

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, JULY 7, 1986

19th Board of Representatives

Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 19th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on MONDAY, JULY 7, 1986, in the Legislative Chambers of the Board, in the Municipal Office Building, Second Floor, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order at 8:15 P.M. by the President after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION was given by Representative Richard L. Lyons of the First District:

"Heavenly Father, we ask your guidance, your blessings, and your help in our deliberations tonight. Let our decisions be worthy of You, our City, and our Country, and the people we represent. Fill our minds with knowledge, and our hearts with wisdom. Bless our City, our Country, and our own humanity. Amen."

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

ROLL CALL was taken by Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville. There were 34 present and 6 absent. Absent were Reps. Rosanne Begel (excused), Katie Glover (excused), Jeremiah Livingston, W. Dennis White (excused), Roger Taranto, and Jeanne-Lois Santy. At 9:07 P.M., there were 35 present and 5 absent, with Rep. Jeanne-Lois Santy arriving at the meeting.

The CHAIR declared a QUORUM.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said before proceeding to a test of the voting equipment, she wished to express to the Board Dennie White's feelings of thanks to the Board for all the cards and for the sentiments and good wishes that he received from all the members. He is feeling well. He is recuperating, and last night when she spoke to him, he was complaining about a million things, so she knows that he is getting better; and he is so grateful for everyone's good wishes. He is very happy that everyone is thinking of him, and she feels that it is helping him in his recovery.

MACHINE TEST VOTE: The machine was found to be in good working order.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE (continued)

MR. DUDLEY asked for a Moment of Silence for two of Stamford's finest citizens: one being the late BENNY GOODMAN, the "King of Swing" himself. So much has been said about Benny Goodman that Mr. Dudley thinks we all feel the same, not just in Stamford, but throughout the country.

MR. DUDLEY also asks for a Moment of Silence for SGT. ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR. Sgt. Boccuzzi was a friend of his, as he was of many people in Stamford. He has known Art for many years. He was a very dedicated police officer. In 35 years on the police force, not once did he use a sick day. Art was known as the "workaholic" of the Police Dept. He will be sorely missed by all of us, and Jim asks that all pray for Art Boccuzzi, as well as for Benny Goodman.

MRS. MATHOCK said she, too, would like a Moment of Silence for the late BENNY GOODMAN. He was one of Stamford's most celebrated residents, and he died suddenly on June 13, 1986. His gift of music, as we are all aware, was acclaimed internationally. It is wonderful when one individual, such as Benny Goodman, can draw together the hearts of so many people all over the world in such a positive way. We are very honored that Benny Goodman chose to live among us in Stamford, and express our deep appreciation for his life's work and contributions not only to our City, but to the world as well.

MR. BOCCUZZI requested a Moment of Silence for the late DANIEL LABELLA. He was the uncle of Rep. Mary Lou Rinaldi.

MRS. FISHMAN asked for a Moment of Silence for the late ADAM KAUFMAN, who, until last year, lived in Stamford. He died tragically on Thursday, in Massachusetts, at the age of 15.

MR. ZELINSKI wished to also pay his respects to the late SGT. ARTHUR BOCCUZZI, SR. Words cannot adequately express the loss and sorrow felt by so many. It is rare indeed that one quiet, ordinary mortal man can become extraordinary and immemorable due to his fine character, and be loved by those, some of whom with which he had only a few minutes of contact. Bless him.

MR. DAVID MARTIN also wished to have a Moment of Silence for BENNY GOODMAN, a resident of the 19th District. While much has been said, there were three things that stuck in his mind to say about him. First was his commitment to excellence in his music, whether it be jazz or classic, or any other style. The second was that he chose his band members based upon the quality of the music and not on the color of their skin, and that was an important break-through in his time; and finally, and most importantly in many ways, for a musician, his music touched the hearts of millions and made people happy.

MR. BLUM asked for a Moment of Silence for LIBERTY WEEK for those immigrants who came to this country, who had at one time gone through privation, through religious and through many other privations, and for all our immigrants.

The CHAIR notes that Mrs. Santy has joined the meeting. We now have 35 members present.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE

The late LERIAINE M. LEVISTER, wife of Superior Court Judge Robert Levister, and an Administrative Assistant for a drug rehabilitation program, died yesterday at Stamford Hospital. She was 62 and lived at 849 Scofieldtown Road in Stamford for 31 years.

Born in Winston-Salem, N.C., on Oct. 17, 1923, Mrs. Levister was the daughter of the late N. Theodore and Nancy Strange Mitchell. She worked for Liberation Programs on Main Street in Stamford, facilities which treat drug abusers in the Greenwich, Stamford and Darien area.

She was also a former board member of the Easter Seal Rehabilitation Center on Palmer's Hill Road in Stamford. Mrs. Levister was also a past board member of the Girls' Club of America, as well as a member of the following organizations: Fairfield County Chapter of Girl-friends; New York Chapter of the North Easterners; and the Urban League Guild of Southwestern Fairfield County.

Mrs. Levister is survived by her husband, Judge Levister; two sisters, Thelma Keck of Raleigh, N.C., Gloria Saunders of New York City; one brother, Norman Theodore Mitchell of Hawaii; one niece and one nephew.

She will truly be missed in the City of Stamford as she touched many persons' lives in many areas in the City, and Ms. Summerville asks the Board to pray for her family. Submitted by Rep. Annie Summerville.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR ROBERT J. LESSARD, JR.
SUBMITTED BY REPS. THOMAS F. CLEAR, JR. AND SCOTT A. MORRIS
17th DISTRICT - SPRINGDALE
JULY, 1986 MONTHLY SESSION - 7/7/86

Madame President, it is with a great deal of sadness and tremendous sorrow that we must respectfully ask for a MOMENT OF SILENCE for the late ROBERT J. LESSARD, JR., who resided in our district in Springdale on Knickerbocker Avenue, and who passed away on Friday, June 13, 1986.

A lifelong resident of Stamford, BOB LESSARD was only 59 years old, but he was a steady and solid fixture in Springdale for quite a long period of time. We in the community will particularly feel his loss because of his dedicated and faithful service with the Springdale Volunteer Fire Company for over 25 years, and his extremely competent and fine work as a dispatcher with the Company for the past 8 years.

BOB LESSARD had a worthy record of constant community involvement, and it is a record of lasting achievement and notable contributions - one in which his family can feel justifiably proud. Both in his work and during his life, ROBERT J. LESSARD, JR. set standards of the highest caliber, and served as a wonderful example to his family and to his community.

On a personal note, every time that we entered Fire Company Headquarters on Hope Street and BOB was on duty, he always greeted us with a warm smile, a friendly handshake, and very challenging questions on district issues. We will certainly miss such stimulating, provocative conversations, as well as BOB's genuine interest in and affection for his friends and neighbors in Springdale and the people of Stamford.

On behalf of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, we want to extend our sympathies to his wife, Annette; his five sons: Robert, Michael, Mark, Brian, and Paul; his sister, Mrs. Mary Alice Jones; and his three grand children. An outstanding individual, a loving husband, and a devoted father and grand father. ROBERT J. LESSARD's absence will be keenly felt.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR.
SUBMITTED BY REPRESENTATIVE SCOTT A. MORRIS
17th DISTRICT - SPRINGDALE
JULY, 1986 MONTHLY SESSION - 7/7/86

Madame President, it is my very sad and sorrowful duty to respectfully request a MOMENT OF SILENCE for the late ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR., who was a lifelong resident of Stamford, and who departed this life much too early at the age of 62 years on Friday, June 6, 1986.

ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR., as we all know, was a sergeant in the Police Department of the City of Stamford, and a member of the Department's Youth Bureau. However, he was no ordinary police officer, and I do not think that any words spoken or thoughts expressed here tonight in his memory can do justice to what he and his life's work meant to the people of this City.

As Deputy Police Chief John Moriarty said of SGT. BOCCUZZI, "He was a rare breed. They don't make them like him anymore". Perhaps such a statement comes the closest to how all of us in Stamford felt about ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR.. Indeed, let us not forget the nearly 36 years, without one single, solitary sick day, that he worked so unselfishly for the people of Stamford. Let us also not forget the fact that he rarely, if ever, signed in for overtime. But, this distinguished, exemplary record, as praiseworthy and notable as it is, constitutes only one small part of what made this man such a great public servant.

The unswerving devotion and dedication of SGT. BOCCUZZI to his job - to doing the best that he could possibly do - is a unique and vanishing quality that really struck me when I first came to know him several years ago. He would actually take time out from a well deserved day - off, and come into Police Headquarters to try and resolve neighborhood disputes, mediate confrontational incidents, or handle very tense situations. He was that kind of person, who wanted only the best for the people of his City, and who worked so hard, so diligently, and so unaparingly to achieve the best, because, to put it quite simply, he was the best.

I do not know, nor do I think that anyone else knows, if we will ever see his like again; but, we all know that the people of the City of Stamford have been truly blessed and honored to have had someone of such enormous stature, such unquestionable integrity, and such native loyalty as ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR. working for us, living among us, and touching all of us in some positive way.

On behalf of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, I want to extend my sympathies to SGT. BOCCUZZI's family, which include his four sons: Brian, Keith, David, and Arthur, Jr., himself a lieutenant in the Police Department; his two daughters: Karen B. Wood and Wendy; his three brothers: Russell, Frank, and Michael; his sister, Mary Dennis; and his four grand children.

All that I can respectfully conclude with is a prayer of thanks and gratitude from all of us to Sgt. of the Stamford Police Department ARTHUR F. BOCCUZZI, SR. for a job so well done. GOD BLESS YOU.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES		DEPARTMENTS	
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32
33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40
41	42	43	44
45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52
53	54	55	56
57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64
65	66	67	68
69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76
77	78	79	80
81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88
89	90	91	92
93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100

101	102	103	104
105	106	107	108
109	110	111	112
113	114	115	116
117	118	119	120
121	122	123	124
125	126	127	128
129	130	131	132
133	134	135	136
137	138	139	140
141	142	143	144
145	146	147	148
149	150	151	152
153	154	155	156
157	158	159	160
161	162	163	164
165	166	167	168
169	170	171	172
173	174	175	176
177	178	179	180
181	182	183	184
185	186	187	188
189	190	191	192
193	194	195	196
197	198	199	200

MAYOR THOM SERRANI'S ANNUAL MESSAGE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985-86

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said it was with great pleasure, as it is on the July of every year that the Board of Representatives has the Mayor of the City of Stamford come before it to present his STATE OF THE CITY MESSAGE.

MAYOR THOM SERRANI thanked Mrs. Goldstein and asked the members to sit back, relax and enjoy themselves as it is the time of year when the Annual State of the City Message is given by the Mayor. He will try to be as brief as possible. He thinks a lot has been covered since last year when he gave his Second State of the City Message to the Board, and he wished to speak of those things.

Before so doing, he will take this opportunity to recognize in the gallery tonight some distinguished guests of the City, namely, George and Edna Goldstein, the in-laws of President Sandra Goldstein, and the mother and father of Bob Goldstein, who is also with us this evening, visiting from Florida, and leaving tomorrow. He welcomed them to Stamford and is happy to see them here tonight to see their daughter-in-law in action, and the rest of the 39 members of the Board of Representatives, which is the second largest city council in the country.

