extending them six months or a year more.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on cutting \$5,000 from Line Item 270.5320 CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS. DEFEATED, voice vote.

MRS. SANTY requested a Division, and the President called for a machine vote.

The Motion to cut \$5,000 from 270.5320 was DEFEATED by machine vote with 14 voting Yes, 20 voting No, and 5 Non-Voting.

MRS. SANTY said that on New Equipment, the two adult CPR mannekins, and two baby CPR mannekins. These mannekins are on loan from the American Red Cross, also from other organizations; it would be very nice and luxurious to even own one of each for training, but she cannot imagine why we'd need so many for training, two of each? Two mannekins are usually used to teach CPR and it is a luxury to own them. Most companies that employ anywhere from 700 to 1,500, have one, and they manage very, very well in their classes. And you cannot have more than 8 people in a class anyway, and they could all utilize one mannekin. She seriously feels that that could be cut to one of each. She Moved to cut one adult mannekin for \$1,150 and one baby mannekin for \$450, for a total cut of \$1,600 in Line Item 270.2650, leaving a balance of \$1,940. Seconded.

A machine vote was taken on Mrs. Santy's Motion to cut \$1,600 from 270.2650. APPROVED with 18 Yes, 15 No, 1 Abstention, and 5 Non-Voting.

MR. DONAHUE said the department Bottom Line on Page 57 is \$497,718.

Page 58 - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$80,088.

Page 59 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 60 is \$847,845.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if any cut was made in the salary account due to the vacancy in the position of Director of Traffic and Parking.

MR. DONAHUE said the adjustment was made by the Board of Finance.

MR. ZELINSKI asked what is 280.1212 STAND-BY TIME?

MR. DONAHUE said that is to give the City 24-hour coverage when signal lights go out and that type of thing. It has already been reduced substantially by the Board of Finance. If City traffic lights go out, in an emergency, and they have to call somebody in, if you don't have Stand-by Time money, these people do not have to be available, so it is for emergency call-in. They get paid to be available.

MR. ZELINSKI said the prior years show \$23,525, and this year \$25,185, and even with the cut from the \$41,168, to \$36,168, the increase is still quite substantial. There are still only 24 hours a day, and even with a rate increase, \$11,000 comes to nearly \$1,000 per month and that is a lot of money.

MR. DONAHUE said he believes it is due to the Teamsters' Contract.

Page 61 - DEPARTMENT OF TRAFFIC AND PARKING

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. On Page 62, Bottom Line is \$1,124,508.

MR. SIGNORE asked what 281.7901 PROGRAM EXPANSION, \$55,000, is to be used for?

MR. DONAHUE said that is to hire three persons within the Parking Division to handle and process parking tickets. By hiring these people, they expect savings of \$45,000 in the next fiscal year.

MR. SIGNORE said it bothers him that we are cutting back or not hiring or giving enough personnel to the Police Dept., yet we are giving three new people to the Traffic Dept. He does not see adding people to some departments and taking away from those departments that give us protection. He Moved a cut of \$55,000 from Line Item 281.7901 Program Expansion. Seconded.

MR. DONAHUE said if this line is reduced, we have to return \$35,000 to the contractor who provides our ticket processing at this point in time. By hiring the three people, we bring part of that contract in-house and no longer have to pay the contractor. The net savings for the first year would be \$45,000. That is why the three positions are in here, so if we cut this out, we will only have to appropriate more money to pay the contractor.

When we went out to bid on this service, there was an alternate bid and it said if the City of Stamford hires a number of people, three, and takes over part of the processing of parking tickets, would there be a reduction in the contract, the answer is yes. If we don't hire the three people, we have to go back to the original contract and fund the contract in full, which would mean an increase along the lines of \$45,000.

MR. SIGNORE said but you would eliminate this \$55,000, and the benefits?

MR. DONAHUE said yes, you would.

MR. SIGNORE asked where is the saving then.

MR. DONAHUE said when we first passed the ordinance for Traffic and Parking, we said that we would eventually begin to bring it back in-house. This is the first step to begin that process. Instead of paying the contractor \$100,000, we will pay him \$55,000. That results in a \$45,000 saving off the contract price.

MRS. McINERNEY supports Mr. Signore's Motion based on the fact that if you figure out long-range, the total number of salary increases for these three people that are being hired, plus their pension benefits in 20 years, you will probably find that it is cheaper to use the consultant service as we have used two consultants for another one.

MR. LYONS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on cutting \$55,000 on Line 7901. Result not definitive and Mrs. Santy asked for a Division. A machine vote indicated DEFEAT with 10 Yes, 24 No, and 5 Non-Voting.

MR. ZELINSKI asked what the rationale is for 281.2310 MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES, for \$30,000.

MR. DONAHUE said that is for striping, Sonitrol, cleaning, major repairs to Bell Street and Bedford Street Parking Garages.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to cut \$2,000 from 281.2310. Seconded. Over the last two years, there was an increase of \$11,000. Now it is jumping another \$6,000. We have to make some cuts. We just can't keep approving, approving, approving. Traffic and Parking have \$416,000 in their Capital Budget approved by the Board of Finance. \$2,000 is a small cut actually.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. DEFEATED, voice vote.

MR. BOCCUZZI said Item 281.3531 METER PARTS went from \$12,000 to \$23,500. He can't find any back-up to substantiate this. Does the Chairman have anything on this item?

MRS. MAIHOCK said that puzzled her also and it was found that the increase is due to (a) increased vendor prices; and (b) increased vandalism; and (c) \$6,000 for parts. These are for rate changes in City-wide standardization of meter rates. But still, when you look at it, it used to be almost \$6,000 and it jumped up to almost \$24,000. It seems an incredible amount of money for this. Have we any statistics on the vandalism, or of the number of meters we are talking about?

MR. DONAHUE said he has talked to individuals first-hand who are constantly complaining about the increased vandalism in the parking lots that we maintain and operate. That he does know personally. There is an effort here to standardize the meter parts and to standardize the inventory which should happen in the future. If there are any cost benefits to doing that, we won't realize them unless we fund this.

MRS. MAIHOCK said, as she pointed out, that amount of money was only \$6,000 to standardize, and we are talking about almost \$24,000 here.

MR. DONAHUE asked where did Mrs. Maihock find the explanation? He doesn't seem to have it.

(At this point in the tape, there is a small section that is totally indecipherable, either who is speaking and what they are saying. It is all static.)

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Boccuzzi if he had a Motion he wished to make in relation to this?

