

MINUTES OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1987

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, April 6, 1987, 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 8:10 p.m. by President Sandra Goldstein, after both political parties had met in caucus.

INVOCATION was given by The Rev. Father Robert J. Valentine, Pastor
St. Gabriel's Roman Catholic Church, 948 Newfield Avenue
Stamford, Connecticut.

"Father, in heaven, in generations past, You taught Your people law so that all the world could see what a wise and intelligent people they were. You taught them wisdom so that they could judge between good and evil. You taught them justice so that they would protect the rights of all including the poor. We ask You to continue to bless with these same virtues that we may continue to build the most honorable, decent and just society yet known to mankind. Amen"

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

ROLL CALL was taken by Clerk of the Board Annie M. Summerville. There were 35 members present and 5 absent. Absent were Victor Biancardi (excused), Patricia McGrath (excused), Jeremiah Livingston, Katie Glover, and David Blum (excused).

The Chair declared a Quorum.

MACHINE TEST VOTE: After test votes were taken by the President, the machine was in good working order.

MOMENTS OF SILENCE:

For the late Henry Jevne by Rep. Stanley Esposito. "Mr. Jevne a long-time resident of the 11th District, along with his family, helped to develop the section of Stamford known as Revonah Woods. He will be deeply missed."

For the late Leo Harmon by Rep. James Dudley. "He was in his eighties. He will be sorely missed."

MRS. McINERNEY said that one of our longstanding public servants is ill and is home recuperating. She requested on behalf of the Board of Representatives that a special letter of encouragement be sent to Loren Jaffe, the Chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals. If anyone can send a card or drop-in, it would boost Loren's spirit. He has given a lot to the city over the past years.

APPOINTMENT:

1. BOARD OF EDUCATION

TERM EXPIRES

Vacancy due to the resignation of Anne B. McDonald (D)
as per Section 113 of the Charter.

12/1/87

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN read the section of the Charter.

MR. BOCCUZZI nominated Stan Cooper to fill the vacancy of Anne McDonald. Mr. Cooper is a financial consultant and tax service. He has been a member of the Parks Commission for the past three years. The Democratic City Committee unanimously nominated Mr. Cooper to fill the vacancy. Mr. Cooper has had long years of activities on a voluntary basis working with the Board of Education on various committees. Mr. Cooper would be an asset to the Board of Education. Seconded by many members of the Board.

MR. SIGNORE said that he has known Stanley Cooper for a few years from his seat on the Board of Education. Stanley will be a plus on the Board of Education. He will lend a certain balance needed on the Board of Education. Mr. Signore looked forward to voting for Mr. Cooper.

CLERK SUMMERVILLE cast a ballot on behalf of the Board for Stanley Cooper for the Board of Education.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN announced the vacancy for the Board of Education by acclamation has been filled with Stanley Cooper. Congratulations to Mr. Cooper.

STANDING COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE: Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN announced that the Steering Committee meeting scheduled for April would be taking place during Holy Week and the Passover Holidays. The Steering Committee will be meeting on Monday, April 20. Also, all Committee meetings from now on will take place at the new Government Center.

The joint public hearing of the Board of Representatives and the Board of Finance will be held Wednesday, April 8, 7:30 p.m. at Dolan School.

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, March 18, 1987, in the Cafeteria, Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairwoman Sandra Goldstein who declared a Quorum.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT; (continued)PRESENT AT THE MEETING:

Sandra Goldstein, Chairwoman
John Boccuzzi
Scott Morris
Audrey Maihock
Thomas Burke
Maria Nakian
Ruth Powers

Thomas Pia
Annie Summerville
Richard Lyons
Lathon Wider
James Dudley
Claire Fishman
David Martin

Thomas Clear
Barbara McInerney
Donald Donahue
W. Dennis White
Sandra Schlachtmeyer
Len Gambino, WSTC
Anne Kachaluba

1. APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda were two of the four items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered Held in Steering were William B. Herman (R) for Traffic Hearing Officer and Martin James Hurley (R) for the Transit District.
2. FISCAL COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda were all 16 items on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Note, two item from Board of Recreation not on Agenda because monies transferred from other accounts.
3. LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda were six of the seven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Ordered on the Pending Agenda was (L&R19.22) for publication, proposed ordinance amending Ord. No. 564 Supplemental concerning sidewalk cafes.
4. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Ordered Held in Steering was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. That was request from H. C. Oefinger to have his retirement period extended.
5. PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda.
6. PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda was the one item on the Tentative Steering Agenda and the one item appearing on the Addenda, being the matter of gas transmission company opening city streets.
7. HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Ordered moved to the Environmental Protection Committee was the item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda regarding household hazardous waste collection day.
8. PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda were the seven items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda and the one item on the Addenda to the Tentative Steering Agenda being request to hang banner from Stamford Power Squadron.
9. EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Suspension of the Rules approved to put an item on the Agenda and that being the Methodology for Memorial Dedications in the Government Center. Ordered on the Agenda was an item from the Pending Agenda being the Request to name floor housing Health Department in Government Center after the late Dr. Ralph Gofstein.

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT: (continued)

10. HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda.

11. URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Pending Agenda was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda regarding a meeting with URC, Canterbury Green and St. John's Episcopal Church concerning the 16 affordable units.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - No items appeared on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Order on the Agenda from the Health and Protection Committee was the item regarding household hazardous waste collection day.

13. TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Ordered on the Agenda were the two items appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Suspension of the Rules approved to order on the Agenda the matter of parking meters on Beehler Street.

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 - Ordered on the Agenda was the item appearing 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 - Ordered on the Agenda was the one item appearing on the Tentative Steering Agenda. Suspension of Rules approved to place on the Agenda a resolution Honoring the Stamford Knights of Columbus Augustine Council #41 on its 100th Anniversary.

ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business to come before the Steering Committee, upon a motion made, seconded and approved, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

SANDRA GOLDSTEIN, CHAIRWOMAN
STEERING COMMITTEE

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE - Mildred Perillo, Chairwoman

MRS. PERILLO said the Appointments Committee met on Tuesday, March 24, 7:30 at Hillandale Avenue. Present were Millie Perillo, John Boccuzzi, Stan Esposito, Jim Toohar, Ruth Powers and Tom Clear. Absent were Pat McGrath, Ann Summerville, (excused), Nick Pavia and Tom Burke (excused).

Mrs. Perillo Moved to the Consent Agenda items 1, 2, and 3.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE: (continued)SOUTHWESTERN REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCYTERM EXPIRES

- | | |
|---|---------|
| 1. <u>MR. RICHARD W. ARNOLD, JR.</u> (R)
324 Haviland Road
(Held in Steering 2/17/87) | 3/15/88 |
|---|---------|

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.SEWER COMMISSION

- | | |
|--|--|
| 2. <u>MR. STEPHEN G. PHILLIPS</u> (R)
73 Weed Hill Avenue
(Held in Steering 2/17/87) | Replacing L. Casale whose 12/1/88
term expired. |
|--|--|

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.PATRIOTIC AND SPECIAL EVENTS COMMISSION

- | | | |
|---|---|---------|
| 3. <u>MR. PATRICK J. PALADINO</u> (R)
44 Calass Lane | Replacing C. Vaccaro
whose term expired. | 12/1/90 |
|---|---|---------|

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.MRS. PERILLO Moved the Consent Agenda. Seconded. Approved, voice vote.FISCAL COMMITTEE - Donald Donahue, Chairman

MR. DONAHUE said the Fiscal Committee met on April 6, 6:30 with the following members of the Committee in attendance: Mr. Mollo, Mr. Esposito, Mr. Rybnick, Mr. Lyons, Ms. Rinaldi and Mr. Donahue. Mr. Donahue placed the following items on the Consent Agenda: Item #1 and item #13. All other items will be held this month because the Board of Finance could not act on them.

1. PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO FILE AN APPLICATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FOR A GRANT UNDER THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED, FOR DIAL-A-RIDE SERVICES TO THE ELDERLY. Funding will be in the amount of approximately \$100,000.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/26/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA.

2. \$ 5,815.60 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 341.2330 GENERAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES - additional appropriation to replace expended funds in this account for related activities. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

3. \$ 35,400.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 338-2650 NEW EQUIPMENT - additional appropriation for the purchase of a TV camera to perform inspections. Rental cost is estimated at over \$1,200/day. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

4. \$ 2,500.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 338.3711 - LABORATORY SUPPLIES - additional appropriation for specialized supplies required for study purposes and analyses. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

5. \$ 10,850.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 338-1201 - OVERTIME - additional appropriation per contract, provides personnel with overtime pay for emergency situations. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

6. \$ 1,010.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 338-2330 - GENERAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES - additional appropriation to provide for various materials and supplies necessary to perform tests and inspections. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

7. \$ 5,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - BUREAU OF SANITATION OPERATION SHELLFISH - CODE 338-2651 EQUIPMENT RENTAL - additional appropriation for boat rental required to examine situations along shoreline. Boat rental for 10 days at \$500/day. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

8. \$ 50,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - CODE 320.2210 MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS - additional appropriation request to replenish funds used for Government Center Building for the balance of fiscal year 1986/87. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/10/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

9. \$172,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - CODE 320.5550 - CONTRACT BUILDING MAINTENANCE - additional appropriation request for operating expense reimbursement paid to city by GTE for Government Center. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/10/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

10. \$ 2,702.00 - BOARD OF RECREATION - CODE 650.5540 SONITROL - additional appropriation request to provide security coverage for portion of Administration Building taken over from Aid for Retarded and now occupied by Project Music. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 2/10/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

11. \$300,000.00 - AMENDMENT TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET - additional appropriation for State Neighborhood Rehabilitation Grant No. 135-NR-5. To be administered by the Community Development Program and will be used to provide loans and grants to support historic residential rehabilitation benefitting low-moderate income families. Program will be 100% grant funded. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/13/87. Planning Board approved 2/3/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

FISCAL COMMITTEE: (continued)

12. \$ 6,000.00 - COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - CODE 240.5210 STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES - additional appropriation request for remaining five months of fiscal year 1986/87. This account is drawn on by all departments requiring stenographic services for public or private hearings under law or regulation. Request by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/2/87. Contingent upon Board of Finance approval.

Above also referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

13. PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION AND AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES FOR THE PURPOSE OF ESTABLISHING AND CARRYING OUT AN AIDS ALTERNATE SITE TESTING AND COUNSELLING PROGRAM FOR THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/10/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

14. PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF BOND ANTICIPATION NOTES FOR ALL PRESENTLY-UNBONDED CAPITAL PROJECTS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$16,956,655.00. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/12/87. Board of Finance approved 3/12/87.

MR. DONAHUE MOVED this item be approved. Seconded.

MRS. McINERNEY asked how many capital projects items were already bonded in this particular fiscal year?

MR. DONAHUE said that he did not know at this time. All the projects are approved and part of the capital projects budget approved by this Board, the Board of Finance and the Mayor. Had he know earlier, Mr. Donahue could have had the information.

MRS. McINERNEY wanted to know the amount of money approved in this fiscal year for bonded capital items?