Mayor Thom Serrani gave his message, copies of which had been distributed to all the Board members, and copy of which is attached to the set of these minutes in the permanent minutes file book. The Message consisted of 36 pages.

At the conclusion of the Message, Mayor Serrani commented that it is traditional since he has been here, and this is his third Annual Message, that a challenge is made for a softball game between the Mayor's Team and this Board's team. Since the Mayor's Team won last year, he is now challenging the Board of Representatives to the Annual Softball Game. He believes this will be the challenge match because Sandy's Sluggers won the first year and Tom's Team won the second year, so this will be the real culmination of the games. He said he knows John Boccuzzi will be out there pitching. He asked Mrs. Goldstein if she accepted his challenge.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said it will be the Board's pleasure to beat his team once again. She thanked the Mayor for his detailed and incisive report and the Board is very proud of what he has accomplished this last year, and part of the job of him as Mayor and his cabinet and staff, and the various department heads have been doing in the City of Stamford.

MAYOR SERRANI said he looks forward to seeing the Board next year in their new chambers.

WEDDING ANNIVERSARY CONGRATULATIONS

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked the Board to congratulate Curley and Mildred Perillo on their 36th wedding anniversary, and Mr. and Mrs. Donahue for their 4th anniversary.

STANDING COMMITTEESSTEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Waive the reading of the Steering Committee Report. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

The Steering Committee met on Wednesday, June 18, 1986, in Conference Room II, Board of Education Building on Hillandale Avenue. The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein who declared a Quorum.

PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman	James Dudley	Thomas Pia
John Boccuzzi	Barbara McInerney	David Martin
Maria Nakian	Annie Somerville	Comm. Paul Pacter
Audrey Mathcock	Scott Morris	Helen McEvoy
Lathon Wider	Donald Donahue	Sandra Schlachtmeyer
Mildred Parillo	Richard Lyons	Anne Kacheluba
Claire Fishman	Ruth Powers	

1. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the four items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and the two items appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and they were Dr. William Rosenfield and Mr. Harry Selin both for the Commission on Aging.

2. FISCAL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the nine items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and two items appearing on the Addenda. These items were Proposed resolution authorizing the filing of budget application for Day Care Program, amount not to exceed \$171,655 and Proposed resolution authorization of preliminary application for State school construction grants for Board of Education capital projects for fiscal year 1986/86. Also, ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one item appearing under Planning & Zoning Committee and that was the Request for approval of the sale of Burdick School property for housing.

3. LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

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

4. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda, one item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that was For approval proposed resolution adopting the City of Stamford deferred compensation plan for voluntary participation of eligible employees, and one item appearing on the Pending Steering Agenda and that was the Review of Merit Rules.

5. PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the Report for the establishment of a strategy for sale of all-city owned assets. ORDERED ON THE FISCAL COMMITTEE AGENDA was the Request for approval of the proposal to proceed with the sale of Burdick School property for housing.

6. PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was the Matter of doing a spring pickup for senior citizens.

7. HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also, an item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was For publication, proposed ordinance concerning blasting permits in unsewered area.

8. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA were all six items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Also, an item appearing on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda and that item was Request for permission to hang a banner on Summer Street from October 6 to 18, 1986 from the YMCA.

9. EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE (Inadvertently left off Tentative Steering Agenda)

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

10. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

ORDERED ON THE AGENDA was one of the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. ORDERED HELD IN STEERING was the Proposed resolution approving submittal of list of programs to the State Commissioner of Revenue Services in accordance with the provisions of an act concerning Connecticut Neighborhood Assistance.

11. URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

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

14. LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

15. HOUSE COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

16. COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

17. CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

18. SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ASSESS PRIORITY ISSUES

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

19. RESOLUTIONS

No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

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

SG:ak

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRWOMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE

MRS. PERILLO said the Appointments Committee met June 24, 1986 at 7:30 P.M., at Hillandale Ave. Present were Millie Perillo, John Boccuzzi, Tom Burke, Ruth Powers, Pat McGrath, and Tom Clear. Absent were Jeanne-Lois Santy, Sal Signore, Annie Summerville, and Dave Blum. Audrey Maihock also attended the meeting.

She Moved to the Consent Agenda #5 and #6.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARDTerm Expires

- (1) RICHARD ROHR (R) Replacing P. Tatano. Dec. 1, 1987
59 East Lane

MRS. PERILLO said Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE as he was out-of-town on vacation.

PLANNING BOARD

- (2) DR. WILLIAM LINKE (D) Replacing P. Grosso whose Dec. 1, 1988
75 Ridgecrest Road term expired.

Dr. Wm. Linke has been a Stamford resident for over 30 years. He is a Director of Research at American Cyanamid Co. Dr. Linke has attended many hearings of Planning Board. He has served on the Democratic City Committee in both the 19th and 20th Districts for eight years, and also served as the Chairman of the City Committee. He was a member of the Fire Commission for eight years, and served as Chairman for four years. Dr. Linke has had extensive conversations with Mr. Grosso, the gentleman he is replacing, and sharing their views on the Planning Board. The interview with Dr. Linke was quite lengthy. She Moved for approval. Seconded. APPROVED, voice vote.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - ALTERNATE

- (3) MS. NOREEN HAYGOOD (D) Replacing Claire Friedlander Dec. 1, 1990
1 Strawberry Hill Ave. who became a regular member.

MRS. PERILLO said Ms. Haygood has resided in Stamford for eight years. She is Secretary-Treasurer of Haygood Associates, Inc. She has been involved in many community activities in the 8 years she has been in this City. She has attended many hearings of the ZBA, as well as the Zoning Board, and various other Land Use boards. She Moved for approval of Ms. Haygood. Seconded. APPROVED, voice vote.

- (4) EDWARD E. GRANELLI, JR. (D) Replacing Orval Stamm Dec. 1, 1986
132 MacGregor Drive whose term expired.

MRS. PERILLO has been a resident for 25 years. He is an accountant with the Joseph Dowling Co. He has been in contact with members of the Zoning Board of Appeals to familiarize himself with this Board. He knows the City well, and the Committee found him a very interesting candidate, and he has no conflict-of-interest. She Moved for his approval. Seconded. APPROVED, voice vote.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE (continued)COMMISSION ON AGINGTerm Expires

- (5) DR. WILLIAM ROSENFELD (D) Reappointment.
71 Doolittle Road

Dec. 1, 1986

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (6) HARRY SELIN (R) Reappointment.
1176 Hope St., Apt. 4

Dec. 1, 1988

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MRS. PERILLO Moved for approval of the Consent Agenda items #5 and #6.
Seconded. APPROVED, voice vote.

FISCAL COMMITTEE

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee met on July 2, 1986 with David Martin, Mr. Lyons, Mrs. Begel, Mr. Esposito, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Donahue in attendance. He Moved to the Consent Agenda, items 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

- (1) \$ 10,000.00 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD - Code 110.5150 PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS - Additional Appropriation requested for funds contributed by private developer to establish a Coastal Resources Inventory and Mapping Project as mitigation for unavoidable environmental impacts to Stamford's coastal resources. Funds are 100% reimbursable. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 4/29/86. Board of Finance approved 5/8/86. Returned to Committee 6/2/86.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said Item #1 is a donation of \$10,000.00 to provide for a Coastal Resources Inventory and Mapping Project. By a vote of 4-1-1, the Committee recommends approval and he so Moves. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK said her Committee did not take a vote, but she and Terrence Martin were present at this meeting. She Moved to waive the committee report. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

MR. DONAHUE said they met with Mark Lubbers last month for a great deal of time and this month for items 1 and 2 on the agenda, nearly two hours on these two items. It is very clear that this satisfies the State regulations concerning the environment and satisfies the Coastal Management Program requirements. Item #1 involves the "Chocolate Factory" project in Waterside. A mud flat had to be dredged.

MR. BLUM said he called the EPB in Hartford and they looked up some matters for him, and he received their letter this evening, which everyone has. He read from the letter "The compromise worked out between Mr. Ginter and the EPB, which was the making of this donation by the Ginter people." It turns out the mud flats in front of his Chocolate Factory, he cannot do anything about because the State is against it. What are we going to do with this money that Mr. Ginter now, in a compromise solution provided, we are going to take this and go to, as it states here "to other public sites, namely, Holly Pond and shellfish beds." We can use that money much better in other resources, namely, perhaps housing in the City of Stamford. A better use would be for housing in the Waterside area than for ^{the} now proposed coastal mapping project. Due to the Supreme Court decision on deficit spending bill, it is very possible we will still get money for coastal management.

MR. TERRENCE MARTIN and he would like to read two paragraphs from the letter to which Mr. Blum refers, which will shed a lot of light on this issue. "The compromise worked out between Mr. Ginter and the EPB with a donation to the City of the approximate sum of money which would have been used for the marsh restoration project, with the strict proviso that the funds would be set aside for mapping and cataloging of coastal resources in the City of Stamford. The researchers and the sites to be mapped will be chosen only by the EPB, and in no case was privately-owned, un-developed property to be the subject of the mapping. Only public sites, (such as Holly Pond's shellfish beds), or already-developed properties are to be selected. Properties which are the subject of pending applications before the Planning, Zoning, or Environmental Protection Boards are to be mapped at the owner's (developer's) expense."

The next paragraph is the one which Mr. Martin wishes to concentrate on. "To answer your question of ethics more specifically, it does not appear that Mr. Ginter will be able in any way to influence the Zoning Board or the EPB on a pending or future application as a result of this grant. The mapping to be performed will not directly benefit (or harm) his personal interests. Legally, this grant seems perfectly reasonable when viewed as a condition of a prior City zoning approval. Furthermore, in his current application before the Zoning Board, Mr. Ginter has provided information on the coastal resources on his site, mapped by his consultants at his own expense, completely independent of the current mapping proposal now under consideration."

Ladies and gentlemen, there has been a lot of discussion on this issue, and I think those of you who know me, know that I have a deep commitment when it comes to environmental issues; and in his opinion, we should take the money, appropriate it and use it for the mapping project as proposed. He fails to see much merit to all the arguments that have been offered to the contrary, although some very legitimate questions were raised at last month's meeting regarding the precedents involved here and also the approval of the State DEP; and he believes that the two paragraphs quoted above, do lay to rest some of the concerns that were expressed by some of the members. He will be voting for this appropriation and hopes others will do likewise.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she is very grateful to Mr. Blum for sharing his reply from the State DEP regarding Item #1. This letter indicates in one place, which has not been quoted by anyone so far; "In the intervening period, however, it was learned that the DEP, which has regulatory authority over wetland restoration, was very unlikely to approve any alteration of the functioning mudflat at Mr. Ginter's site." Mrs. Maihock said a developer should not be

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)MRS. MAIHOCK (continuing)

penalized if he comes in good faith, as Mr. Ginter did to the Zoning Board, so she would certainly have to honor his right to a permit. However, she still has grave reservations about the mitigation measures that were taken in this particular instance. She continues to feel that if compensation were deemed necessary, it should have been used for on-site uses, not extraneous uses. She just believes that Mr. Blum has done the Board a great favor to present this to them so that we might have a balanced perspective of this particular issue. Because she does have reservations about this mitigation, she will not vote for this.

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

THE PRESIDENT asked those members not seated, to please join the machine vote on appropriating \$10,000, Item #1. APPROVED, with 25 Yes votes, 9 No votes, 2 Abstentions.