MR. BOCCUZZI said he did not.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to cut \$3,500, leaving \$20,000 in Item 281.3531 Meter Parts. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote, and it was APPROVED, voice vote. A Division was requested. Machine vote result was APPROVED with 23 Yes, 11 No, and 5 Non-Voting.

MR. BLUM asked if Item 281.5560 CONTRACT-PARKING GARAGE is a contract with the Edison Parking people.

MR. DONAHUE said he believes they are the people with whom the contract is.

MR. BLUM asked if this is a contract that has already been signed for \$342,009.

MR. DONAHUE believes that is accurate.

MR. BLUM asked if the contract has been signed by the parking department.

MR. DONAHUE said it is a multi-year contract and yes, it is signed.

MR. MORRIS said the department total is \$1,121,008.

Page 63 - STAMFORD RAILROAD STATION MAINTENANCE

MR. DONAHUE said there are no reductions recommended. Bottom Line is \$151,410.

Page 64 - GROUP 29 INDIRECT EXPENSES

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 65 is \$14,774,290.

Page 66 - PRIOR YEARS RETROACTIVE PAY

MR. DONAHUE said no funding requested here. Bottom Line is Zero.

MR. MORRIS said the new SECTION TOTAL for GENERAL GOVERNMENT is \$22,230,286.
This is on Page 66.

Page 67 - DEPT. GROUP 30 PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line on Page 68 is \$676,056.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked about 2920 ADVERTISING. Is there any breakdown as to the extent of the advertising. She knows they advertising Leaf Pick-Up, when they have it, with a map of the City showing pick-up areas. What else would they be advertising?

MR. DONAHUE said snow-plowing contractors on which they do quite a program.

MRS. McNERNEY asked for an explanation of 5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS, and elaborate a bit on the kind of policy planning studies they are doing, and emergency communications systems study and how it will affect the Public Works Administration and/or be a saving.

MR. DONAHUE pointed out that the original departmental request was \$25,000 and it has already been reduced to \$10,000. It probably comes out of our experience with the hurricane last year and developing new communications systems. He believes that is part of it.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if Mr. Donahue was thinking about the Early Warning System that comes under Environmental Protection; but Mr. Donahue does not have specifics then, at this moment?

Page 69 - DEPT. GROUP 31 BUREAU OF HIGHWAYS AND MAINTENANCE DIV. HWY.

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 72 is \$6,121,000.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said it was suggested that when we got to the major Fuel Oil and Gasoline accounts that he might wish to try again to lower the amounts as he had proposed earlier. On Line 2710 FUEL OIL (Page 70) he proposed a mere 10% cut versus the Board of Finance of \$8,226, bringing the net amount to \$74,034. Seconded.

Mr. Martin said that based on current prices, the appropriate cut should be \$31,990, and even the cut he would have proposed would have been \$18,000, so he is giving them lots of room here.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED, voice vote.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said in a similar vein, Account 2750 GASOLINE, a reduction of \$8,855, which is 10% of the Board of Finance number, bringing that total to \$79,698. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED, voice vote.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said in a similar vein on Line 2751 DIESEL FUEL, instead of what should be proposed, \$20,384, he is proposing a cut of \$7,056. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. APPROVED, voice vote. The new total for that line is \$63,504.

MR. MORRIS said the new departmental total with these cuts is now \$6,096,926 on Page 72.

Page 73 - DEPT. GROUP 33 BUREAU OF ENGINEERING

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line, Page 84. is \$2,971,541.

Page 75 - DEPT. GROUP 34 BUREAU OF SANITATION

MR. DONAHUE said no changes recommended. Bottom Line on Page 78, departmental total is \$10,971,924.

MR. MORRIS said on Page 78 is the new SECTION TOTAL - \$20,716,448.

Page 79 - DEPT. GROUP 41 POLICE PROTECTION

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 82 is \$16,789,033.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said he is very concerned about the funding for the Police and the talk about the levels of support that we are going to have and that there are going to be possible lay-offs. He is particularly concerned because we have already experienced cut-backs in certain areas of the City related to trying to save funds. The emergency response time in certain parts of the City has already begun to deteriorate. He does not appreciate that and he believes that the people who voted last year to support some of these services, extra patrol car, and some of the foot patrols in downtown Stamford will be disappointed to learn that these items have been cut back in an effort to try to save funds.

MR. DAVID MARTIN (continuing)

He thinks that that is inappropriate and we should have those services reinstated.

Page 83 - DEPT. GROUP 45 CITY FIRE PROTECTION

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 85 is \$12,106,714.

The record will show that REPS. McGRATH and BEGEL will not participate in the discussion or voting of this department.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved for a cut of 10%, \$945, Line 2710 FUEL OIL. Page 84.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said in keeping with Mr. Martin's rationale that he elaborated on about the Police budget, she asked the Board members not to vote in favor of Mr. Martin's Motion; not to support his Motion, but to support the Fire Department's budget in the total that it is presented to us because of already previous cuts.

MR. DONAHUE said he wished to remind the Board that the City Fire Dept. has to find \$202,326 in the Budget Reduction line.

MR. WIDER said please do not cut this fuel because we don't want to have a fire and no fire truck due to an empty fuel tank.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said although he disagrees with the point that people will not be able to come to fires given the amount of cuts, he is going to withdraw his Motion.

Page 86 - VOLUNTEER FIRE AND AMBULANCE

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$2,393,270.

Page 87 - HARBORMASTER

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$1,655.

MR. MORRIS said the Section Total on Page 87 is \$31,290,672.

Page 88 - WELFARE DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line on Page 89 is \$2,852,351.

Page 90 - DEPT. GROUP 50 SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY (SNF)

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is on Page 93, \$4,657,162.

MRS. BEGEL said he wishes to abstain from voting on this budget since she understands the Welfare Director's salary has been transferred to the Professional Consultants Account 5150, Page 92, and she is a little bit uncomfortable with that since there is a pending court case and also that the Charter says that we should have a Director of Welfare, so she has a problem with that, and she will abstain from voting on that.

MR. SIGNORE said he would like to know what the rationale is on the Welfare Director's salary.

MR. DONAHUE said he believed it was the recommendation of various committees, and one committee appointed specifically to look at Smith House Skilled Nursing Facility, that a management group be brought in to take on the job of running the building on a day-to-day basis.

MR. SIGNORE asked where could he find the management group's recommendations.

MR. DONAHUE said "professional consultants."

MR. SIGNORE said "and we have eliminated the Welfare Director"?

MR. DONAHUE said some of that funding was taken out of the salary account.

MR. HEINS asked for clarification of Part-Time and Permanent Part-Time increases of Line 1130 and 1135. 1130 is an increase of approximately \$11,000; and 1135 is an increase of approximately \$240,000.