MR. DONAHUE stated that this was the balance of the total capital projects budget that was not funded; a resolution was passed authorizing the bonding of the new Government Center and other projects that were not previously bonded. This is for the capital projects budget that we approved at the budget meeting. This is for the remainder of the items in the current capital projects budget. Mr. Donahue did not know the exact figure at this time.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on item #14. APPROVED with four no votes: Reps. McInerney, Signore, Maihock and Santy. (voice vote)

MR. DONAHUE Moved to approved the Consent Agenda. Seconded. Carried (voice vote)

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE - David Martin & Maria Nakian, Co-Chairpersons

MR. D. MARTIN said the Legislative and Rules Committee met on March 30, 1987. Members present were David Martin, Maria Nakian, Ellen Bromley, James Dudley, Ruth Powers, John Zelinski, James Rubino and Audrey Maihock. Also, in attendance was Rep. White and Richard Robinson, Staff Counsel; also Sherry Williamson for item #1. The Committee voted 8 - 0 - 0 to approve. That would be on the Consent Agenda.

1. (L&R19.31) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 220 ARTICLE II OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD CODE OF ORDINANCES. This ordinance would exempt ambulance-type vehicles from personal property taxes. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 1/6/87. Held in Committee 2/2 and 3/2/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

2. (L&R19.32) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING TAX ABATEMENT FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROGRAM OF STAMFORD, CT., INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,178.15 PLUS APPLICABLE INTERESTS AND LIEN FEES FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 107 LOCKWOOD AVENUE. Requested by Joan Carty, Exec. Director, NPP, Inc., 295 West Main Street, Stamford, CT. 06902, 1/5/86. Held in Committee 2/2/87. Approved for publication 3/2/87.

MR. D. MARTIN said a public hearing was held on item #2. No one from the public attended. The Committee approved that item 6 - 1 - 1. Moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on item #2. APPROVED with Mrs. Maihock a no vote and Mrs. Bromley abstaining.

3. (L&R19.13) FOR FINAL ADOPTION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 214-25 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BY ADDING A NEW PARAGRAPH ALLOWING AWNINGS TO ENCROACH UPON A CITY SIDEWALK. Submitted by Gary W. Dayton, Exec. Director, Urban Renewal Commission 7/30/86. Held in Committee 9/8, 12/8/86, 1/12 and 2/2/87. Held on Pending Agenda 9/17 and 10/17/86. Approved for publication 3/2/87.

MR. D. MARTIN said a public hearing was held; no one attended or spoke. Ann Luders of the Urban Renewal Commission attended. At the suggestion of Corporation Counsel, the Committee adopted an entire rewording of this ordinance. There would be no need to republish.

Mr. D. Martin Moved to amend this ordinance by deleting the entire published text and adopting the text that was distributed to all members on 4/3/87. There are no material changes. The amendment was approved by the Committee 7-1-0. Seconded.

MR. WIDER inquired about the height of the awnings.

MR. D. Martin stated that it was in compliance with the state building code.

LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said that awnings could possible have an adverse impact on the cosmetic appearance of the city; they will have advertising on them. She said the presence of awnings could be a factor in the restriction of visibility.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on item #3. APPROVED with Rep. Pia and Rep. Maihock voting no.

4. (L&R19.34) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 9-4 THROUGH 9-7 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES REGARDING SALE OR LEASE OF CITY-OWNED REAL PROPERTIES. Submitted by Paul A. Pacter, Commissioner of Finance 2/4/87. Held in Committee 3/2/87. (Awaiting opinion from Planning Board and Board of Finance.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

5. (L&R19.35) REQUEST FOR A WAIVER AND REFUND OF A BUILDING PERMIT FEE PAID BY NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION PROGRAM OF STAMFORD, CT., INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,620.00 FOR REHABILITATION AT 107 LOCKWOOD AVENUE ON PERMIT NO. 65388, 1/16/87. Requested by Joan Carty, Exec. Director, NPP, Inc., 295 West Main Street, Stamford, CT 06902, 2/23/87.

MR. D. MARTIN said the Committee approved the request by a vote of 6 - 1 - 1. Moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote to approve the waiver and refund for Neighborhood Preservation Program. APPROVED with Mrs. Maihock voting no, and Mrs. Bromley abstaining.

6. (L&R19.36) FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED ORDINANCE CONCERNING MUNICIPALITY LIABILITY FOR ICE AND SNOW ON PUBLIC SIDEWALKS. Submitted by Mary E. Sommer, Corporation Counsel 2/27/87.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. D. MARTIN Moved the Consent Agenda. Seconded. Carried. (voice vote)

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - James Dudley & Claire Fishman, Co-Chairpersons - No report.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE - W. Dennis White, Chairman - No report.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE - Richard Lyons, Chairman

MR. LYONS said his Committee met on April 1. Present were Reps. Santy, Zelinski, Biancardi, Lyons, Pavia and Rybnick. The Commissioner of Public Works was unable to attend.

PUBLIC WORKS AND SEWER COMMITTEE: (continued)

1. MATTER OF LEAF DUMPING AT COVE ISLAND PARK. Submitted by Rep. Gerald Rybnick (D) 4th District 3/11/87.

Above also referred to PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

2. MATTER OF GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY OPENING CITY STREETS. Submitted by Rep. Richard Lyons, Chairman, Public Works and Sewer Committee 3/18/87.

MR. LYONS said a discussion was held with Mr. Steeger and Mr. Soldano of the Public Works Department. The city is short on street opening inspectors. The Committee asked Mr. Soldano to prepare a report for submission to the Board. When received, all members will receive a copy.

HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Scott Morris, Chairman - No report.

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE - Thomas Pia, Chairman

MR. PIA said the Parks and Recreation Committee met this evening due to a conflict in meeting places on March 30. In attendance were Reps. Powers, Rybnick, Heinsand Pia. Rep. McGrath was excused. Mr. Pia placed items 5, 6, 7 and 8 on the Consent Agenda.