- (2) \$ 14,000.00 - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION BOARD - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET FOR PROJECT #110-084 FLOOD FORECAST AND EARLY WARNING SYSTEM. To be financed by the developer. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 4/29/86. Board of Finance approved 5/8/86. Planning Board approved 5/8/86. Returned to Committee 6/2/86.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said this again is a donation by two separate contractors which will allow the City to place flood warning monitor stations in the Toilsome Brook area and also in the Noroton River Basin. By a vote of 4-1-1, the Committee recommended approval of the \$14,000. Seconded.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to waive the secondary committee report. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

MR. DONAHUE said his explanation is pretty much the same as Item #1, although he wished to add that it is very important for the EPB to purchase and install this equipment so that it is compatible with the system we already have in place.

MR. HEINS said he will vote Yes, same as he did for Item #1. He is voting Yes as a practical matter as he believes if it is defeated, it reverts back to the developer. His problem with both these items is the concept of unavoidable environmental impact. It is only unavoidable once we pass these developmental, these issues, and it seems the DEP, as stated in the first letter, having the regulatory authority, was unlikely to approve any alterations to the functioning of the mudflat. The DEP could have turned down this proposal. In that way, we would not have had the issue of unavoidable environmental impact; and the fact that we somehow came upon a compromise solution disturbs Mr. Heins a little bit. He would like to have all of us monitor and at least be aware of what appears to be some negotiating, which should be very clear-cut laws concerning wetlands, clearly delineated in the laws, and he is a little confused as to how we can go and tamper with what should be some of ^{our} very precious natural resources for these "mitigating" circumstances.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)MR. HEINS (continuing)

He is voting Yes for it, but he thinks it is really a distasteful issue as far as he is concerned.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she will approve this because if someone is in a flood plain and wants to protect himself by contributing to the Early Warning System, she certainly would not in good conscience deny him the right to protect himself. However, she does have great concern for the welfare of persons who develop in such places, and she would hope they are watching developments therein.

MRS. MCINERNEY said she agrees with the statements made by Mr. Heins and Mrs. Maihock. It has really become apparent that trade-offs are being given due to problems with development within our wetlands. She is going to place an item on the Agenda for Steering next month that is going to request the Environmental Protection Committee to investigate the policy and/or posture of the EPB approval of building permits in any areas that are sensitive environmentally; and certainly what has gone before us this evening is going to cause irreparable damage to those particular wetlands, and it does create a potential danger to those residents living in that Darien/Stamford area on the Noroton River with flooding in the future. She does not agree in principle. She thinks this is really a way to get around a situation which never should have occurred in the first place. That Board is charged with the preservation of our wetlands, not coming to compromise situations in which to protect other areas in this City. She will vote No, on general principles. It should not happen. It should never occur again. And we certainly should not allow this to continue in the future.

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

A machine vote was taken on the Main Motion, to approve \$14,000, and it was APPROVED with 28 Yes, 5 No, 2 Abstentions, and 1 Non-Voting.

- (3) \$ 5,000.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655.1390 - GENERAL INSURANCE.
Additional Appropriation requested to cover unanticipated
265% increase in ASA Team Liability Insurance for softball
leagues. The offsetting additional revenue has already
been collected. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 6/5/86.
Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE:

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (4) \$350,000.00 - PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT - Code 351.5520 CONTRACT HAULAWAY -
Additional Appropriation requested to cover this fiscal
year due to increase in rates. Requested by Mayor Thom
Serrani 6/5/86. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (5) \$ 3,000.00 - HEALTH DEPARTMENT - Code 559 Various - TUBERCULOSIS CONTROL GRANT - Additional Appropriation requested for the fiscal year 1986/87. To be reimbursed by a grant requested by Mayor 6/5; Finance Board approved 6/12/86.
- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| 559.2510 Automobile Maintenance . . . \$ | 75.00 |
| 559.2740 Telephone | 150.00 |
| 559.2750 Gasoline | 100.00 |
| 559.2921 Printing , , | 175.00 |
| 559.2922 Postage. | 175.00 |
| 559.2930 Stationery and Supplies. . | 150.00 |
| 559.3736 Clinic Supplies. . , . . | 175.00 |
| 559.5130 Professional Medical Care. | 2,000.00 |
| | <u>\$3,000.00</u> |

Above also referred to HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE FOR ONE MONTH said MR. DONAHUE.

- (6) \$ 5,184.98 - REGISTRARS OF VOTERS - Code 101.3140 TOWN COMMITTEE ELECTION - Additional Appropriation requested to cover election held on March 4, 1986, for Districts 3, 5, and 8. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 6/5/86. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

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

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (7) \$ 16,526.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - Code 655. FEE-SUPPORTING PROGRAMS - Additional Appropriation requested for fee-sustaining programs. Details will be supplied. Request by _____. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said this will be HELD FOR ONE MONTH awaiting more information.

- (8) \$ 15,000.00 - LABOR NEGOTIATOR - Code 271.5350 CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION - Additional Appropriation requested due to prolonged negotiations with several City bargaining units, resulting in need for FactFinding and/or Binding Arbitrations; expenses exceeding original estimate. Requested by Mayor Thom Serrani 4/2/86. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

Above also referred to LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

FISCAL COMMITTEE (continued)

- (9) \$1,279,654.00 - LABOR NEGOTIATIONS - AFSCME Local 2657 ADMINISTRATORS CONTRACT - F/Y 1985/86 and 1986/87; 7% and 7%:

Fiscal Year 1985/86	\$ 410,791.00
Fiscal Year 1986/87	868,863.00
	<u>\$1,279,654.00</u>

Requested by Mayor Serrani 4/2/86. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

Above also referred to PERSONNEL COMMITTEE and LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMM.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (10) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET APPLICATION FOR THE STAMFORD DAY CARE PROGRAM. Amount not to exceed \$171,655.00 Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 6/5/86.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA, with Mrs. Maihock in opposition.

- (11) PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZATION OF PRELIMINARY APPLICATION FOR STATE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION CAPITAL PROJECTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986/87. Approximately 40% of final approved cost of these projects, including any additional phases, will be received directly into the City's General Fund. Projects funded through sale of bonds may also become eligible for bond interest subsidies. Submitted by B. R. Reed, Stamford Public Schools 6/12/86.

MURPHY SCHOOL: Alterations and Renovations, Phase II.....	\$1,340,000.
STILLMEADOW SCHOOL: Roof Repair & Replacement, Phase III..	250,000.
TURN-OF-RIVER FIRE DISTRICT: Schools/Code Compliance (Turn-of-River Middle School and Westhill High School).	200,000.
HART SCHOOL: Alterations and Renovations, Phase I.....	26,000.
RIPPOWAM CENTER/Fire Code Compliance.....	85,600.
	<u>\$1,891,600.</u>

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

- (12) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSAL TO PROCEED WITH THE SALE OF BURDICK SCHOOL PROPERTY FOR HOUSING as outlined in the "Request for Proposals, Purchase and Development of the former Burdick School Site."; request by Mayor Thom Serrani 11/5/85; also letter 4/19/86. Planning Board approved 11/26/85. Board of Finance approved with proviso that 20% of units be Moderate Income Housing for either sale or rental 5/8/86. Held in Planning & Zoning Committee 6/2/86,

Above also referred to PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE.

MR. DONAHUE said this is being HELD IN COMMITTEE for one month. They have a sub-committee meeting with Comm. Pacter on this item.

Mr. Donahue Moved for approval of Consent Agenda items #3,4,6,8,9,10,11. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote, with Mrs. Maihock in opposition on Item #10.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE

MRS. NAKIAN said the L&R Committee met on Monday, June 29, 1986, at 7:30 P.M., in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Committee members Nakian, David Martin, Bromley, Dudley, Maihock, Morris, Pavia, Powers, Rubino and Zelinski. Also present were Reps. Fishman, Board Researcher Sandra Schlachtmeyer, Staff Counsel Richard Robinson. On Item #1 Charles Lee, Gary Dayton, and Anne Luders from the URC, and Finance Comm. Paul Pacter;; and on Item #2 Chief of Police John Considine and Supt. of Parks Robert Cook.

She said on Item #1, the Committee voted 5-4-1, and she Moved for approval for publication. Seconded.

This is a program whereby buildings that are in the Urban Redevelopment Quadrant and the Community Development target areas, which are at least 50 years old, or designated historic, have building code violations, can be renovated and apply to the City for a deferral of their assessment. This would mean that if the assessment, due to the rehabilitation, increased by at least 30%, they would be eligible for one year where the assessment was not increased at all, and after that, the assessment would be phased in at 20% increments over a period of five years. In other words, the first year that they were in this program, they would have no increased deferral, and in the fifth year, they would be paying 100% of their increased taxes.

When we were looking into this program, we asked our Board Researcher if she could answer for us the question "If the resolution had been in effect for five previous years, how much rehabilitation would have taken place under this program; and how much would the cost to the City have been in deferred taxes?" Everybody received a very large packet of information which includes in great detail how the research was done, exactly all the steps that were taken, and the conclusions that were drawn, both by our Researcher and independently by the Urban Redevelopment Commission.

The bottom line that this Committee found was that there was very little rehabilitation that was taking place, and that the cost to the City was approximately \$140,000 per year, over the cost of the program. When this was discussed in Committee, several issues were brought up, and it is very hard because this is all projecting, finding the answers concretely, but these were the things the Committee was grappling with: the extent to which the program would be an incentive to increase rehabilitation; the extent to which rehabilitation was already being planned and would take place even without the program; and whether gentrification of the neighborhoods would be a result. Changes were proposed which would limit the program to just the historic districts, the one in the downtown URC area and the one in the South End. Also there was a proposal for raising the 30% increase to 50% for commercial buildings, and lowering it to 20% for housing. At the time, because none of this had been carefully thought out and traced through the five pages, or whatever, of the resolution, the Committee compromised by agreeing that they would submit to the full Board the resolution as it stood. Because the Committee wanted to get in-put from the general public, from the other Boards who would have a hand in this, from other City departments not just the Tax Assessor's Office, exactly how they felt about the program, and if we cut it down, we would not be getting their in-put on the program as it is written. We agreed, therefore, to present it this way.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)MRS. NAKIAN (continuing)

She wished to make clear that this is a vote for publication. According to State enabling legislation, it has to be published and a public hearing held before final adoption is voted upon. The Committee members favoring this legislation saw the program as an incentive to preserve and rehabilitate some of Stamford's few remaining historic buildings; and also to preserve and upgrade some of the vanishing stock of affordable housing. They also felt it would serve to expand tax base in the long run by increasing assessments, and provide a viable alternative to new construction. If this program were available, owners might think twice about rehabilitating what was already there rather than tearing it down and building new, which would in the long run cost tenants or commercial enterprises in the building a great deal more money. We realize this doesn't cure all problems in the area, but it was felt it would be a small but positive step, and one which we felt the City should be willing to undertake.

The Committee felt that particularly in the South End and the West End, it was possible that housing could be renovated and still remain affordable rather than banishing to new construction or high-priced condominiums; as was presented that night, a proposal from a Stamford developer who was going to renovate buildings and turn them into condominiums, and is already giving notice to tenants that they will have to leave and the prices of course are increasing dramatically. This won't solve all cases like that, but it is hoped it will have an effect of keeping some of historic Stamford and some of what is affordable. For that reason, she believes it should be passed. She will vote for it and urges everyone else to do the same. Seconded.