MR. DONAHUE said over the years they have had some problems with staffing Smith House to meet State levels. Through negotiations with the unions involved, he believes they have been able to gain leverage and some leeway in how they assign staff. He believes they are going to make more opportunities open for part-time employment to help limiting the use of outside employment agencies whenever possible. This is one of the largest amounts that has been requested for this line item in years.

MR. SIGNORE said if the Welfare Director is reinstated, will we still need the professional consultants?

MR. DONAHUE said it was a recommendation that the management agency to run the Skilled Nursing Facility and the Residence. If and when a Welfare Director is in place, and as Mrs. Begel talks about the Charter requiring same, there may be a need for an additional appropriation, but that is a long way from being solved at this point in time. The most important thing, and he thinks the most important recommendation of the committee, and there may be people in this room who served on that committee, is that we bring in a professional group to manage the Skilled Nursing Facility. They have already come in and appeared before the Fiscal Committee and it is believed there is substantial impact they can have in first producing more revenue for the Facility and helping to offset the costs. He thinks it has been demonstrated there is a need.

MR. SIGNORE said in all due respect, Mr. Donahue would not believe that they (the management agency) would tell you that they could not do the job? Would he?

MR. DONAHUE said they seemed like nice people.

MR. SIGNORE said he knows they are nice people, but they took a positive attitude. They are not going to say they came in here and cannot do the job.

MR. CLEAR would like clarification on the increase in account 1140 SEASONAL which went from \$15,885 this year to \$36,633 next year.

MR. DONAHUE said this is to fund an office worker, 840 hrs.; a nurses' aide, 2,750 hrs.; groundskeeper, 540 hrs.; program aide, 480 hrs.; physical therapy aide, 975 hrs. Total is 5,085 hrs. It is a similar situation in other departments that they have certain needs at certain times of the year.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said the accounts at Smith House have been a little out of whack for a while particularly with regard to some of the employment accounts, and his understanding from a variety of sources is they are trying to get those account lines in line with what is actually going on.

The management team that was brought in was a fundamentally sound decision. At the Fiscal Committee, there were two critical issues that were raised that have not been answered yet, and it should be kept in mind that the most important management aspects of this team will not be in generating revenue, but will in how they manage the personnel that deliver those services to the patients; and it is very uncertain, as they describe it to us, what exactly their authority is with regard to personnel evaluations, merit reviews, and any other matters that are important in running a department. We have a Civil Service System in bringing in a management team as consultants in a very misty area that should be clarified, as well as a clear decision on who they actually report to. Some of the issues such as is there a Director of Welfare, which the Charter requires, etc., is all tied up, and those are all very important issues and need to be clarified.

Page 94 - DEPT, GROUP 52 SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE

MR. DONAHUE said no changes recommended. Bottom Line on Page 96 is \$905,593.

Page 97 - NON-CITY SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$52,283.

Page 98 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 99 is \$1,068,786.

Page 100 - CODE ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$244,591.

Page 101 - DRUG FORENSIC LABORATORY

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$46,554.

Page 103 - VENEREAL DISEASE CLINIC - STATE GRANT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$9,800.

Page 105 - MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH PROGRAM

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$50,911.

Page 106 - HEALTH RISK REDUCTION GRANT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$15,110.

Page 107 - TUBERCULOSIS CONTROL GRANT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$972.

Page 108 - PUBLIC SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line is \$707,386.

Page 109 - HEALTH PROGRAM FOR PAROCHIAL AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 110 is \$1,266,537.

The record will show that MR. SIGNORE has abstained from participation in any vote on the school health programs.

Page 111 - S.H.A.P.E.

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions, Bottom Line is \$45,139.

Page 112 - NON-CITY HEALTH AGENCIES - DRUG LIBERATION

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$163,415.

Page 113 - SHELLFISH COMMISSION

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$1,225.

MR. DONAHUE said the SECTION TOTAL is \$12,087,815.

Page 114 - PARKS DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 115 is \$1,582,523.

MR. ZELINSKI asked the rationale for Line 610.1130 PART-TIME asking for \$8,560, while there was nothing expended for the last two years.

MR. DONAHUE said a part-time clerk has been added due to increased arena operations, park permits, bookkeeping, and impending computer installation, roughly 910 hours of part-time work.

MR. ZELINSKI said Line Item 1140 SEASONAL, there is a rather large increase of approximately \$65,000 over last year.

MR. DONAHUE said these are for attendants, park security, park workers, and personnel during the summer season. There is a Budget Reduction of \$33,277. We were advised this would be taken from the Seasonal Account.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved that Line Item 1140 SEASONAL be reduced by \$15,000 leaving \$354,927. Seconded. He can understand this account requiring an increase but the line has to be drawn somewhere. We have an obligation to scrutinize this budget carefully, and such a large increase over last year with no strong supporting back-up argument is ludicrous.

MR. DUDLEY said he is adamantly opposed to any cuts in this department. How soon we forget that recently one of the committees of this Board took a trip down to the beach areas, and part of the problem were the conditions that we are facing there today is the lack of enforcement, and that is what this is for is to add patrols in those areas. The vandalism, the drinking, and he could on ad infinitum, is a lack of enforcement and by eliminating any funds from this area, you are asking for more trouble. Yes, we have an obligation, an obligation to maintain our parks.

MR. LIVINGSTON said the back-up information indicates they are asking for a 6% wage increase, which is budgeted within this figure. It is reasonable. The most important thing is the seasonal account reflects the summer-time when the parks are most in use. Additional hours will provide more security, particularly in Scalzi Park, and two full-time workers in Carwin Park, for Spring through Fall. This is going to be extremely important to a large part of Mr. Livingston's District and he urges a vote against Mr. Zelinski's Motion to cut.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the Question. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. Zelinski's Motion. DEFEATED, voice vote.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved for a cut of \$1,000 on Line Item 610.2112 PLANTINGS-TURF and FLOWER, leaving 11,000. The current year is budgeted at \$9,500.

There is no Seconding Motion.

MRS. MAIHOCK said 610.2650 NEW EQUIPMENT-EQUIPMENT is \$20,600 and 610.2651 EQUIPMENT RENTAL-EQUIPMENT is \$5,000 and she cannot find anything in the back-up pertaining to it. The next item below it is 610.2660 SMALL TOOLS and REPLACEMENT for \$4,200. The Equipment Rental is for a bulldozer for cleaning the beaches this time of year. It is a specialized piece of equipment that is used only once or twice and that's it.