1. DISCUSSION ON ORGANIZATIONS REQUESTING PERMISSION TO HANG BANNERS. Submitted by Rep. Thomas Pia, Chairman, Parks and Recreation Committee 10/8/86. Held in Committee 1/3, 12/8/86, 1/12, 2/2, and 3/2/87.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

2. PROGRESS REPORT ON STERLING BARN THEATRE IMPROVEMENTS. Submitted by Reps. Thomas Pia and John Boccuzzi 12/15/86. Held in Committee 1/12, 2/2 and 3/2/87.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

3. FOR PUBLICATION - PROPOSED RESOLUTION TO CHANGE THE NAME OF CITY PARK NOW KNOWN AS "STRAWBERRY HILL PARK" TO "JOSEPH L. CARPINELLA PARK." Park located at intersection of Strawberry Hill Avenue and Hoyt Street. Submitted by Reps. Thomas Burke (R) 13th District and Gerald Rybnick (D) 4th District 1/26/87. Held in Committee 3/2/87.

MR. PIA Moved to approved the resolution for publication. Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI asked if a public hearing will be held on this item?

MR. PIA stated that a public hearing will be held.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on the proposed resolution (for publication) to change the name of Strawberry Hill Park to Joseph L. Carpinella Park. APPROVED with one no vote Mrs. Maihock.

4. REQUEST FOR STATUS REPORT ON CITY BEACHES. Request from Rep. James L. Dudley (D) 6th District 3/9/87.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MR. PIA said that Mr. Cook could not make the meeting. Mr. Cook reported that the stairs are finished at the pavilion. The other items that were questioned in the past are in the capital budget for this year.

MR. DUDLEY asked that this item be kept on the Agenda in case some of the items do not make it through the capital budget.

5. REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON BEDFORD STREET FROM MAY 25 TO JUNE 8, 1987 TO PUBLICIZE FESITVAL. Request from Dennis Vlahakis, Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church, 1230 Newfield Avenue, Stamford, CT 06905 3/11/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

6. REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER STREET FROM APRIL 12 TO APRIL 26, 1987 TO PUBLICIZE ART AUCTION. Request from Annette Arase, Jr. Class Advisor, Westhill High School, 125 Roxbury Road, Stamford, CT 06902 2/27/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

7. REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON SUMMER STREET FROM JUNE 15 TO JUNE 29, 1987 TO PUBLICIZE ANNUAL PARISH BAZAAR. Request from Rev. Barry J. Furey, Associate, Sacred Heart Church, 37 Schuyler Avenue, Stamford, CT 06902

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

8. REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO HANG A BANNER ON BEDFORD STREET FROM JUNE 1 TO JUNE 14, 1987 TO PUBLICIZE NATIONAL SAFE BOATING WEEK. Requested by David Winston, Safety Committee, Stamford Power Squadron, 1128 Cove Road, Stamford, CT 06902, 3/16/87.

APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA

MR. PIA Moved to approved the Consent Agenda. Seconded. Carried by voice vote.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Ruth Powers, Chairwoman

MRS. POWERS said the Education, Welfare and Government Committee met on March 23, at the Board of Education Building. Present were Reps. Nakian, Bromley, Fishman, Maihock and Powers.

EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE: (continued)

1. METHODOLOGY FOR MEMORIAL DEDICATIONS IN THE GOVERNMENT CENTER.
Submitted by Rep. Ruth Powers, Chairwoman, Education, Welfare and Government Committee 3/18/87.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

MRS. POWERS said that an amendment to the existing ordinance will be submitted.

2. REQUEST TO NAME FLOOR HOUSING HEALTH DEPARTMENT IN GOVERNMENT CENTER AFTER THE LATE DR. RALPH GOFSTEIN. Submitted by Reps. S. A. Signore and Sandra Goldstein 10/9/86. Held in Committee 11/3/86. Held on Pending Agenda since 11/17/86.

HELD IN COMMITTEEHOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE - Lathon Wider, Chairman

MR. WIDER said the Housing and Community Development Committee met on March 25, in the Board of Education Building. Present at the meeting were Reps. Biancardi, Esposito, Glover and Wider. Rep. Summerville was excused. Catherine Trentini, Director of Community Development was also present.

1. PROPOSED RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO FILE THIRTEENTH (13) YEAR APPLICATION FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD, CT. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,027,140.00 FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT. Submitted by Mayor Thom Serrani 3/6/87.

MR. WIDER said the Committee discussed the 13th year application. The Committee voted 4 to 0 to approve this resolution. Moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote to approve the resolution.
APPROVED.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE - Annie M. Summerville, Chairwoman - No report.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Audrey Maihock, Chairwoman

MRS. MAIHOCK said the Environmental Protection Committee was held on March 25, 1987, at 7:40 p.m. in the Board of Education Building. Present were Audrey Maihock, Dennis White, Scott Morris, Herbert Bijur, and Dr. Sam Kahn also appeared briefly.

1. PRESENTATION OF PROPOSED HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION DAY FOR THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris, Chairman, Health and Protection Committee 3/5/87.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE: (continued)

*See
corrected
remarks
attached
to
these
minutes*

MRS. MAIHOCK said Mr. Bijur gave a informative report. He stated that the household hazardous waste collection day for the City of Stamford is to be held to enable citizens of Stamford to dispose of articles such hazardous paints, insecticides, etc. in a safe manner so it does not possibly affect our city's water supplies. Also, to raise the conscientiousness of people about what materials are in the hazard waste category. Mr. Bijur said to buy just what is needed so surplus quantities are not stored in homes.