MR. RUBINO gave a minority report. He said L&R19.4 is a proposal which is not without its share of controversy. When it was first proposed, the L&R Committee voted against recommending it for publication some months ago. After heated discussion, the full Board voted to send the bill back to committee. In the interim, research was conducted on the cost to the City of this measure. At the June L&R meeting, after about an hour or debate, the L&R Committee voted 5-4-1 to recommend publication of the resolution. He opposes the resolution and urges the Board to vote against its publication for at least five reasons.

First, the plan won't work. The tax incentive is miniscule in comparison to the cost of such project. The ordinance requires that the assessed value of the building increase by 30% before the building is eligible for a deferral. Keeping in mind the fact that assessed values are 70% of fair market value, this means that a building assessed at \$200,000, having a fair market value of \$285,700, would need to have its assessed value increased to \$260,000 resulting in a probable fair market value of \$371,410 before it would qualify for a deferral plan. This represents an assessment increase of \$60,000, and a fair market value increase of \$85,710; therefore, an owner is required to invest something in the neighborhood of \$86,000 to have a \$60,000 assessment increase phased over a five-year period in 20% steps. Based on the highest mill rate in the City, which is 30, the savings over a six-year period would total about \$5,400. If this amount were discounted at present market rates, it would be worth about \$4,000 present value. We would be asking an owner to invest about \$85,000 to receive a benefit of about \$4,000 payable over six years. He submits this is a small amount and not an incentive. It dwarfs by comparison by Federal tax incentives

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)MR. RUBINO (continuing)

such as the 25% investment tax credit, 18-year accelerated depreciation, 7.75% CHFA rehabilitation mortgages, and other low interest sources such as Community Development.

Since the plan was first proposed to this Board, the URC pointed to New Haven and Norwalk as examples of what could result. On question at the June 30th Committee Meeting, Gary Dayton admitted to the Committee that the real incentive for the rehabs of NORWALK and NEW HAVEN were the tax incentives from the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, and the fact that Norwalk was named an Enterprise Zone by the Federal Government, and that these incentives dwarfed any incentive that our municipality could propose. Rehabs are being encouraged by the Federal and State Governments, and L&R19.4 would add little in the way of incentives.

The second reason Mr. Rubino opposes this is that L&R19.4 amounts to a giveaway program to developers who are planning rehabs anyway. Contrary to our Researcher's reports, there are significant amounts of rehabs completed or in process. For example, Woodside Green, the Davenport Hotel, the Heritage Bldg., One Dock Street, 22 Glenbrook Road, the building the Bourbon Street Restaurant is in, the building Bobby Valentine's Restaurant is in, one building on Bank Street near the Old Town Hall, the Advocate Building, and this list could go on and on. He is not sure of how many of these would have qualified for L&R19.4, but they prove that rehabilitation is going on in Stamford and that L&R19.4 would be a giveaway to many developers who would have rehabilitated anyway. Mr. Rubino wished to underscore this point by drawing attention to the photocopy of a letter on every desk tonight from Atty. John Fusaro to Mr. Clifford Perdue. As you can see, 18 units on Woodside Avenue are slated for rehab, whether or not L&R19.4 passes. Also attached is a list of 151 units, including the 18 units on Woodside, owned by the same developer, which are rehab possibilities.

(New tape inserted, resulting in loss of some of Mr. Rubino's report.)

...required. As he stated before, \$85,000 would be required on a \$200,000 assessed building in order to qualify for the plan. Such high investments would be recouped by condo conversion or by enormous rent increases. For example, in the Fusaro letter, on Page 2, in the middle of the page, those 18 units are now rented for \$350 per month. When the condo conversion is done, they will sell for \$255,000 each. This is the type of rehab that this bill aims to encourage, not modest repairs of code violations, but a radical change in affordability of the building. Such gentrification will liably, racially and economically, dispart impact. It will tend to drive minorities from traditional neighborhoods and replace them with people from higher income levels. Mr. Rubino submits to the members that the chart placed on each desk lists 151 affordable units owned by only one developer which could fall prey to gentrification, and he feels sure there will be more.

The fourth reason is that eligibility is partially premised on ^{an} existing code violation in the building. Mr. Rubino is opposed to paying lawbreakers to comply with the law. Strict code enforcement is the better route since it will result in safe housing without robbing affordability. Also, our Fair Rent Commission does have the power to escrow rents until such time as code violations are fixed.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. RUBINO said the fifth and final reason is that a better-reasoned plan that utilizes our power under Section 12.127a of the Connecticut General Statutes should be implemented. This Statute allows the Board to structure tax-abating plans on a case-by-case basis. It will allow us to use perhaps an advisory panel to choose the exact buildings we would like rehabed, and it would allow us to decide the amount of the tax incentive that should be given. This would allow us to pinpoint the projects that we would like to encourage and concentrate our tax abatement dollars so that a real incentive could be accomplished. At the same time, the Board could apply restrictions that would insure a reasonable rent.

To summarize, this plan, is at best, a giveaway to developers, and at worst, if it works, it destroys affordable housing and will have the insidious effect of gentrification of traditional neighborhoods.

That concludes the Minority Report.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said a number of members in caucus requested a copy of the Minority Report, so she asked Mr. Rubino to give a copy to the Staff so distribution can be made to Board members.

MR. BLUM said Mr. Rubino's report is an excellent one. It is something that has been going on for many years. One of the things that really bothers him of this Item #1, what effect does a Resolution have as opposed to an Ordinance. We can pass all kinds of Resolutions here, but Ordinance is law. Resolution is just what it is, just a form of feeling.

Second, Mr. Rubino mentioned 22 Glenbrook Road. He should also have mentioned 39 Glenbrook Road, in which Mr. Blum lives. Both of them are now high-priced condominiums. Mr. Blum would hate to tell you what his rent went up from to what it is now, from a low to a high, and he is expecting another rent increase. He keeps saying on this Board that the time will come in this City that one like himself and many others in the same boat. The resolution is a nice idea but it has no merit. It has no teeth. Mr. Rubino's opinion has a lot of merit. We have had moderate-income housing in the private sector. changed to condominiums; rents have gone up unbearably high.

We have a Fair Rent Commission and have had for quite a number of years, but nothing has been done, nothing substantial. It has no teeth. There is no rent control. Many middle class people have been leaving Stamford because they are being driven out because their incomes have not kept pace with the cost of living here, and when you consider the retired elderly, it is even worse because they have no expectations of increased incomes in the future, like the younger upward bound people. Even if they want to work beyond 65, or 70, they are forced into retirement and the only available work is entry level, \$3.45 or something like that! We need something better than this, with controls, as Mr. Rubino says. Thank you.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she would support protecting historic structures. They provide an unique quality to our City. However, she is totally against this new concept for structuring an umbrella over all fifty-year-old structures in these areas. It was particularly revealing to her that absentee owners owned a significant number of these structures. It could possibly become a bonanza for outsiders.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)MRS. MATHOCK (continuing)

The report states 76% of all residential structures in poor condition were absentee-owned. Mr. Mr. Selin, in his interview before the Appointments Committee, for a position on the Commission on Aging, informed us that 18% of the Stamford population is composed of senior citizens at this time. These people cannot afford any more giveaways by our City. They want to stay in Stamford where they have lived for so many years. Every time we give away a deferral to others in their taxes, we increase the difficulty for senior citizens and lower-income persons to pay our ever-increasing taxes. She is against this proposed resolution and also against spending City money for publication of it.

MR. PAVIA said he totally agrees with Rep. Rubino, Mr. Blum, and Mrs. Mathock, and he also would like to read a paragraph from this back-up material from the third person on the wall there, John Wayne Fox, "The concept is a good one said Democratic State Rep. John Wayne Fox, echoing a common sentiment among City officials. 'But if it significantly raises rents and forces out the people who can least afford it...the end result certainly is not what we want to see.'"

Mr. Pavia said, in his own words, and he has been silent for a while until an issue like this comes up, if he personally were not living at home, he would have to leave Stamford, and he knows he speaks for thousands of people, young and old, in Stamford. That is one of the reasons he ran for this Board, to hopefully protect whatever he can, and tonight hopefully it will be one of them. People who are born and raised here and try to make their livelihood here, have to be forced out! Why? Because of some New Yorker or some developer wants to get rich? He absolutely agrees with Rep. Rubino, and he hopes each Board member will truly and conscientiously represent his or her constituents who have delegated authority to each of us to protect their interests; and each of us, also, collectively, represent all of the people of Stamford. Many issues transcend just this District or that one, and we ^{must} just be wise and judge the broad picture. Please, please, vote this measure down.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said to clear up a legal issue raised by Rep. Blum on whether this is a resolution or an ordinance. Much work by the Corporation Counsel's Office has been done in this area, and specifically the State Statutes designate that this will be passed as a resolution. As done by State Statutes, which have a variety of procedural issues in terms of how it has to be published, etc., it has the force of law. It is a legislative act. It is not one of our routine resolutions. It is a very special resolution, which has a very special, State-mandated procedure and for resulting in its enforcement. So it is not like one of our regular, or sense-of-the-Board resolutions, it has the force of law. And the State law says so. That should deal with that.

Secondly, Mr. Martin, too, is concerned about affordable housing. And he is concerned about gentrification, and about people who buy up large tracts of property and hold them, waiting for the day when they, too, can get rich. He is concerned about the destruction of our neighborhoods. He suggests to everyone here that sticking their heads in the sand is not going to prevent any of those things from happening. The biggest destruction of our neighborhoods, and the thing which will make housing most expensive and have the most gentrification, will not be this resolution, but it will be the wrecking ball that comes in and tears down decaying structures that once were part of

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)MR. DAVID MARTIN (continued)

historic Stamford, but now will be gleaming new condominium high-rises. That is the direction in which Stamford is going, and what this resolution intends to do is to provide an incentive for the people of Stamford who own those historic structures, to keep them in good condition and not let them fall into disuse. In that way, we can help to preserve some of those properties. He will not say every problem has been solved. There are many more, and perhaps it would be wise if some of these people ^{who} have such a concern, were to introduce ordinances that would help us deal with some of these other problems in a more direct fashion. This resolution is not going to encourage gentrification, or raising of rents. It will encourage the restoration of properties in an historic manner consistent with the way they were originally built. Having some hand at small cost, as Mr. Rubino pointed out, in order to encourage that rehabilitation, shape it, Mr. Martin thinks that is something that is very commendable on the part of the City. Many of the incentives that have been pointed out that exist anyway, exist in many towns, yet the level of rehabilitation in our town is much below that of other cities.

And finally, Mr. Martin would like to say that the people who approved this, approved it with the full intent that there need^{ed} to be some minor refinements in the resolution. He, for one, is not completely happy with it as it is now structured. He would like to see two or three minor changes, but he agrees that it is better to put this before the public, let the concerned parties, whether they be from the Tax Assessor's Office, or the Fair Rent Commission, or any one, come forward and speak at a hearing. Based on that input, the Committee can craft something which is much better for everyone in Stamford.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a ^{machine} vote on the publication of the resolution, Item #1, L&R19.4. APPROVED with 19 Yes, 14 No, 3 Abstentions.