MRS. MCINERNEY said on Page 114 Line Item 610.1130 PART-TIME is shown in this budget book but in the detail book, there is 610.1135 is PERMANENT PART-TIME. Which one of these is the proper account for this item?

MR. DONAHUE said the correct item is 610.1130 PART-TIME. It was an error. The amounts are the same.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved to reduce 610.2750 GASOLINE by \$2,250, leaving \$20,250. Seconded. That would compare to \$6,500 if taken down to current price levels.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. The AYES have it. A DIVISION was requested. APPROVED with 18 Yes, 16 No, and 5 Non-Voting.

MR. MORRIS said the new total on Page 115 is \$1,580,273.

Page 116 - TERRY CONNERS RINK

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions. Bottom Line on Page 117 is \$367,285.

Page 118 - DEPT. GROUP 65 RECREATION

MR. DONAHUE said said the Fiscal Committee reduced Line Item 2651 EQUIPMENT RENTAL-EQUIPMENT by \$605, leaving \$8,000.

MR. DONAHUE said on Page 120 Line Item 3430 EMERGENCY EQUIPMENT was reduced by the Fiscal Committee by \$500 from \$9,000 to \$8,500. The new Bottom Line on Page 122 is \$1,182,726.

MRS. MATHOCK asked what 3644 BUSING is as distinguished from 3645 SUMMER BUSING-GRANT.

MR. DONAHUE said the Board of Reduction provides busing directly in account 3644. And there is also a Summer Busing Grant which is 3645.

MRS. MATHOCK said her question is why 3644 has gone up \$1,500 over the current year and \$2,100 over 1984/85.

MR. DONAHUE said it is the cost of leasing the bus. It has contractually risen. It is a number of buses. During the summer they take children from playground to playground.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said on Page 119 Item 2710 FUEL OIL, he Moved to cut \$990, leaving \$8,910. He calculates they have \$3,850 there to cut and he is asking a \$900 cut. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote. The No's have it. A DIVISION was called for. A machine vote was taken. APPROVED with 20 Yes, 18 No, and 1 Non-Voting.

MR. DAVID MARTIN Moved on Page 120, Line 2750 GASOLINE, to cut \$990, leaving \$8,910. Seconded.

MR. LIVINGSTON said what we are doing here is saying this Department of Recreation is to accept all the previous cuts plus another \$990. As he sees it, we are chipping away at the Board of Recreation's programs. If we were to go along with this cut the same way we did it with other departments, considering the cuts made by the Mayor and the Board of Finance and the Budget Reduction of \$22,656, the Recreation Dept. will be left with something like \$150,000 over the current year which leaves no space to move around with the children's, adults and senior adult programs for the summer, and the rest of the year. Let us hope no emergencies arise.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote. APPROVED, with 23 Yes, 16 No, and 1 Non-Voting. The Gasoline account is cut \$990.

MR. MORRIS said on Page 122 the new Bottom Line is \$1,180,746.

Page 123 - GROUP 66 RECREATION AREA MAINTENANCE

MR. DONAHUE said the Bottom Line on Page 125 is \$107,704. No reductions.

Page 126 - GROUP 67 ETHEL KWESKIN THEATRE

MR. DONAHUE said no reductions recommended. Bottom Line on Page 127 is \$83,594

Page 128 - BRENNAN GOLF COURSE

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts. Bottom Line on Page 129 is \$332,974.

MR. MORRIS said the SECTION TOTAL on Page 130 is \$3,652,575.

Page 131 - FERGUSON LIBRARY

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts recommended. Bottom Line is \$4,021,782.

PAGE 132 - STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$680,120.

Page 133 - COMMUNITY CENTERS

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$133,968.

MR. MORRIS said Section Total on Page 133 is \$4,835,870.

Page 134 - BOARD OF EDUCATION

MR. DONAHUE turned over the Report of the Fiscal Committee to Mary Lou Rinaldi, and he will leave the floor and not participate in the Board of Education items.

MS. RINALDI said she kind of feels like Joan Rivers filling in for Johnny Carson here.

Also not participating along with Mr. Donahue, are Mr. Clear, Mr. DeRose, and Mr. White, having left the floor and not participating in the Board of Education budget.

MS. RINALDI said the Fiscal Committee recommended a cut of \$200,000 from the Board of Education budget, leaving \$69,425,083.

MRS. BEGEL Moved for an additional cut of \$250,000, making the total cut \$450,000, and leaving \$69,175,083.

MR. SIGNORE said as he looks around this room, he daresays he is the only one who has served on the Board of Education and on the Board of Representatives. He was elected to this Board in 1975. He served for 3 years, and when in 1978, a vacancy occurred on the Board of Education, the Board of Representatives saw fit to send him to the Board of Education. He was consistent in his efforts to curb the school budget while serving on both Boards. After serving three years on the Board of Education, he was elected their President. In 1982, the school budget was cut \$6,000,000. People were crying the school system would go down the drain, that the real estate values would suffer, everything would collapse, and it would be the end of the world. As President, he had to sign 72 letters which let that many teachers go. By the end of the school year, only ten teachers were unemployed. He will vote for a cut in the Board of Education budget as he feels it is in the best all-around interests, the taxpayers and the City.

MRS. FISHMAN said her car bumper carries a sticker which says "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance." The alternative of producing a generation of students ill-prepared for the job market has the potential for more costly amounts in welfare and unemployment. The decrease of 311 in enrolment is scattered between 21 schools, so savings are not easily effected. There are programs mandated by the State such as Special Education and others. The figures for the non-school City budget show the percentage increase is higher in every department except education which is projected at 11.6%. When a 7.35%

MRS. FISHMAN (continuing)

for labor costs is deducted, this only leaves an increase of 3.65% for the remainder of the budget. On top of that education receives State disbursements. The Guaranteed Tax Base due the City this next year will be \$3,142,043 but this goes to the General Fund of the City, and the City funds the total education budget of some \$69 Million. Since Stamford can expect to receive in excess of \$6 Million in State and Federal sources, and the total budget increase is \$7.2 Million, she believes the bottom line is \$1.2 Million which is an increase of 1.5%, not 11%. Please fund the children's future.

MR. JEPSEN Moved the Question. Mr. Boccuzzi took a voice vote. ^(not definitive) Eight persons raised their hands. The Question was not Moved.

MR. SANTY said increased dollars for education does not mean better education. We have 57% of the pupils we had 12 years ago but we still have 87% of the staff. Let's get back to the basics. We do have to educate the poor, the bi-lingual, and the handicapped, and no one knows handicapped more than she does. If her grandson lives long enough to be in school as a handicapped child, she would still be here today saying the same thing. She Moved for a cut of \$550,000, bringing the total cut to \$1.0 Million. Seconded.