Mrs. Maihock said that some surrounding communities such as Greenwich and Ridgefield have already had successful hazardous waste collection days. Mrs. Maihock spoke to Mr. Brown, Director of Environmental Health in Greenwich and he was very informative. He explained the very excellent organization that characterized Greenwich's hazardous collection days. The contractor hired for the collection of materials took the materials out of the trunks of the cars, as residents, one at a time, were admitted to the reviewing area. Paints were put into a drum. The empty cans and containers were tossed into the Town's dump truck. This reduced the cost of the collection day. Also, the Environmental Protection Department arranged with local service stations to take lub oil and car batteries which reduced the amount of material to be collected and consequently the cost.

Mrs. Maihock said the state was very strict about insuring safe collections day. Mr. Bijur expects Stamford's collection day to be after Labor Day. He and the task force expect to have a very well organized day. The Board of Representatives will be asked to appropriate money for a hazardous waste collection day. Mrs. Maihock spoke with Mr. DiMattia, Director of the Library and he offered the Library's services to help publicize the collection effort. Every effort will be taken to publicize this day in Stamford, and hope that this day will be a successful one.

MRS. McINERNEY thanked Mrs. Maihock for a concise and complete report.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE - Thomas Clear, Chairman

MR. CLEAR said that the Transportation Committee meet on Tuesday, March 31, 7:30 p.m. in the Board of Education Building. Present were Reps. Audrey Maihock, Tom Pia and Tom Clear. Also present were Reps. Barbara McInerney and John Zelinski. Present also were Carmine Longo, Vincent Akhimie, Paul Disario and Arthur Selkowitz.

1. UPDATE ON STATUS OF RAILROAD STATION. Submitted by Rep. Audrey Maihock (R) 19th District 3/3/87.

MR. CLEAR said that Paul Disario informed the Committee that as of November, 1984, the project was 90% ^{completed} when design errors were discovered. The errors are being corrected. All firms are coordinating efforts as to whose responsibly the errors were. Mr. Disario said that the errors are well on the way of being resolved. The Parking Garage is operable. The garage was approved by the federal and state government. The concourse is complete. There is an area for stores; bids are being presently taken.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. CLEAR said the tunnel lobby has to be completed. That will have to be demolished and replaced. The north tower is not complete; renovations will be taken place. Mr. Disario said the operational date should be November or December of this year. The final completion date for the Transportation Center will in the spring of 1988.

Mr. Clear said that security was addressed. There will be guards at various locations in the garage, also TV cameras and patrols.

MR. WIDER asked who was to be in charge of the security and who will be responsible?

MR. CLEAR said that there is overlap between Metro North and our local police. There will be patrols by security people, by Metro North and our police.

MR. WIDER asked who will coordinate the security at the Center? He said that he wanted to know with whom he should deal with; Metro North or our police; he said all should be under one umbrella.

MR. CLEAR said that there is a multiplicity as to regards to different agencies. Mr. Clear said that various problems would have to be taken up with the various agencies.

MR. WIDER said that he has to know who is obligated to take care of the needs of that district which is his.

MR. CLEAR said that he would be happen to meet with Mr. Wider so many of Mr. Wider's concerns could be addressed.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that she understood Mr. Disario to say that there would be security in the garage 24 hours a day. She said that she believed that Mr. Disario said that no tower would be used for security. She wanted to know how effective security will be in the area around the railroad station apart from the garage. The lighting there is an improved situation.

MRS. McINERNEY said she agreed with Mrs. Maihock about the 24 hour surveillance by closed circuit television in the garage area, and the security office is in the north tower with 13 cameras and guards would be on the concourse and station place and the hours of operation for the station itself was not 24 hours a day, but technically 18 hours a day. She understood the platform area was the responsibility of the Metro North.

MR. DONAHUE said that security in general in the whole area will come under the Stamford Police Department. The security people in the garage or in the Center will be under contract to the city or to the city's contractor, Edison Parking. They do not have arrest powers. They call the police and make the complaint. Our police respond and make the arrest. Metro North has areas patrolled by their people; they don't have arrest powers. They may apprehend someone but they are arrested by our police. There is also a plan to have the Special Police in the Center to aid in security and they report to the Chief of Police in the City also. Our police will be aided by private security forces; it is the city's responsibility as far as our property and streets go.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE: (continued)

2. REVIEW AND BREAKDOWN OF FEE SCHEDULE FOR NEW TRANSPORTATION CENTER PARKING GARAGE. Submitted by Rep. Barbara McInerney (R) 20th District 3/3/87.

MR. CLEAR said all members of the Board received copies of the proposed parking rates dated 2/18/87. Mr. Clear said there will be a 90-day trial period in regards to the new parking rates. Presently, a monthly permit will cost \$45.00 for the Center; for the South Street lot, it will be \$35.00 per month. Mr. Akhimie and Mr. Longo were honest and forthcoming with their comments. Mr. Akhimie said the \$45.00 rate was competitive with other companies. 330 permits out of 435 have been spoken for. It was the sense of the Committee to have flyers handed out in the garage to obtain feed-back regarding rates, and having a gate to exit was another concern of the Committee. Exiting by the gate caused delays. Mr. Akhimie said that a police officer may be assigned to the South Street lot for traffic and pedestrian traffic.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that it seemed that the rates were set without any consideration for the commuters of this city; other communities do have such consideration. Mrs. Maihock objected to the increase in the parking rates for commuters. Mrs. Maihock said that no improvements have been made to the South Street lot and the cost went up \$5.00 a month. Mrs. Maihock said that we subsidize other things in the community such as the buses now; some consideration should be given to the commuters who pay for the fare to New York and possibly other fares as well. Nothing has been done at present.

MRS. FISHMAN did not think the rates were exorbitant.

MR. CLEAR said that a letter may be sent on behalf of the Board indicating that we would like to have the residents of Stamford have some degree of preferential treatment with regards to the rates if possible.

3. MATTER OF PARKING METERS ON BEEHLER STREET. Submitted by President Sandra Goldstein, 16th District Representative, 3/18/87.