- (1) (L&R19.4) FOR PUBLICATION, PROPOSED RESOLUTION DESIGNATING CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE CITY AS REHABILITATION AREAS AND ESTABLISHING CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY OF REAL PROPERTY FOR ASSESSMENT DEFERRALS. Submitted by the Urban Redevelopment Commission 12/18/85. Held in Steering 12/18/85 and 1/15/86. Returned to Committee 3/3/86. Held in Committee 4/7, 5/5, and 6/2/86.

Above also referred to URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE.

The record will show that MRS. BROMLEY has Abstained. MR. ESPOSITO also Abstained. The Abstentions are recorded on the machine tally.

MR. ZELINSKI asked is this all we had to do. When this is published, is it law according to the State, the fact that we passed it tonight?

THE PRESIDENT it is not an ordinance; just a publication of this resolution. There will be a public hearing, and the Board will have another opportunity to decide if they wish to approve this resolution.

MRS. NAKIAN said there also has to be a report from the Planning Board, another element that has to be taken into consideration before being finally passed.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) (L&R19.11) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE BANNING THE CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOL BY MINORS ON PUBLIC PROPERTY. This would include schools, school grounds, parks, and other municipal land and facilities. Submitted by Reps. David Martin, Ruth Powers, James Dudley, and Maria Nakian, 6/6/86.

MRS. NAKIAN said this is being HELD IN COMMITTEE. The majority of the members on the Committee were in favor of the ordinance; however, the question was raised as to the legality of passing an ordinance in the absence of enabling legislation. In the opinion of Corporation Counsel, the State Statutes neither regulate the consumption of alcohol by minors nor give the power to regulate this to municipalities. Those municipalities which have passed ordinances dealing with this subject seem to have done so under the provision of general police powers, not under anything contained in the Liquor Control Act. In addition, there is new legislation which has just been passed in the State and will take effect on October 1, 1986, which will ban the possession and consumption of liquor by minors in public places; and as of October 1st of this year, that would preempt municipal legislation. Therefore, because we don't seem to have the right to do anything and because it will really be only for a two-month period before it was preempted by the State, we voted tonight, by a vote of 8-0, to hold this in committee.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

MRS. FISHMAN said the Personnel Committee met on Tuesday, July 1, 1986, at 7:30 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. Present were Reps. Morris, Burke, Pavia, Jachimczyk, and Comm. Paul Pacter.

- (1) PROPOSED RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY OF STAMFORD GIVE CONSIDERATION TO INCREASING PENSION BENEFITS TO ALL RETIREES, IN ALL FOUR PENSION PLANS, BY FIVE PER CENT (5%) FOR THOSE WHO RETIRED BEFORE 7/1/82. This would increase the City's annual pension cost by approximately \$197,000. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/15/86. Board of Finance approved 2/13/86. Held in Committee 3/3, 4/7, and 6/2/86. Held in Steering 4/16/86.

MRS. FISHMAN said Item #1 is being HELD IN COMMITTEE until an actuarial report has been presented.

- (2) FOR APPROVAL, PROPOSED RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE CITY OF STAMFORD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN FOR VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION OF ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES (INCLUDING CITY OFFICIALS)--457 PLAN. Submitted by Personnel Director S. Bernstein 6/16/86.

MRS. FISHMAN said this is a plan that is going to be for all City employees, to take part in a Deferred Compensation Plan offered by The Copeland Companies. This is what is called a 457 Fund and is available only to government employees and will encompass a variety of funds for investment. This particular plan compares favorably with that of the United States Conference of Mayors' Fund which is very limited. This will cost the City nothing, as the company will get their commissions from the Funds and a \$20 annual management fee from each participant. She hopes that everybody will support this.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

ACTING PRESIDENT JOHN BOCCUZZI asked if Item #2 were Seconded. Seconded.
Any discussion?

MR. ZELINSKI asked how long The Copeland Companies of New Jersey, a Delaware corporation, have been in business.

MRS. FISHMAN said they are part of The Travelers Insurance Company, and she does not know how long they have been in business. However, Travelers Insurance Co. is well-known.

MR. ZELINSKI said the back-up material dated June 16, 1986 from Sim Bernstein to President Sandra Goldstein regarding the resolution itself, it mentions on Page 1 under the Agreement: "WHEREAS, the Administrator in conjunction with its affiliate corporations..." and it lists H. C. Copeland & Associates, Equities, Inc., H. C. Copeland Financial Services, Inc., and Intangible Marketing, Inc." Mr. Zelinski asked if any of the principals, stockholders, or employees of any of these affiliates or the main corporation, reside in the City of Stamford.

MRS. FISHMAN said she has no way of knowing that.

MR. ZELINSKI said, again referring to Page 1, it mentions under the Agreement: "WHEREAS, the Employer desires to engage the Administrator, (The Administrator being H. C. Copeland), as the exclusive administrative contractor and marketing organization for the Deferred Compensation Program. It also mentions on Page 2, under the Administrative Responsibilities, that it is to assist the Employer in the selection of companies providing the best savings and investment products for the Deferred Compensation Program." That's #3. No. 6 says "to provide an adequate number of licensed and trained representatives to explain and then enroll employees who desire to participate in the Deferred Compensation Program." Again, under Employer Responsibilities, it read #2 under C heading: "Present to its employees only those investment products approved by the Employer and provided by and through the affiliate corporations of the Administrator." Again, does this mean the City employees would only have the choice of the ones that have been approved and recommended by this company and would not have any choice at to their own personal financial institutions in which they may want to take out a Deferred Compensation Plan?

MRS. FISHMAN said she understand that each Copeland has a list of about 60 different things that people can invest in. However, on consultation, they pick six which were the most commonly used. The people who take part in this Plan have the ability to change what they invest in from day-to-day if they want to. Even if they are limited to six choices, they can decide whether they want to invest in the stock market, in the bond market, into mutual funds, into to a money market fund; they have a great, large number of ways of investing their money. This whole thing is voluntary. They don't have to do it if they don't want to, and it is a Plan that is only available to government employees. She finds it hard to follow some of Mr. Zelinski's questioning, as he puts so many things together. Does this answer everything he wants to know?

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI said he has one final question. Does the Chairperson of the Committee know whether the City employees or their Union representatives have been consulted as to their feelings, if they are in agreement with this company and that only six plans can be chosen from, as far as their Deferred Compensation Agreement is concerned?

MRS. FISHMAN said she really does not know that answer. She thinks they have known about it and they have had an opportunity to express any feelings they had on it. They did not come to the Committee on it.

MR. ZELINSKI said that under the Agreement, it specifically states under "D. Compensation" that the Administrator, who is the Copeland Companies, shall not receive or be entitled to any compensation or remuneration from the Employer for performing the services required by this Agreement. Their so-called compensation comes from enrolling of City employees in the specific plans, in this case, six, which they have to choose from. If they don't choose one of the six, they cannot enroll or take advantage of this particular program, which he feels is a very fine program. The Board of Education has it; other municipalities have it; and it is good. He also feels very strongly that the employees should not be limited in that regard.

One last question, are there any fees or expenses that would be incurred by City employees for enrolling in a Deferred Compensation Plan by the Copeland Companies?

MRS. FISHMAN said as she stated previously, there will be an annual \$20 fee to each Participant, as is in the material, plus whatever money the company gets from the fund that they manage, in the normal way.

MR. ZELINSKI said under Definitions in the back-up material, it does specifically raise that issue. ² On Page 1, under Introduction: 1.2 Purpose of the Plan, Definitions "Account" - the bookkeeping account maintained for each Participant reflecting the cumulative amount of the Participant's Deferred Compensation, including any gross income, gains, losses, or increases or decreases of market value attributable to the Employer's investment of the Participant's Deferred Compensation, and further reflecting any amounts accepted as a transfer under Section 5.04. any distributions to the Participant, and any fees or expenses charged against the Participant's Deferred Compensation." It doesn't say in any of the material that Mr. Zelinski has seen that they actually list what those expenses or fees can be, which means that they can be anything that the Administrator decides that they would want to charge the employee, which means that a portion of their particular contribution could go for fees and expenses. Because of these questions, and more importantly not giving them the benefit of allowing them to choose a financial vehicle in which to have their money invested, and because the Union representatives had not been contacted, or actually had any in-put into this proposal, Mr. Zelinski MOVED to send this BACK TO COMMITTEE for one month. Seconded.

ACTING PRESIDENT JOHN BOCCUZZI asked for discussion on the Motion to Return to Committee.

MR. DUDLEY Moved the Question. Seconded. A voice vote carried the Motion.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

ACTING PRESIDENT JOHN BOCCUZZI called for a machine vote on the Motion to Return to Committee. DEFEATED with 10 Yes, 22 No, 1 Abstention, 3 Non-Votes.

On the Main Motion, the next speaker is Mrs. Maihock.

MRS. MAIHOCK thinks the deferral plan would be very helpful to new City employees. She would certainly be supportive of the concept of giving City employees such an option. However, her concern would be if the Administrator who is mentioned in this literature, is entrusted with the City employees' funds, and should suffer any severe financial problems, would the City in any way be liable for reimbursement of these funds. Do we release all responsibility for any financial redress when the employees enter this plan? That is one of the reasons that Mrs. Maihock would like the Corporation Counsel's opinion on that particular facet.

MRS. FISHMAN said the covering letter of June 16, 1986.

MRS. MAIHOCK said the letter of June 16th states "The Corporation Counsel's Office is in the process of reviewing the documents for form, and we will confirm approval by the end of this week. Paul Pacter or I (Sim Bernstein) will be available to answer any questions you may have in this regard."

This letter does not state anything about the Corporation Counsel giving us assurance that the City will not have a liability for this, and we should really find that out before this Board indulges in something like this.

MRS. FISHMAN said Mr. Pacter was at her meeting and gave them assurance then.

MRS. SANTY asked what letter are they referring to?

MRS. FISHMAN said the one dated June 16th. She cannot lay her hands on it, but Mr. Pacter did state there was no problem.

MR. BURKE said the employee in signing the enrollment form absolves anyone other than himself. All the City is doing is acting as a transfer agent, taking the money authorized by the employee to be put into another vehicle. As a transfer agent, the City assumes no liability whatsoever.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that may be the usual pattern, but she would like to know definitely and be assured that we will not suffer any liability, and she would like to have that very same assurance from the Corporation Counsel. If we can have that in writing from the Corporation Counsel, Mrs. Maihock is all for it. She is in favor of this item.

MR. MORRIS said he has nothing to add.

MR. BLUM said this being a municipality, we have the last say-so to vote yea or nay on something like this, he sometimes wonders if all the municipal employees, and that can be from the top to the bottom, as the resolution states that elected and appointed officials are all to be designated as "employees" in this matter; and we have to really think if we are talking about a municipality, he can see a plan like this coming before a private

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)MR. BLUM (continuing)

enterprise, it goes on every day in a private enterprise in the top echelon where they want to defer the high salaries and dividends and other "perks" or remuneration that will not be taxed at current income tax rates, but will be equivalent to a pension after they retire and their taxes are lower. We are a municipality and we get grants from the Federal Government. Are the proposers of this plan saying to us that the government wants to defer taxation to the Feds? Why are we taking the grants, then?

MRS. FISHMAN said the letter of June 18, 1986 from Paul Pacter, on Page 3, Item 5, says: "The employee bears the investment risk and can minimize that risk by selecting conservative investment options. Literally thousands of cities and towns throughout the U.S. have 457 Plans. Plan administrators tell us that, usually, 80% of the participants choose to put their money in the guaranteed fund."