Even with a \$1.0 Million cut, there is still a \$4.0 Million increase over last year's budget. Consider that: \$4.0 Million. From all the facts available, this is an increase that is more than adequate. Every one must be considered: not only the teachers, the children, but their parents, the senior citizens, everyone. When you cast your vote, think of every one.

MR. BOCCUZZI (ACTING PRESIDENT) asked if there was discussion on the amendment only.

MR. ESPOSITO said he has children in the Stamford school system. While the school enrolment has dropped, some of that population is more diverse today than ever before. In order to meet the needs of the ever-expanding range of educational needs, the Board of Ed budget reflects some innovative and necessary programs. He cannot consider a major budget cut here. He Moves to amend the amended Motion back to \$450,000.

ACTING PRESIDENT BOCCUZZI said he could not do that. He has to either approve the amendment or vote against it.

MR. WIDER said he knows the price of ignorance. The Body does not know, because they have been privileged. You don't know how it hurts not being able to read. It takes money to prepare children to earn their living. He is willing to filibuster all night if necessary, against deep cuts. He is warning what they are leading into. He is a taxpayer, too, and no more than \$450,000 should be cut

MR. SIGNORE will vote in favor of the \$1.0 Million cut. He has heard these arguments year in and year out, and Mr. Wider was here when the \$6.0 Million cut was made. The school system did not collapse. The year after that, they re-opened Rippowam High School. And new programs were instituted at Rippowam. We had Special Ed, Bi-Lingual; we had all these things at that time. They are not new. And those programs are not being cut. A \$1.0 Million cut still leaves \$4.0 Million over the previous budget. You cannot let the rest of the City do without. We need sewers, added police protection, fire protection, public works services,

MR. LIVINGSTON said the reason we have heard the same arguments year after year is that they continue to be relevant toward improving our educational system. A \$1.0 Million cut will do harm to the system. These cuts will go directly into salaries, as he sees it, and when programs go, teachers go. Hopefully we will not cut the fuel account but then it is not in our power to do it. It is the Board of Education that must make adjustments to equal the cuts that are made.

THE PRESIDENT said there are still quite a number of names on the list to speak and it would be appreciated if there is no repetition of remarks in the interests of time.

MS. POWERS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT said the Motion is to cut \$1,0 Million. A Roll Call vote is requested. Not sufficient hands up for a Roll Call vote. Please use the machine. The Motion has been DEFEATED by a vote of 6 Yes, 25 No, 3 Abstentions, and 5 Non-Voting.

THE PRESIDENT asked for discussion on the initial amendment for a cut of \$450,000.

MR. LYONS Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote to cut \$450,000. APPROVED, 31 Yes, 3 No, 3 Abstentions, 2 Non-Voting.

MR. MORRIS said the Bottom Line on Page 134 for the Board of Education is \$69,175,083.

Page 135 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MS. RINALDI said no cuts here. Bottom Line is \$903,947.

Page 136 - FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM

MS. RINALDI said no reductions here. Bottom Line on Page 136 is \$98,632.

MR. MORRIS said the SECTION TOTAL on Page 136 is \$70,177,662.

Page 137 - DEBT SERVICE

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$18,187,106, on Page 137. This is also the SECTION TOTAL amount: \$18,187,106.

MR. MORRIS said the GRAND BUDGET TOTAL is \$185,273,381.

THE PRESIDENT told Mr. Morris he was terrific for his assistance this evening. The members applauded him.

The total for the 1986/87 OPERATING BUDGETS IS \$185,273,381.

We will now go on to the CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET for 1986/87.

CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET 1986/87Page 139 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$742,250.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to delete 110.489 OPEN SPACE ACQUISITION for the entire \$415,000. Seconded. Some of the Reps. were speaking with Mr. Lubbers the other night and although it would be very nice to be able to have more green area, the problems that we have experienced and which were enumerated the other night with congregation of people in all the areas we have in the City, in our parks, parklands, etc., it seems very obvious that we will be creating just one more spot to bring a lot of heartache to a lot of people.

MR. PAVIA wishes to echo what Mrs. Maihock just said. He can't believe that the same people who cried about the poor maintenance and the lack of police protection and all the rest about the parks in the City and the beaches, and especially those Reps who don't live in that area and don't know how Carwin Park is and places like that, would even consider approving this item. If you can't maintain what we already have, we don't need any more headaches and problems especially when it means adding to the property tax mill rate increase. To spend this type of money, almost a half million dollars (and they originally wanted One Million), for something, as was said before so many times, we don't right now have the proper maintenance for. Please be good citizens yourselves and vote this down. You'll be glad you did. Please support Mrs. Maihock's Motion to cut.

MR. JEPSEN said he is in favor of the purchase. This is an opportunity that if we pass it up now, we very likely will never have it again because of the great value of downtown real estate property. It will no doubt be picked up and developed as much of downtown has. If nobody has the foresight to build Central Park in New York City, there would be a lot of skyscrapers there now. This is our opportunity to create a green belt through Stamford and something that for generations for years and years from now will be able to enjoy. If you pass this opportunity up now, it will be lost forever.

MS. RINALDI spoke about people who don't live in the area. She, herself, does live in the area. Part of this acquisition is in the Fifth District. It is on the West Side. She said it is very important to the revitalization and the rebirth of the West Side. She would very much like to see this pass.

MS. POWERS said she would like to agree with Mr. Jepsen's sentiments. Once you have a 12-story office or high-rise apartment building on a piece of land, it is lost to us forever.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on deleting \$415,000. DEFEATED with 9 Yes votes, 29 No votes, 1 Non-Voting.

Page 140 - SEWER COMMISSION

MR. DONAHUE said there are no cuts recommended. Bottom Line is \$7,133,500.

Page 141 - MAYOR'S OFFICE

MR. DONAHUE said no cuts recommended. Bottom Line is \$45,450,000.

MR. RUBINO Moved to delete 201,349 GOVERNMENT CENTER BUILDING for \$45 Million... Seconded. He said the phone calls he has received during the past few weeks, which he is sure a lot of other Reps have received calls of a similar nature, they were at least 90% against purchase One Telecom Place. His constituents asked this Board to commit capital funds not to an over-sized office building, but to look first to the unavoidable capital expenditures in the areas of sewage treatment, solid waste disposal, and extensive sidewalk and road repairs in neighborhoods such as Glenbrook, Springdale, and Belltown. He asks this Board to heed the wisdom of the overwhelming majority of Stamford citizens and vote NO on the purchase of One Telecom Place.