MR. CLEAR said that Mr. Selkowitz attended the meeting regarding this item. He is a resident of Stamford and utilizes the Beehler Street parking facilities on a routine basis. Mr. Selkowitz has had problems with regards to tickets and the Traffic Department. Mr. Akhimie and Mr. Longo said they had access to the number of complaints about a specific area, and the number of failures regarding meters. They assured the Committee and Mr. Selkowitz that they would investigate further to determine if the Beehler Street area has older meters or meters not functioning properly.

MRS. McINERNEY said this gentleman brought other things to the attention of the Committee, many things that cause trauma to the commuter. For example, if he was running for a train, he could not get a newspaper without getting on the escalator and going to the second floor concourse. He cannot buy a ticket or get a cup of coffee without going up there. Mrs. McInerney said that there was no quick exit out of the garage. Mr. Selkowitz's presence was very thoughtful and he promoted a lot of good thoughts. His comments would benefit all the people using the trains.

LABOR CONTRACTS LIAISON COMMITTEE - Thomas Burke, Chairman - No report.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HOUSE COMMITTEE - Gerald Rybnick, Chairman - No report.

COLISEUM AUTHORITY LIAISON COMMITTEE - Joseph DeRose, Chairman - No report.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE - Maria Nakian and Claire Fishman, Co-Chairpersons

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN commended the Committee for all the hard work; also, Ms. Fishman and Mrs. Nakian as Chairs, and other Committee members, Ms. Summerville, Mr. Lyons, Mrs. Maihock, Mr. Rubino, and Mr. Pavia. The Committee put in many, many evenings working very hard on this entire procedure. On behalf of the Board, President Goldstein thanked the Committee on doing a fine job and a lot of hard work.

MRS. NAKIAN said the Charter Revision Committee met on Wednesday, March 11, Wednesday, March 18, Tuesday, March 24, Tuesday, March 31 and Friday, April 3, 1987, in the Stamford Government Center. In addition, a Public Hearing was held on Wednesday, April 1, 1987, 7:30 p.m. in the Government Center. Present at all meetings were Reps. Fishman, Nakian, Summerville, Lyons, Pavia, Rubino and Maihock with the exception of Rep. Lyons was absent on March 11, Rep. Summerville on March 24, and Rep. Rubino on March 31. Also present at various meetings were President Goldstein, Reps. Lathon Wider, John Boccuzzi, Mary Lou Rinaldi, Corporation Counsel Mary Sommer, Asst. Corporation Counsel Deborah Steeves, Edward Condon, Parks Department, Frank Soldano, City Engineer, Robert Cook, Superintendent of Parks, Jay Gould, Special Police, Michael Macri, Building Inspector, Phil Norgren; Lou Casales and George Connors from the Sewer Commission and from the Charter Revision Commission were David Schropfer, Tom Lombardo, Janet Vanderwaart, Judy Fishman, John Kane, and Irving Beck, Commission Consultant. Approximately 40 people attended the Public Hearing.

Mrs. Nakian said that speaking for the majority of the members of the Charter Revision Committee, she stated that they were angry with the Media coverage of the actions at the Friday evening Committee meeting, giving the impression that the recommendations in the Draft Report was an attempt to kill Charter Revision, and to deny the citizens the right to vote on Charter proposals, was irresponsible and inaccurate reporting.

Mrs. Nakian said that she would start her report this evening by clearly delineating the procedure that is outlined in the Home Rule Act. She said that the Home Rule Act states in Section 7-191, paragraphs B & C, within fifteen (15) days after its last hearing, the appointing authority shall make recommendations to the Commission for such changes in the Draft Report as it deems desirable. If the appointing authority makes recommendations for changes in the Draft Report to the Commission, the Commission shall confer with the appointing authority concerning any such recommendations and may amend any recommendations to the proposed Charter in accordance with such recommendations or the Commission may reject such recommendations.

The Home Rule Act does not say that the appointing authority shall rubber stamp the Commission's report, and immediately send it on to the voters. It does not even say that the appointing authority shall at this time, vote on questions to be put on the ballot. What it does say is that the Board of Representatives may spend up to 45 days to review the report, to seek additional information and opinions, and then make whatever recommendations for changes in the Draft Report that the

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

The Charter Revision Commission worked long and hard and came up with proposed changes to the Charter which in its opinion would benefit the City of Stamford. This is exactly what the Home Rule Act charged it to do. However, it is highly unlikely that any proposal can be perfect the first time around or please everyone involved, so the same Home Rule Act gave this Board the right of review, of valuation, and recommended change.

MRS. NAKIAN: (continuing) said that we would not be fulfilling our mandate if we did not take a hard look at the proposed draft and refer back to the Commission those areas which, in our opinion, need more thought, clarification or changes in order to achieve the common-goal of greatest benefit to the city. The Commission does not have to take our advice, but the Board has every right under State law to offer it. The Home Rule Act did not put a monopoly on wisdom with either Body. Out of the process of suggested change and conference, a process to combine the experience of the members of the Legislative Body with the work of the Charter Revision Commission should come a better proposed Charter to put before the voters. This is the mandated process and the work tonight is a necessary part of it. Any action taken this evening is not a vote to put on the ballot; nor a vote to kill; it should be a vote to improve.

To accomplish this process, the Charter Revision Committee has reviewed the entire Charter, page by page, asking questions of the Commission members, of Corporation Counsel, and those people who spoke before us. Areas of concern were identified, and on Friday evening, the Committee voted on its recommendations to be presented to the full Board so that, in accordance with the State Statutes, the Board can make recommendations for changes in the Draft Report to the Charter Revision Commission. For this evening, two packets have been prepared. One is titled, Recommendations for Change and the other is Recommendations for minor, typographical and technical changes proposed to be voted on as one item at the end of the presentation. There are also at least two packets of back-up material primarily opinions from Corporation Counsel which back-up many of the changes that the Committee has proposed. All recommendations have been incorporated into the Committee report.