To her, that statement says that the City does not have the risk, that the employee has the risk. This is a follow-up to the letter of June 16th.

MR. JACHIMCZYK said he would first like to answer one of Mr. Zelinski's concerns. As he recalls, at their meeting, Comm. Pacter, when asked about the limited number of options offered, said that when, and if, this is enacted, the Committee which would be formed, which is outlined in the resolution, they then, when they meet, can choose to increase or decrease the amount of options available to the employees, so that number that is in this Agreement is not set in stone. They will have a variety of options, if the Committee which is made up of:

- (a) Finance Commissioner
- (b) Personnel Director
- (c) Benefits Manager
- (d) One member of the Board of Finance
- (e) one member of the Board of Representatives

choose that they need more options available. I just basically think that this is a very good plan. In view of the fact that there is talk in Washington that the I.R.A.s may be disallowed in the new tax legislation, this particular heart of the tax bill is safe - it is not in any of the conference committees. This will remain ⁱⁿ effect. Mr. Jachimczyk thinks that by choosing to enact this legislation, this Board in the future, hopefully, if we have good labor negotiators, will be giving ourselves a better bargaining chip with the unions by saying we have given them this fringe benefit - now we would like something in return.

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

ACTING PRESIDENT BOCCUZZI called for a machine vote on Item #2.

APPROVED with 26 Yes, 6 No, 3 Abstentions, and 1 Non-Voting.

- (3) REVIEW OF MERIT RULES. Submitted by Rep. James Dudley 11/18/85. Held in Committee 12/16/85 and 1/13/86. Held in Steering 1/15/86. Held on Pending Agenda since 3/3/86.

MRS. FISHMAN said the Committee met with the Personnel Commission. She asked Rep. Dudley, the Co-Chairperson of the Personnel Committee to give the report on that.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (continued)

MR. DUDLEY said, after two terms on the Merit Rules, and this goes back to the last Board, they did complete the Committee's work, and submitted a detailed list of recommendations from the Personnel Committee to the Personnel Commission. They have met with the Personnel Commission and will be meeting with them again in the future. Mr. Dudley is pleased to report that the Personnel Commission is working very closely with the Personnel Committee. They have taken heed to many of the Committee's recommendations already and are working them into their Merit Rules, and the name will be changed from Merit Rules to a more suitable one. In addition to that, they have come up with a rather unique format which, once the total revision is done, there will be a public hearing held on the Merit Rules and every one will have an opportunity to review the Merit Rules at that time. Mr. Dudley wishes to thank the Personnel Committee because this has been a long-time, and on-going matter, not just the 19th Board's Personnel Committee but the 18th Board's as well, for the work that has already been done.

MRS. FISHMAN said that concludes her report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

MR. JACHIMCZYK said there is no report.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE

MR. LYONS said there is no report.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MR. MORRIS said his Committee met on Wednesday, June 25, 1986, at 8:00 P.M. in Conference Room II at the Board of Education Bldg. Committee members present were Reps. McGrath, Burke, and Morris. Also in attendance were Audrey Malhock, Chairwoman of the Environmental Protection Committee, which is the secondary committee on Item #3 on the H&P agenda. Eric Reinken, Esq., Asst. Corp. Counsel, Dr. Ralph Gofstein, Health Dir., John Keenan, Fire Marshal of the Long Ridge Volunteer Fire Dept., and Richard Morris, a licensed plasterer.

- (1) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 8-46 PUNISHMENT FOR VIOLATION OF THE ANTI-LITTER ORDINANCE - Stamford Code of Ordinances - submitted by Rep. Scott Morris 3/12/86. Held in Committee 4/7 and 6/2/86. Held in Steering 4/16/86.

MR. MORRIS said the Committee voted 3-0 to approve the publication of the proposed ordinance as amended by deleting Section 8-46 of the Anti-Litter ordinance as it now stands, and substituting in lieu thereof the amendment dated 7/3/86 and received by all Board members and he so Moves. Seconded.

There was no discussion on Item 1, and the President called for a voice vote, which was APPROVED.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE (continued)

- (2) MATTER OF LITTER AND THE VIGOROUS ENFORCEMENT OF THE LITTER ORDINANCE. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris 1/7/86. Held on Pending Steering Agenda since 2/3/86. Held in Committee 6/2/86.

MR. MORRIS said this item has been HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (3) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING BLASTING PERMITS IN UNSEWERED AREAS. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris 6/13/86. Re: Letter from Dr. Gofstein, Health Director, 6/13/86.

Above also referred to ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

MR. PIA said his Committee met on Thursday, June 26, 1986, at 8:00 P.M. in the Board of Education Bldg. In attendance were Reps. McGrath, Rybnick, Powers, Pia. Wm. Heins was excused. Also in attendance were Staff Counsel Eric Reinken, Deane Pomeroy and Gary Peterson of the Parks Dept., and the members of the Junior Blades Skating Club of Terry Connors Rink. The Committee met and voted 4-0 on the following items: to Hold in Committee Items 1, 3, 4, and 6. He Moved to the Consent Agenda Item #7.

- (1) REPORT ON PRESENT CONDITIONS AT ALL CITY BEACHES. Submitted by Rep. Ruth Powers 2/3/86. Held in Committee 3/3, 4/7, and 6/2/86. Reports made 5/5 and 6/2/86.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 175-1 (15-I) OF THE STAMFORD CODE OF ORDINANCES TO AMEND SECTION 2 OF THE STAMFORD PARK REGULATIONS BY ADDING: "NO PERSON SHALL: (5) POSSESS, SELL, OR CONSUME ANY ALCOHOLIC LIQUOR AS DEFINED IN SECTION 30-1(3) OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES IN ANY PARK AFTER 9:00 P.M." Submitted by Robert Cook, Parks Supt., 5/7/86. Park Commission approved 5/6/86. Returned to Committee 6/2/86.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said there appears to be a problem with Item #1. She wished to know from the Parks Chairman if he plans to have a report on this next month? This refers to Item #1.

MR. PIA said yes, they would have a report next month.

On Item #2, Mr. Pia Moves for approval. Seconded.

MR. DUDLEY said this was originally proposed for an eight o'clock time period. At that time we had discussed a ten o'clock time period. Nine o'clock was a compromise that was reached. The most important thing here is that we can

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)MR. DUDLEY (continuing)

legislate, and we can pass rules and regulations, and they are no good with the lack of enforcement. He is in favor of nine o'clock. He is a little hesitant but he would be in favor of the nine o'clock, although he tends to think ten o'clock would be better. Whether it is eight, nine, or ten o'clock really has no bearing, as the main thing here is that any law or regulation that we pass has no bearing whatsoever unless we get the enforcement. He has heard in the past that we can't enforce until this, or we can't enforce until that time, so when are you going to enforce? It is time, now, to enforce regulations and legislation that we enact. Everything we have on the books should be enforced, whether it be an ordinance, or a park regulation, or whatever. He will support the nine o'clock, and he urges his fellow Board members to support it.

He would also like to send out a message to those who should be enforcing this, to do their job and to do it right.

MR. ZELINSKI Moved to amend the time to read eight p.m. instead of nine p.m. Seconded.

Tonight on our desks is correspondence from Parks Supt. Cook, and Mr. Cook said the Parks Commission voted, at their June 3rd meeting, unanimously to re-submit to this Board their recommendations regarding this, and that the resolution read eight p.m. In his last paragraph, he states: "The Commission strongly supports an eight p.m. curfew as the most effective means of reducing the problem of drinking in our parks, while at the same time, not unduly penalizing the responsible park users." And they say the Park Commission emphasizes this is an amendment, in addition to the current park regulations, and not a change in the ordinance itself that provides for these regulations.

He does not think we should get bogged down as far as eight, nine, or ten p.m. is concerned. We have to give credence to the Parks Commission and also the Parks Dept. staff, namely, their Special Police officers and other personnel who would be enforcing this regulation, or resolution, which is part of a regulation. As it gets darker, it would be more difficult to see if a person is drinking a can of beer or a can of soda. We are not trying, in any way, to prohibit people from enjoying our parks. What this is doing is asking and mandating that the residents discontinue drinking at a certain hour, and eight p.m. is not an unreasonable hour. It is one hour less than nine p.m. Mr. Zelinski strongly supports the resolution. It is long overdue that we have control over the drinking of alcohol in the parks, and he thinks we should give the Parks Commission and their staff to have an opportunity to enforce it, and if they find that eight p.m. will do a better job and help enforce this, then we should give it to them, and it would be a sad mistake tonight if we get bogged down for one hour either way, earlier or later. He hopes the eight p.m. amendment can be passed tonight.

MRS. McGRATH said she agrees with Mr. Zelinski and with the Parks Commissioners. At the meeting Mr. Gary Peterson, the Head Ranger, gave several reasons why they wanted it at eight p.m. We argued and we cajoled and we tried to talk him into nine p.m., but they were very strongly convinced that eight p.m. would help them do a better job in enforcing the regulation and in trying to control the situations that they wanted to take care of at the parks.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)MRS. McGRATH (continuing)

In response to Mr. Dudley's remarks on the strict enforcement, that is why they did ask for an eight p.m. time limit on the drinking in the parks, that they could in fact control it and enforce it to the best of their ability, and they thought they could do a much better job if they had that one hour of daylight. She strongly urges the rest of the Representatives here to support the Park Commission in their endeavor.

MR. BOCCUZZI is against the amendment which reduce the time down to eight o'clock. If you go down to the parks on any given evening, you will find that the athletic activities that go on in the parks are going pretty strong around eight o'clock. There is softball, hardball, boccie leagues, etc., etc., being played. These activities get finished after eight o'clock. Even our own softball game gets finished after eight o'clock, when we play against the Mayor's Team. If you reduce the hour to eight, you are not solving the problem. What you are doing is saying to those people who have a sociable can of beer after a ball game and go home, that they can't do it. Then what you are saying is that the people who are giving you the problem, are never there at eight o'clock anyway. They don't hit the parks until after nine o'clock. Mr. Boccuzzi feels the eight o'clock time does nothing but hurt those kind of people who are paying for the parks, who are enjoying the parks, and are not causing any disturbances. He firmly believes that this resolution should go into effect with nine o'clock as that is when the problem starts.

MR. SIGNORE said he takes issue with Mr. Boccuzzi. He does not think it follows that after you play in a ballgame, you have to stand there and have a can of beer. You can go home and take a shower and go out and have a couple of drinks at the local pub. They don't have to drink on City property and raise Cain on City property and cause problems. He is going to vote in favor of Mr. Zelinski's amendment.

MS. POWERS is in favor of the nine o'clock curfew. When you start to work on one of these items on the agenda, it gets lost from where we really started from to begin with. It started with the request to ban alcohol by minors, and to work on impositions of curfew for drinking. We were told by Corporation Counsel that it was illegal to ban drinking by minors. So as a compromise, the Committee worked on this and found that nine o'clock would be fair. The real thrust of this when the Committee met with the Mayor's Office, and we met with the Police Dept., and representatives from other organizations, was really to be on drinking or not drinking by minors on public property. And this is a temporary regulation for the parks to use until the strong ordinance comes from the State which will be effective Oct. 1st as Mrs. Nakian outlined. Ms. Powers would be in favor of nine o'clock. It is not right to penalize other people, when the real object of what we wanted to do was ban drinking by minors.