MRS. SANTY said May 12, 1986 is an infamous day, a sad, sad day, for the taxpayer of Stamford. To spend the largest amount of money, \$45 Million, for a capital project and sell all of our assets is unthinkable when areas of Stamford are in such desperate need of sewers, a solid waste disposal plant, and a sewage treatment plant. How will we ever get them? It is alarming when we think of just a few weeks spent to make such a monumental decision, which will affect our children, their children, and their children, a lot of future generations with this tremendous burden, if in reality they can afford to live here. The unfortunate part of it all is that all other desperately needed capital projects will have to either be delayed or just forgotten. These are health-related projects such as sewers, clean water, and disposal of live garbage and other trash. She will vote NO because her 18th District constituents have mandated that decision. Ladies and gentlemen, are the 18th District residents and taxpayers the only ones who relayed this message to their Representatives? She doubts it. A simple example is an \$185,000 item in the budget and a special letter was sent from the Planning Board to the Mayor. For a 20-year old drainage erosion problem in three of the streets in the area. They can't be repaved; there is damage to the property; the Planning Board put it in the budget and the Mayor cut it every year to Zero. Obviously, we can't afford it. How can we tell our taxpayers that we can afford a \$45 Million gleaming, gold-plated, over-sized palace, but we can't afford to help them around their homes which generate taxes every year, year after year. Historically we know the City sells their property, our property, for 20% below market value and buys it for 25% above market value, if not more. Some we even give away. Tonight there is one issue really. Do we, as elected officials, act out of party loyalty or vote against or for this issue, keeping in mind the constituents we were elected to represent and protect? GTE is not the people's choice. Are you the voice of the people? Do you know how many of your constituents, not just mine in the 18th, who have been waiting 20, 30, 40 years for City water, storm drains, sewers, paved streets, adequate street lights, adequate police protection, supporting our own volunteer fire departments and they are members of those volunteers? And have you checked lately to see how close the C District mill rate has crept to the A District, which is fully serviced? Check out the last 10 or 20 years. The infrastructure downtown is so horrendous that it means the C District will just keep dropping further and further on the priority list. Every day and night they use septic tanks, have wells where the quality of the water may be questionable, where pumps may have to be purchased to boost the water supply to the second floor, where flooding occurs due to no storm drains, et cetera. My constituents would trade for a smaller City Hall and a few human amenities, no necessities, as those I have listed, instead of an over-sized building that we will be renting out a good portion of. There should be a referendum on this.

MR. SIGNORE said he has stated his position in the past and there is nothing new on it. His constituents are in favor of some other site than One Telecom Place. He did not receive one phone call in favor of GTE. All the calls were opposed to it. When you represent a District, you do what they want you to do. If you can't do that, then you don't belong on this Body. You don't vote for what the Mayor wants for his own particular reasons, whatever they are, unless your constituents want it, too. Mrs. Santy has covered most of the important points. I will vote NO on this acquisition.

MRS. BEGEL said since this proposal was presented, a lot of planning has gone into trying to convince us that this is the best alternative to our City Hall needs. And we do have a real City Hall need. However, there are equally pressing problems that demand not only our attention but our money. Selling all City assets isn't the way to plan for future needs. She truly feels that given a time frame in which we had to proceed, no one took seriously the outcry from the people. The people have a right to be heard and we represent those people. Serious negotiations must be held with the Board of Education to come up with a solution to meet their needs and other high-priority community needs. You must(the rest of Mrs. Begel's remarks lost here. End of tape.)

MRS. MCINERNEY's dialogue on the new tape partially lost at the beginning.) If one component changed, so did the plan, or at least so did the plan that was offered to us in February. In her opinion, the purchase of this building in effect mortgages the future of generations to come in Stamford. It creates chaos with the taxstabilization in our community, and it throws all of our other capital project improvement requests into jeopardy. She feels as Mrs. Begel does that our citizens deserve the types of services that they need to improve the quality of their daily living, just as Mrs. Santy enumerated. They would like to have their roads re-paved; they would like to have sewers; they would like to be able to feel that the City is doing something for them, not the other way around. She is glad that Mr. Pacter finally honored his commitment of March 25, 1986 to send information to the Board regarding more pertinent information about the purchase of the GTE Bldg., and certainly some of those financial contingencies have changed. GTE is willing to let us have furniture. We are going to be able to properly attire most of the floors of that GTE Telecom Bldg. The offer has been made to trade this furniture for the rent for two years on the bldg. That does throw a little bit of a change in what is happening at GTE. Stamford will no longer be floating a bond of \$35 Million for two years. Stamford is now going to have \$45 Million of General Obligation Bonds for a term of 20 year. And obviously, our Debt Service is going to be increased for 20 years on this one item alone, at an estimated interest rate of 6%. I am not a mind reader, but I certainly don't know whether 6% will become an actual figure, or projected figure that changes as do all the other figures.

The proceeds from the sale of our City properties will not be used to offset. They will be credited to the Capital Non-Recurring Fund and will earn interest until used to repay the bonds. The property taxes on those taxes sold on the land alone will be about \$500,000. The taxes on the present GTE Bldg. are \$600,0 Plus Personal Property Taxes. It seems that what we have done is that we have locked ourselves into a position from which there will be no return for our taxpayers; and fortunately, one of our newspapers was very public-spirited and published their own poll, large enough to see, obviously, and came out with results that indicated 76% of the people who participated in that poll were not for the GTE Bldg.

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing)

It's not the first poll that was taken on the building. It's the second one, and I must admit it is accurate by using the GTE Bldg. But I have had something in my basement for over a year now that I've been dying to get rid of. And it was based on the poll that I did last year of my constituents. They had to put stamps on all of these things and return to me via the United States mail. I appreciate that communication. I realize I am no longer talking about a combined Government Center, or downtown campus, and I am not talking about a downtown City Hall in URC Blocks 8 and 9. But we still are talking for relevance sake, a new City Hall building. Here is the boxful I have been saving of the responses I received to the notice I paid for and placed in the newspaper. These were the letters that were for Rippowam at that time. What it says to me is that we have not come up with an alternate that is suitable to the beliefs of our taxpaying residents. We have an obligation and I don't know whether we have met that obligation. I certainly will not vote to have more people sell their homes, move out of the community, to force them to change their life styles, which for most of the elderly has changed dramatically, drastically anyway. They are on fixed incomes. We aren't. There aren't too many of us on this Board who are now on fixed incomes, and even if we aren't, there are not that many of us on this Board who can afford sizeable tax increases. Yes, many people came from New York and said well, Connecticut doesn't pay any taxes. That's fine. When the people came from New York, Stamford was not assessing very high taxes, but over the years, we have. This budget reflects a \$62 Million capital project. That is unreasonable. 90% of it belongs to the GTE Bldg. I don't think we are being fair to our constituents. I'm trying to do the best job I can and I am trying to reflect what those people who called me, are concerned with, and I cannot support this based on the entire plan. It has nothing to do with the building, even though there is not adequate parking, even though they have gone in and changed their parking restrictions to accommodate commuters which we do not have. No one is going to take the railroad in, or at least not on very many occasions to park over there.