MRS. NAKIAN Moved to accept the Draft Report of the 14th Charter Revision Commission as amended by the Charter Revision Committee and the Board of Representatives as the proposed 1987 Charter Revision Report. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that before discussion or amendment to this Motion, the Chair would like noted that as it is done during budget, we will have a rolling Motion. We have a list of all of the Committee's changes. We do not have to vote individually on any of them until we vote at the very end of the Report on all of them as the entire Motion.

If any members of the Board wishes to amend, or changed any of the Committee's recommendations, or any of the recommendations that the Commission made that the Committee did not feel necessary to change, they will all be accepted as amendments to the running Motion. This will be done page by page.

MRS. NAKIAN repeated the above Motion.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. SANTY Moved a substitute Motion that the Board accepts the 14th Charter Revision Commission's report as presented to the Board of Representatives. Seconded.

Mrs. Santy said that the Board appointed the 14th Commission after lengthly interviews and discussions. The individuals are highly qualified and capable who gave hundreds of hours, and we gave thousands of dollars. She said that she would have preferred many changes, and sections that she disagreed with but she felt strongly that the Commission's final report, technical changes made, should be sent to the people to decide. The voters are informed, knowledgeable and she felt that their decision should be their own and should be made at the polls.

MRS. FISHMAN said that the Home Rule Acts says that if we accept as recommended, then we are tying the hands of the Commission to make some changes of their own. If we accept, they cannot change anything. We should not do this.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that he disagreed with Mrs. Santy. He said that he sat through the voting on Friday night, and it was brought to the attention of the Charter Revision Committee through work and reports of Corporation Counsel that some of the things eliminated by the Commission should not have been eliminated; there was no other place in the Charter where substitute language was available. If we go along with the Motion, no one would have the opportunity to make any suggestions about the things that were left untouched by the Committee of this Board. The Committee should be allowed to review the book and tell the Board what the changes are and their recommendations.

MR. BURKE said that he would probably vote for this, and one reason is to reinforce Ms. Nakian's anger and to voice his displeasure. He said the only other item to come before the Board prior to this that had resulted in so many phone calls as this has, was accessory apartments. The tenor of the phone calls was much of what has been said, "why have they worked so hard and so long, intelligent people, and the Board is going to throw it out?" That is not the case. Mr. Burke said the perception that the general public received, is that this Board is going to discard the recommendations which is not so.

MS. BEGEL said that to disregard the Board of Representatives as a layer of the process in Charter Revision would be dangerous to accept at this time; to go from the Charter Revision Commission to the public. We are to act between the citizens and the government.

MRS. McINERNEY said that the people on the Commission did a very fine job. They gave what they thought would be a change for the best in the community, and commended them for their time and diligence. She said she would be ill-informed and non-cognizant of the affects of some of the changes that are within the text to arbitrarily say that the voters should vote on it. There are flaws with legal problems and they have to be corrected. She said the Charter took effect in 1949 when the town and city were incorporated; that is the government by which we operate. We would be losing some things as far as Home Rule. She said the Board has the right to look at the text and it does not stop the Commission from rejecting all, or a part, or a portion of our recommendations, and resubmitting the text. She said that all the recommendations of the Committee should be looked at and a decision made intotal. It would be a disservice to the Community to put it directly to the voters.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. LYONS agreed with Mrs. McInerney. He said that the constituents charged the Board of Representatives to execute the laws of this city; one happens to be Charter Revision. He is a member of the Committee and has problems with some of the recommendations but he would like to have a dialogue with his fellow representatives tonight. He said to vote for this Motion would be a dereliction of duty on part of the representatives.

MR. SIGNORE Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the substitute Motion to accept the 14th Charter Revision Commission's report as presented to the Board of Representatives. DEFEATED by a vote of 30 opposed and 5 in favor.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN proceeded to the main Motion which is to accept the Draft Report of the 14th Charter Revision Commission as amended by the Charter Revision Committee of the Board of Representatives as the proposed 1987 Charter Revision Commission.

MRS. NAKIAN: Underscore is text to be added. Page 1, no recommendations.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that if the Committee had no recommendations, and if anyone wants to make one, raise your hand.

MRS. NAKIAN: Page 2, section 1-10-4 - three minor changes that the Committee proposed:

1) "Public Notice" means a notice published in an official newspaper which is a newspaper of general circulation published at least once weekly in Stamford.

This is a clarification of what is in the Draft, and also a retention of the old Charter where it did specify that the newspaper had to be published a certain number of times.

2) that a notice must be published at least once not more than 30 days rather than 15 days; changing 15 days to 30 days.

3) (3) "Department or agency" shall include but not be limited to any department, office, bureau, board, commission, authority, agency program or part thereof. The reason for this being, when you have what is termed a "laundry list" of things, anything which is not in that list is determined not to be included, and this has come up in city government before when something did not have one of these names, was not included.

The Committee voted 6 to 1 in favor of this.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN stated that it was not necessary to give the Committee's vote. If the Chair sees hands, then we'll have further discussion.

MRS. NAKIAN: Page 4, section 1-40-3, should read: This Act shall take effect April 15, 1949; amendments hereto shall take effect on December 1, 1987, except that any amendments applying to municipal elections shall apply first to the municipal elections of 1989. Mrs. McInerney gave reasons for that.

MRS. McINERNEY: Page 5, section 1-40-5 Mandatory Review of Charter Every Ten Years: Mrs. McInerney made a Motion that the existing section of the Charter be retained in that section instead of changing it to the regularly scheduled February meeting of the Board of Representatives in 1996. The purpose for the February 1, 1986, was not to change it with each following Charter Revision; it was to establish a date by which we would have a mandatory review every ten years. In 1986, you had a review. 1996 the next review and then add the ten years after that.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY (continuing)

The second paragraph, the existing language be retained: Such review shall first be conducted by a Charter Revision Commission which shall be appointed not later than February 1, 1986. This is an establishment of continuity in history and should be retained. The Motion was Moved and Seconded.