MRS. SANTY takes exception to both Mr. Boccuzzi and Mr. Signore. I don't think you need a can of beer, and you don't have to go to a local pub. She is very happy with a soft drink. Aside from that, the Parks Dept. came to this Board and asked that we give them a better regulation, and are we not here to assist the departments to better serve the people of Stamford? If they feel they can enforce it better, aren't we here to do what they ask us to do? Isn't it worth a trial?

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)MRS. SANTY (continuing)

You see so much in the papers and in the media about the drinking with young people today. We don't know exactly where the problem is. It exists out there, and one hour, eight o'clock, is not going to hurt anyone. If they so strongly convinced the committee, as Mrs. McGrath and Mr. Zelinski said, Mrs. Santy feels that is what we are here to do. The parks should be used for athletic events, as well as picnics and outings, and we are not condoning or regulating drinking, but we should assist the boards and commissions and our employees to do a better job for our City, your City. She hopes the Board supports the eight o'clock curfew.

MR. BLUM said parks are for people's enjoyment. A few years ago, the same thing came up, but we were not talking about alcohol; we were talking about a curfew. We finally went along with the Parks Commission and they promised to solve the problem and get everyone out of the parks by ten o'clock, and we voted for ten o'clock. Now we are not talking about minors; we are not talking about alcohol. We are telling people to get out of the parks. We are going to put up a sign indicating a curfew and the parks must be vacated by eight o'clock. What are parks for...

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN interjected and reminded Mr. Blum that the discussion was on alcoholic beverages, not a curfew.

MR. BLUM said, yes, we are talking about an eight o'clock alcohol ban. And that is for everyone. Then, everyone who drinks liquor must leave the park, right?

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said this is a ban on alcoholic consumption. Mr. Zelinski's Motion is for eight o'clock, it should be made clear that this is not a curfew for people to leave the premises.

MR. BLUM wonders if Mr. Zelinski will advise who it is that Mr. Zelinski wants to leave the park at eight o'clock, or when does he want to deny them the privilege of drinking there?

MR. ZELINSKI said he does not want anyone to leave the park. He just does not want anyone to drink after eight p.m.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said she is not going to Move the Question, and she is not as confused as Mr. Blum, but she is a little confused as to why we would like to see this particular item passed. She is not convinced, and she is speaking to the eight o'clock amendment that was made by Mr. Zelinski, but when she is against something, she is against it at eight o'clock in the morning as well as she is at eight o'clock at night. It appears that if the concerns of the Board are what some of them allude to and that is to protect these kids, but we only want to protect them because the Parks Dept. says they can only control the protection of the problem at eight o'clock at night. If you are committed to protecting them, why then would we be making a priority, as a legislative body, to protect not only in the parks, the beaches, whatever, as far as enforcement is concerned. She could on and on why she does not think that our commitment is as deep as we profess it to be. She will vote for this because some of you are so convinced that this is going to help the problem be solved. She is not doing it because of the reasons she just enumerated, but her commitment is to save a life, or to protect you,

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE (continued)MS. SUMMERVILLE (continuing)

I am going to try and protect you from the time you leave work, or the time you leave school, or the time you leave your home, until you return. Some examples are she serves on the Drug Liberation Board here in Stamford and was a vice-president for many years. She has never see a drug item come before this Board, or any kind of legislation before this Board before this Board as far as enforcement by the Police Dept. or the State, become a priority. It amazes her because she knows the problems in the parks are much more serious as it relates to drug abuse than it does to alcohol. Some people say the Police Dept. wants this eight o'clock restriction. Also, that additional officers are needed to do an effective job of enforcement. Ms. Summerville drives every day to work in Southfield Village. She goes from lunch, home, and back, and every day she passes the Majority Leader of this Board, Rep. John Boccuzzi, who can witness this. Public streets, the public entrances right off the Thruway I-95, where all kinds of persons get lost, have to detour to come into the mainstream of this City and barely can go up and down the street in Southfield Village without being asked what would you like? Crack? Coke? And on, and on, pure dope, etc. She also sees the police there, enforcing the law, and before she can get back from home, the same persons she saw arrested and taken down in a police car, before she can get back home for lunch, back to her office, she sees that person back out there doing the same thing exactly. She does not want to burden you, but asks that you search your conscience. If this particular item is going to save a life, she is going to vote it. Let us all re-commit ourselves and solve this problem.

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

THE PRESIDENT called for a machine vote on the amendment to change the time from nine to eight. DEFEATED, with 14 Yes, 20 No, 1 Abstention, 1 Non-Voting.

MR. JEPSEN Moved the Question.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Lyons was first on the list to speak to the Main Motion.

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

MR. BURKE made a Point of Information. He asked if this would be effective upon enactment. The President said no. It will be sent to the Parks Commission on enactment, but it really is up to them to decide whether to go along with it. Mr. Burke said then it is really a "wish list". The PRESIDENT said that is not really accurate. They came to us with a recommendation. We changed their recommendation. Now they can either go along with it, or not go along with it.

A machine vote was taken and resulted in APPROVAL with 34 Yes, 1 Abstention, and 1 Non-Voting.

31. MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING - MONDAY, JULY 7, 1986 31.

- (3) PROPOSED RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF THE TRAFFIC ISLAND AT THE INTERSECTION OF STRAWBERRY HILL AND HOYT STREET TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE PARK DEPARTMENT AS A PARK AND TO BE NAMED "STRAWBERRY HILL PARK". Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 5/12/86. Approved by Park Commission 5/6/86 and has consent of the Commissioner of Public Works.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (4) MATTER OF REQUEST OF JUNIOR BLADES SKATING CLUB OF TERRY CONNORS RINK FOR A REDUCTION IN THE RATE FOR ICE TIME. Submitted by Rep. Thomas Pia, 6/4/86.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (5) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG TWO BANNERS, ONE OVER SUMMER ST. and ONE OVER BEDFORD ST. FOR AUGUST 10th to 30th, to publicize annual parish fair. Requested by Gerry Lynch Katz, Publicity Committee, St. Leo's Church, 460 Hunting Ridge Rd., Stamford, 5/28/86.

A voice vote was taken and Item #5 was APPROVED for Aug. 10th to 30th.

- (6) REPORT ON CONDITIONS OF SOFTBALL FIELDS. Submitted by Rep. Mildred Perillo 4/16/86. Reports made and Held in Committee 5/5 and 6/2/86.

HELD IN COMMITTEE.

- (7) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ACROSS SUMMER ST. FROM Oct. 6th to Oct. 18, 1986, from YMCA, 909 Washington Blvd., 06901, Wm. G. Kane, Assoc. Genl. Dir., 6/18/86.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES TO CONSIDER AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA

MR. PIA Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the agenda. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote. This to hang a banner on Summer St. for Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church.

- (8) REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER ST. AUG. 25th to SEPT. 8, 1986 FROM THE ANNUNCIATION GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH on Newfield Ave.

APPROVED, by voice vote. Moved and Seconded.

MR. PIA Moved for approval of Consent Agenda Item #7. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote. End of Report.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he knows items should be sent to the Steering Committee first, but he has before him an article appearing in THE ADVOCATE today, which he just does not know what to do. It is an article stating that a teenager was mugged after leaving Southfield Beach at 3:00 A.M. in the park after a beer party. He realizes we just passed a resolution on this subject, but he thinks this cannot wait for the next Steering Committee meeting. Something has to be done, and has to be done soon, to instruct the Police Department to enforce the curfew law. The curfew law on Southfield Beach is ten o'clock. This party went on until three a.m., and he cannot believe that a police car, for five hours, did not go by that beach and go down there to enforce the law. That means by the Stamford Police or the Park Police, or whatever. This is not to say this 16-year-old girl should not have been out walking the streets at three a.m. He does not know where her parents are, or if she has any, but that is beside the point. The point is that if we enforce the laws that are on the books today, we could do away with a lot of the problems that we are having at twelve o'clock, and one or two o'clock in the morning. He Moves that the President of the Board send a letter to the Police Dept. and ask that they check into the time when the beaches are supposed to be closed, the parks are to be closed, and enforce the law. Mr. Boccuzzi thinks this should not have to wait 30 days and that it is supposed to go to Steering. It should be handled at once. If anyone wants to read it, he has it here; he does not want to read it again, it is so disgusting.

THE PRESIDENT said she would would let Mr. Boccuzzi Move to Suspend the Rules to consider a letter in regard to that.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO CONSIDER AN ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Suspend the Rules. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

He Moved that the President send a letter regarding enforcing the curfew by the police. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT asked MR. Boccuzzi to give her the article. One of the important things is if the Media would assist with publicity, and the authorities enforce curfews, but that there be parents who would not permit 16 or even 18-year-olds out until three a.m.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

MS. POWERS said no report.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MR. WIDER said his Committee met on 7/7/86 at 6:30 P.M. in the Republican Caucus Room. Present were Reps. Jepsen, Esposito, Summerville, and Wider. He Moved Item #2 on Consent Agenda.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (continued)

- (1) MATTER OF A PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATIONS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD ASSISTANCE ACT. Public hearing necessary to receive proposals. The City must submit a list of certified projects to the Dept. of Revenue Services by 9/1/86. (A resolution must be considered at August meeting.) Submitted by Sandra Gilbane, Grants Director, 5/12/86.

MR. WIDER said this item is HELD IN COMMITTEE for next month. This is a very important item. On Wednesday night, at 7:30 P.M., in the Main Room of the Board of Education, we are having a public hearing. If any of the agencies in your area want to make an application to the Dept. of Revenue Sharing for money on a tax write-down basis, please ask them to have their application ready and present it at that meeting.

- (2) REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO A LICENSE (LEASE) AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, COVERING APPROXIMATELY 1,750 SQ. FT. of vacant, excess State highway land abutting I-95 at the end of Brown Ave., located within the "Non-Access Highway Right-of-Way", at a one-time charge of \$400.00 to defray costs of preparation and execution of the license; and

FOR VALIDATION PURPOSES, APPROVE THE TRANSFER BY QUIT CLAIM DEED in Sept., 1983, of approximately 7,285 sq. ft. of adjacent State-owned land, lying outside the "non-access highway right-of-way" to the City of Stamford, more particularly described on the map on file in the Town Clerk's Office. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 5/22/86. Planning Board approved 6/10/86. Board of Finance approved 6/12/86.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

MR. WIDER Moved for approval of Consent Agenda Item #2. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

THE PRESIDENT announced that we have another very lovely visitor with us this evening, Avital Kasar, from Israel, Rep. Fishman's niece. Mrs. Goldstein is happy to have her here and hopes she enjoys her stay in the United States.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

MS. SUMMERVILLE said no report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MRS. MAIHOCK said she and Terrence Martin attended the Fiscal Committee meeting regarding Items 1 and 2 on the agenda, as representatives of their Committee.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MR. CLEAR said his Committee met on Tuesday, July 1st, at 7:30 P.M. in Conference Room I at the Board of Education Bldg. In attendance were Reps. Maihock, Donahue, David Martin, Pia, Mollo, Begel, and Tom Clear. Also present and invited to speak were Paul Disario, Project Director for the Transportation Center, and David Anderson, President of SEAC. Paul Disario spoke, updating those present on the status and plans for the Transportation Center, particularly concerning the expected opening date of the parking garage. Gannett-Fleming has approved the remedial measures. The Building Dept. has approved the drawings, but no construction has started. Paul indicated and was advised that it would start in about a week. The Pedestrian Bridge drawings have been approved and they have started some reconstruction and have demolished the roof. Waiting for materials for the new roof is the biggest problem they have right now, or at least one of the problems. The South Tower drawings have not been approved by Gannett-Fleming, our consulting engineers, and no construction has started on it yet. The South Tunnel Extension drawings are not completed yet, nor have they been submitted for Gannett-Fleming's approval. These drawings will be here in about a week to ten days. The North Tower Extension drawings have not been submitted, but part of it has already been demolished and stairs have been installed to provide pedestrian traffic. The Tunnel Lobby is being demolished, and about 30% has been done. The North Tower drawings will be delivered to Gannett-Fleming in about a week to ten days. All of the steps for the Concourse have been installed, and preparatory work has been started. The Tunnel Crossing was closed on June 9th of this year and it re-opened on June 16, 1986.