WE have a problem. That building is also being maintained by Cushman, Wakefield. I would say that a high tech building of that nature could not be maintained adequately, or at least in a manner in which it would have the life expectancy that it should without that kind of professional engineering staff there. Yes, there is a problem. We may need a new City Hall, but then we may not need a new City Hall. Maybe we could renovate this building, but certainly Lois Santy is right, who are the voice of the people? Do we listen? Do we care?

MR. DAVID MARTIN said he received a number of calls. Some are definitely in favor of this, seeing it as an opportunity, and very importantly, they do not see another solution that is imminent or do-able within the near future for our City. But for those who vote NO, he hears a grave concern that we are spending a lot of money without any consideration for cutting costs. As a result, he has made a commitment to those people that he would do what he could to make certain that we made a commitment to cutting costs and tonight on your desk, you will find a response that Paul Pacter has provided us with some information about some of those operating costs savings. It is one of the three major reasons why we are moving there. He thinks this commitment is very, very important. It is one of the reasons that it makes sense for consolidating, and to have this commitment makes a lot more sense to Mr. Martin and to the people that he represents.

MR. ZELINSKI said he drove down Washington Blvd. this evening on his way here, and passed by the new GTE Bldg., sparkling and beautiful. He cannot fault the City employees who signed petitions which everyone received. He commends the Mayor on his ability and salesmanship to present this to the various boards, and to win their approval in such a speedy fashion. The April, 1986 edition of the EMPLOYEES' NEWSLETTER includes pages dedicated to the new City Hall, which is an excellent selling job, and as a salesman, I can appreciate that. The Mayor in his last paragraph said "It is my wish that we will all(unclear) in the near future; however, I must request all City employees contact members of the Board of Finance and Board of Representatives, urging them to support this proposal. It is extremely important that they hear from you, the employees of the City of Stamford."

Again, Mr. Zelinski does not fault the employees at all, but we have to recognize the Stamford taxpayers' plight. How many City employees live in Stamford, and are taxpayers, and would feel the tax burden in their pockets? He wants to commend publicly, the Stamford Mail Newspaper, which took it upon itself in their May 8-14, 1986 edition to print a poll that they had done, asking the people of Stamford, the taxpayers, what they wanted, where they wanted their City Hall to be. Out of the 1,266 people who took the time and the trouble to mail in those ballots, 723 people, or 56%, were in favor of Rippowam Center; 212, or 17% wanted Stamford High School, and only 151 people, which is 12% of that poll, were in favor of GTE. It makes one want to think what is going on here. Is this really in the best interests of the people, the residents?

We have been given a lot of information by Finance Commissioner Pacter and he is to be commended. We all have to vote our consciences this evening. In my 11th District and of the 50 people who called me and gave their names and addresses, one out of 50 wanted GTE. The other 49 were in favor of Stamford High School or Rippowam High School. I will be voting against the appropriation. If other members do so, perhaps the Mayor can look into other avenues such as negotiations with the Board of Education to either look into Rippowam or Stamford High Schools.

MS. FISHMAN said she has 3,000 registered voters in her 12th District. She presumes there are probably 3,000 who are not registered to vote, but she still represents them. She had two calls against GTE, and over 100 for it. She considers that 2 out of 6,000 as not being representative of her District. What this tells her is that the rest of the people believe she would do the right thing. A poll of 1,000 people out of 106,000 population does not show a great deal of interest in this subject. She urges buying GTE.

MR. BLUM said he received numerous calls but not too many from his 12th District. Many of the callers were people who knew him for several years, some many years. Mr. Blum spoke of previous City Halls of Stamford. In this building, the "Berlin Wall" was put up and taken down in this very room. Mr. Blum will vote for this new City Hall. Let the new building be named "The People's Hall."

THE CHAIR noted there are still eleven speakers.

MR. JACHIMCZYK Moved the Question. Seconded. A voice vote CARRIED, voice vote.

HE PRESIDENT said the vote is on a Motion to cut \$45 Million, Line Item 201.349 Government Center Bldg. A Yes vote is to cut; a No vote is not to cut. It is a Roll Call vote. DEFEATED with 15 Yes, 24 No votes.

MS. SUMMERVILLE called the Roll and below is the vote on the Motion to cut \$45 Million from the Capital Projects Budget, Line 201.349 Government Center Bldg. on Page 141:

ROLL CALL VOTETHOSE VOTING YES (15) (to cut)

Rosanne Begel
Thomas Pia
Patricia McGrath
Wm. Heins
Frank Mollo
Jeanne-Lois Santy
James Rubino
Audrey Maihock
Nicholas Pavia
Barbara McInerney
S. A. Signore
John Zelinski
James Dudley
Joseph DeRose
W. Dennis White

THOSE VOTING NO (24) (not to cut)

Maria Nakian	Donald Donahue
George Jepsen	Mildred Perillo
Richard Lyons	Katie Glover
Gerald Rybnick	Terrence Martin
David Martin	Scott Morris
Stanley Esposito	Claire Fishman
Ellen Bromley	Ruth Powers
Roger Taranto	David Blum
Annie Summerville	David Jachimczyk
Jeremiah Livingston	Mary Lou Rinaldi
Thomas Clear	John Boccuzzi
Lathon Wider	Sandra Goldstein

ABSENT FROM THE MEETING (1)

Thomas Burke (excused due to illness)

THE PRESIDENT said there were 24 against the Motion, and 15 for the Motion.
The Motion has been DEFEATED.

MR. HEINS asked that now that that has passed, could he make an amendment? Is there a possibility to make a Motion? A Resolution?

THE PRESIDENT said the only thing that we have is a Motion that was defeated. I don't know what, no idea what we can do.

MR. HEINS said he would like to put forth a resolution that we finance this building, once it goes through, with the original terms that Commissioner Pacter put forth. Is that appropriate right here?

THE PRESIDENT said no, it is not what is being done tonight. It is not an appropriate Motion. It is something, though, that she suggests that Mr. Heins talk to Mr. Pacter about, and to members of Fiscal about, and perhaps if it is something that is amenable, they could effectuate.

MR. PAVIA made a Point of Clarification. Because the question was Moved, and he did not get a chance to speak, could he submit a statement for the record so that his people two years from now will know how he voted.

THE PRESIDENT said she would permit that.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked about Item 201.155, HOUSING FUND, and Moved for a reduction of \$150,000, leaving \$100,000. Seconded.

MR. JEPSEN is against this as a Representative of the South End. He has seen what these Revolving Door Funds can do to leverage product investment to fix up homes and down in the poorer areas of town. It is essential for our housing policy to have this kind of money available so that people who cannot get money through normal fund sources can have the opportunity to leverage money to provide fix-up.

MR. WIDER is against eliminating any part of this funding because at times we run across properties which we can build housing on, and if we don't have this Housing Fund, we cannot get the property, and most times, time is of the essence.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on the MOTION to cut \$150,000 from Item 201.155 HOUSING FUND. Motion was DEFEATED, voice vote.

ME. DONAHUE said the department total on Page 141 is \$45,450,000.

Page 142 - TRAFFIC AND PARKING DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$416,000.

Page 143 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said the total is on Page 149 and it is \$4,425,388. No changes.

THE PRESIDENT said several Representatives are leaving. We have still got to have a vote on the entire budget and that is the critical vote tonight.

Page 151 - FIRE DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said there are no changes. The Bottom Line is \$250,000.

Page 153 - LONG RIDGE FIRE DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes recommended. Bottom Line is \$209,000.

Page 154 - TURN-OF-RIVER FIRE DEPARTMENT (2 stations)

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$60,000.

Page 155 - SMITH HOUSE SKILLED NURSING FACILITY

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$115,000.

Page 156 - SMITH HOUSE RESIDENCE

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$33,000.

Page 157 - PARKS DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line on Page 159 is \$395,000.

Page 160 - RECREATION DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$34,270.

Page 161 - FERGUSON LIBRARY

MR. DONAHUE said no changes. Bottom Line is \$35,000. There is a typo to be corrected on this page. Board of Finance should show \$35,000 Line Item 710.616.

Page 162 - STAMFORD MUSEUM AND NATURE CENTER

MR. DONAHUE said no changes recommended. Bottom Line is on Page 163 and is \$111,065.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she was at the Fiscal Committee at which the people from the Museum appeared. They did indicate that there were certain things they were very anxious to receive. However, we do have an item of 720.112 GATE HOUSE WINDOW for \$7,000. She feels that with careful and expeditious work, they could really get along without that until there is another capital projects budget. She Moved to cut the \$7,000. There is no Seconding Motion.

MRS. SANTY said she would be remiss if she did not make her annual statement on this appropriation. This building was founded by her great-uncle and he is rolling over and over and over in his grave. There was never any intention that any taxpayers money from Stamford was to be paid for this facility in any way. He founded it. He supported it, and it was to be a museum very, very different from what it is today. He is still rolling, and she still visits his grave every year and she tells him what is going on.

Page 164 - BOARD OF EDUCATION

MR. DONAHUE asked MS. RINALDI to preside on the Board of Education Capital Projects Budget.

MS. RINALDI said no changes were recommended. The Bottom Line is on Page 166 and the total is \$2,312,200.

Page 167 - DATA PROCESSING DEPARTMENT

MR. DONAHUE said there is a typo to be corrected under the Mayor's Request column and the Board of Finance column; both should show \$620,000 (not \$60,000). No changes recommended. Bottom Line is \$1,126,975.

That is the end of the Capital Projects Budget item.

The Grand Total for the Capital Projects Budget for 1986/87 is \$62,341,673.

MR. MORRIS said the final figures are as follows:

Fiscal Year 1986 /87 Operating Budget	\$185,273,381.00
Fiscal YEAR 1986/87 Capital Projects Budget	62,341,673.00

MR. DONAHUE read the Budget Resolution and it is attached to these Minutes, and he Moved for its acceptance. Seconded.

MRS. MCINERNEY said as a member of the Republican Party and as Minority Leader, she cannot support the 1986/87 Operating and Capital Projects Budgets. Based on the fact that this budget has grown from 1982/83 when our Republican Mayor left office from \$137.9 Million to \$185.3 Million, \$47 Million in Operating expenditures. Likewise, this year's Capital Projects Budget has grown in excess of the \$45 Million. It is interesting how, when parties change, people's opinions change, and the good of Stamford is left behind and only promoting and supporting administrative stands are important. This budget reflects all of those new employees who were hired last year. It reflects every benefit, every insurance item that was given to everybody. She cannot support it. The taxpayers of this community cannot absorb it. Her priority has always centered on stabilizing taxes for those citizens who can least afford these increases. She cannot be part and parcel of a budget that will increase the City's taxes to well over 6%. She is

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing)

not pleased with the Board's actions. She thinks each and every one of us will find out come July One exactly how our constituents feel, and she certainly hopes that in November of 1987, that the City and the City's voters get out and make a difference because they can. We haven't, and we won't.

MRS. SANTY said she, too, cannot be a part of this entire budget process. She will have to vote NO. As she said before, it is a sad, sad day for the Stamford taxpayers. She does not want her name down as a part of the disservice and the burden that this Board has placed on the generations in this town as has been done here tonight, whose actions have certainly reflected it. Mrs. McInerney has reflected all the previous Administrations and how we sat here, some of the same members, to keep those budgets in line, and we did it. Tonight we will go down in history. and 20 years from now, she hopes that some of this Board's members are still around, and she probably won't be in this town because she can't afford to stay here and regret exactly what was done here tonight by this 19th Board, by party statement. This City, this country, was founded on unreasonable taxes. That's why we are this country today, and what we have done tonight is unreasonable taxation.

MR. SIGNORE said he does not wish to drag the evening any further because it is late, although he does wish to state that he does agree with his two Republican colleagues, Mrs. McInerney and Mrs. Santy, and he will vote against this budget.

MR. WIDER Moved the Question. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote to approve the Budget Resolution. APPROVED with 27 Yes, 10 No, and 2 Abstentions. The budget is adopted.

She thanked the staff this evening who worked tonight and will have further work: Mrs. McEvoy, Mrs. Kachaluba, Mrs. Schlachtmeyer. Thank you all.

ADJOURNMENT: Upon Motion duly made and Seconded, and CARRIED, voice vote, the Meeting was adjourned at 1:30 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
19th Board of Representatives

SG:HMM
Encs.