The Garage construction will begin in about a week. It will take "a few months" and this is a quote from Mr. Disario; that is, a few months to complete it. We will probably not have it ready by the Fall. The Committee suggested that the Garage should be a primary focus to fix as soon as possible. It also suggested that the safety situation in the existing Tunnel be addressed by providing either police cooperation and/or some communication link with the Metro/North ticket booth. Paul agreed that he would look into this for us, but police statistical data would be necessary.

The second speaker was David Anderson, the President of SEAC. He came to give a status report on the Shuttle Bus System for Downtown Stamford. A copy of the Business Plan Information Packet dated May, 1986, is available if you ask for it. Mr. Davidson gave us the information they have developed over the last year. SEAC is a partnership between the private and public sector. It is a 45-member committee, one of the few that is larger than this Board. Two years ago it was formed to look into the flexibility of operating a Shuttle Bus System from the Transportation Center. They were able to get a \$20,000 grant from the private sector by First Stamford Place for expert research on transportation.

45,000 commuters come into Stamford each day:

85% drive by car

3% come by train

In ten years, there will be 24,000 NEW jobs created in Stamford:

16,000 will be commuters:

85% will drive

3% will take the train

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (continued)MR. CLEAR (continuing)

There are four markets for the Shuttle, basically. Of those who use the train, 60% of these commuters walk to work.

The second area is drivers up line in the Fairfield area:

15,000 people work in walking distance to the train station.

14,000 in downtown Stamford, beyond a 15-minute walk.

The mid-day shoppers, commuters who come in by train, and have no local travel accommodations.

People in the Hoyt. St., Morgan Manor, Strawberry Hill area. This is about a half-mile walk to their businesses, and they use a parking space at their place of employment.

There are basically three parts to the Shuttle Service:

Moving fixed routes from 6:00 A.M. in the morning to 10:00 p.m. in the downtown core fixed route.

There will also be a midday route which will have a 15-min. cycle.

Third, will be a Brokerage Service, which will provide a system for people outside the first two routes for companies like Pitney-Bowes, Xerox, Combustion Engineering, General Reinsurance. This is to provide their employees with shuttle service.

A Transit Manager will be hired to head this up. By that, he means the brokerage and the marketing of the Shuttle System to businesses. In the operational costs, we have some numbers here:

For the busses, it will be about - \$255,000.

The management costs will be about \$104,000.

The fare box revenue will be about \$ 84,000.

When you tally this out, you come up with about \$275,000 deficit for the first year of operation. But this figure does not reflect any of the revenues that will be derived from the brokerage of Shuttle service.

Now to talk a little bit about how Mr. Davidson would like to address the funding and the funding sources for the Shuttle. The primary source that they have keyed in on would be the use of Stamford employees and Stamford businesses, who currently have eleven separate operations that run busses for themselves and their own employees at an approximate rate of about \$35.00 per person per month.

The other funding source would be in the excise over-charges that amounted to \$37 Million that last year went back to the State. The State hasn't approved but has keyed in on the Shuttle, and they may be able to give us up to \$250,000 in the rebate for the excise over-charges that we over-paid last year.

The final area of funding would be grant money. There are UPTA grants, SWRPA grants; and we hope to recoup a good deal of money from those two sources.

Initially, Connecticut Transit busses will be used. We will start with three busses initially and expand on it on an as-need basis.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (continued)MR. CLEAR (continuing)

Dave would like the City to become one of the employers to set an example by sponsoring its own employees. David further hopes the system would begin in November. The Committee suggested that he look into getting a standard rate for the entire City with Connecticut Transit. We also encouraged Mr. Anderson to increase corporate involvement which is so critical to the success of the Shuttle System. David said that ^{of} the existing eleven companies, all of them expressed an interest and fifteen other companies have approached with regards to seeing if they can take advantage of the Shuttle System.

- (1) UP-DATE ON THE STATUS AND PLANS FOR THE TRANSPORTATION CENTER, PARTICULARLY IN REGARD TO EXPECTED OPENING DATE OF PARKING GARAGE.
Submitted by Rep. David Martin 6/5/86.
- (2) STATUS REPORT ON THE SHUTTLE BUS SYSTEM FOR DOWNTOWN STAMFORD. Report prepared for the City by SEAC. Submitted by Sandra Goldstein, President, Board of Representatives, 6/6/86.

MR. CLEAR said that concludes his report, and if he could have made it shorter, he would have.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN thanked Mr. Clear for that very complete report. It was just like being there. You did a fine and clear job.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. BURKE said there is no report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEESHOUSE COMMITTEE

MR. RYBNICK said no report.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE

MR. DeROSE said no report.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE

MRS. NAKIAN said no report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ASSESS PRIORITY ISSUES

MR. MORRIS said it will be a very short report, delivered in two very short parts, first by Mr. Blum, and the second by Mr. Esposito. He will defer to Mr. Blum,

- (1) DISCUSSION ON THE ISSUE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING - Submitted by Rep. Stanley Esposito 1/17/86. Reports made 3/3, 4/7, 5/5, and 6/2/86.

MR. BLUM said the Committee met Tuesday, June 10, 1986, at 7:30 P.M., in Conference Room I in the Board of Education Bldg. Committee members present were Reps. Rybnick, Blum, Esposito, Morris. Excused were Reps. Boccuzzi, Donahue, McInerney, and Pia. Also in attendance were Reps. Begel, SACIA V.P. Pobie Johnston, Mr. Mallozzi, President of the West Side Business Assn. and owner of several properties located on Main Street. The following representatives of New Neighborhoods: Mrs. Dwight Marshall, President; Mr. L. Barnes, Housing Director; Ms. Georgeanne Rucker, member of the Board of Directors. The primary item on the agenda was the discussion of affordable housing. Mr. Morris briefly reviewed the mid-November, 1985, legislative seminar, which laid the groundwork for the creation of this Special Committee, and the Committee targeted Agenda for its first several meetings the Issue of Affordable Housing for the City of Stamford and ways in which to approach and address the goals. Madam Chairman, it is now ten minutes to twelve. You all have copies of this beautiful report, and with that the issue of affordable housing is an on-going matter, and we are planning to invite members from various communities on what they are doing in Hartford, Norwich, and Norwalk, and how they are going about addressing this problem of affordable housing. As Mrs. Marshall brought out, "affordable" can mean a lot of things. We are talking affordable for moderate and low income units here in the City of Stamford.

MR. ESPOSITO said this Special Committee also met on June 23, 1986 at 7:30 p.m. with members of the Community Housing Coalition, which is part of Family and Children's Services. Minutes are forthcoming from that meeting and will be sent to all Board members. That concludes his report.

RESOLUTIONSREQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO CONSIDER ONE RESOLUTION NOT ON THE AGENDA.

MS. FISHMAN Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider a resolution honoring Dr. Paul Pacter. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

- (1) SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING DR. PAUL A. PACTER, COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE FOR THE CERTIFICATE OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR EXCELLENCE IN FINANCIAL REPORTING.

MS. FISHMAN said this resolution honors Finance Commissioner Paul Pacter. She read the resolution, copy of which is attached to these Minutes.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Ms. Fishman's Motion to approve. It was Seconded; and APPROVED by voice vote.

RESOLUTIONS (continued)

THE PRESIDENT presented the Resolution to Mr. Pacter. There was prolonged applause.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO CONSIDER A RESOLUTION NOT ON THE AGENDA

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to Suspend the Rules to consider an item not on the agenda, being a resolution to change the date of the next regular Board meeting. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

- (2) PROPOSED RESOLUTION to change the date of the August Regular Board Meeting from August 4th to August 11, 1986.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved for approval of a resolution reading: "BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED THAT THE REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE MONTH OF AUGUST BE CHANGED FROM AUGUST 4th to AUGUST 11, 1986." Seconded.

MR. BURKE asked if there were a reason for the change.

MR. BOCCUZZI said a lot of people are on vacation between the end of July and beginning of August, and there might be a problem having quorums at committee meetings, etc.

THE PRESIDENT called for a voice vote on Mr. Boccuzzi's Motion. CARRIED, voice vote.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

MAY 12, 1986, SPECIAL BUDGET MEETING (for fiscal year 1986/87)

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to HOLD these Minutes for next month as he felt they were not received in sufficient time to read them. Seconded. SECONDED. CARRIED, voice vote.

JUNE 2, 1986 REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING

It was Moved and Seconded to accept the June 2, 1986 Minutes.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she had 2 corrections. First on Page 13, Line 4, under Mrs. Maihock, should read "a well worthwhile activity"; "while" was omitted for some reason; and second, on the second line from the bottom, of that same paragraph, it should read "Commissioner Pacter", not "Commission Pacter". The "er" was left off.

MR. ZELINSKI said under Fiscal Committee, Item #1, for \$1,500.00 for the Mayor's Office, there ^{were} some comments that he said that were not in the Minutes and he would like to have his comments recorded verbatim.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES (continued)

MS. SUMMERVILLE told Mr. Zelinski that she would be more than happy to give him the courtesy of having his remarks recorded verbatim in the Minutes of the Meeting if he would tell her what was missing, in writing. She has to know what is not there.

MR. ZELINSKI said they are on the tapes.

MS. SUMMERVILLE asked that Mr. Zelinski listen to the tapes and tell her what was missed, in writing, and she would be more than happy to include them in the Minutes. We don't have the staff to go back and search what was missed. The gist of what was said is there. But whatever you would like, if you would give it to us in writing, we would be more than happy to do it.

It was MOVED to approve the June 2, 1986 Minutes as corrected. Seconded. CARRIED, voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS - None.

NEW BUSINESS

THE PRESIDENT said she appointed a Committee to work on the Board's Chambers for the new City Hall. Ms. Summerville will Chair the Committee and she will send around a notice of the members of the Committee. This Committee will be meeting very, very shortly, and all suggestions with relations to the Board's quarters there will be welcome, so if you have any, please let Ms. Summerville know. The President will send the notice of who the members are very shortly to all of you.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon Motion duly Moved, Seconded, and CARRIED by voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Midnight.

By

Helen M. McEvoy
Helen M. McEvoy, Administrative Asst.
(and Recording Secretary)
Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Connecticut, U.S.A.

APPROVED;

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
19th Board of Representatives

SG:AMS:HMM

Encls.