MS. FISHMAN: The reason for the change was that February 1st this year fell on a Saturday or a Sunday which made it difficult to hit everything in before February 1st. This was done to facilitate this if that should happen.

MRS. McINERNEY said she did not see that as a problem because when dealing with February 1, 1986, you are talking about the first mandatory review shall take place on February 1, 1986; you were not mandating that every ten year interval from that point, it has to be February 1, 1996. You are mandating that you have to have a review every ten years.

MRS. NAKIAN said that she did not disagree with Mrs. McInerney. She has a good point that this was the first one. The problem is reconciling it with the fact that February 1 may be difficult in succeeding years. Could we ask the Commission to come up with wording which would satisfy both those requirements? That we keep the original language "shall be appointed not later than February 1, 1986" and then have them work in, "the regularly scheduled February meeting" in each successive ten year period.

MRS. McINERNEY said that that could be a workable situation.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the amendment. APPROVED by a voice vote with Ms. Fishman in opposition.

MRS. McINERNEY: Page 6, she said she had a problem with the Miscellaneous section. She did not think it was the intent of the city to do away with the support of the Library; to do away with Section 1-60-2, 1-60-3, and 1-60-4. and to incorporate other groups "may give financial and in-kind assistance to the Ferguson Library, the Stamford Historical Society, other qualified non-profit corporations and other governmental agencies."

She said the Charter is based on where we came from which was the Library, Historical Society, things of that nature. We have legislative authority and the Mayor has administrative authority and our budgeting process to include these other items which are presently being included under the Coliseum Authority. She said she would like to see the deletion of Sec. 1-60-5 and the retention of 1-60-2, 1-60-3 Library and 1-60-4 and made a Motion to that effect. Seconded.

MRS. NAKIAN said the reason 1-60-2 was deleted was because it is already covered by freedom of information. That's the Commission's rationale.

MRS. McINERNEY said the Freedom of Information Act by the State of Connecticut can be repealed at anytime.

MRS. MAIHOCK said she agreed with Mrs. McInerney. She said it was important that the public knows that it has access to records in the city.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if Mrs. McInerney would accept an amendment that we keep 1-60-2, eliminate 1-60-3 and 1-60-4 and incorporate 1-60-5 because it says, "The City of Stamford may give financial aid; it doesn't say it has to."

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said she was agreeable to 1-60-2, but not in favor of 1-60-5. It creates a lot of problems for the city in the future. We do not need to have something in the Charter that says we may give money to other governmental agencies and non-profit corporations.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that Mrs. McInerney's Motion is the running Motion on the Floor.

MR. DAVID MARTIN made a Motion to separate the 1-60-2, the Freedom of Information paragraph versus 1-60-3 thru 5 which have to do with agencies which may be supported. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to split the Motion. APPROVED by voice vote.

The first Motion will be to consider Section 1-60-2 as a separate section, and then to vote on the inclusion of 60-3, 60-4 and the deletion of 60-5.

Motion to reinstate 60-2 Moved and Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on the Motion to reinstate 60-2. APPROVED. Mr. Rubino noted as a no vote.

MRS. McINERNEY made a Motion to reinstate Section 1-60-3, the Library and Section 1-60-4, Historical Society and delete Section 1-60-5 Financial and In-Kind Assistance. Seconded.

MRS. NAKIAN said that in the back of the Charter where it deals with financial transactions and budgets, we did recommend that there be put in a phrase that would include any entity which is receiving or expending city funds or grant funds. Therefore, part of 1-60-5 would be covered there. It is not saying that anyone may receive assistance, but it is saying that if someone is receiving it, they come under the budget process.

MR. WHITE said that he would agree with Mrs. McInerney. Section 1-60-3, Library and Section 1-60-4 Historical Society has worked very well for the Community until now, why change it? Why insert 1-60-5. He would not like to see the Library and Historical Society mixed-up in terms of budget with other entities that we may not want to have them connected with.

The Charter Revision Commission has a mandate to examine the Charter. If they find nothing wrong with the Charter, then leave it alone.

MR. RUBINO asked that his vote be changed on 1-60-2. It is his opinion that a good deal of it is inoperative; it dictates a rule of evidence, and you cannot dictate a rule of evidence in a State of Connecticut court except by statute or a court ruling.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the only way you can make that change now is if there is nobody on the Board that objects to you changing your vote. No one objected. Mr. Rubino's vote will be recorded as a no vote.

MR. LYONS said that his problem with 1-60-5 is the word "may." If that could be changed to "shall" he would be happy. He believed the city is responsible for a library. In the old Charter, we were responsible for a library. He said he would vote to reinstate 60-3 and 4.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said she questioned in 1-60-5, "other qualified non-profit corporations and other governmental agencies which provide service or benefits for the general welfare of the inhabitants of the City. She said if we say shall, we are going to have a lot of other agencies, etc. that will also be entitled to this assistance.

MRS. SANTY said that Section 1-60-4, says that the City of Stamford may give financial assistance. It says the Library shall, and the Historical Society may. She thought that the Commission changed them both to may. She would recommend that it be kept as it was.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said that it has worked out well, and that is why 60-5 retains all provisions of 60-3 and 60-4. The problem has to do with the Stamford Museum. Why does the Historical Society get mentioned in the Charter but not the Museum? And why did we not allow for that. Two specific agencies are included but others are left out. The intent of this section was to merely clean-up the language that it was consistent and clear. There is no change from 60-3 and 60-4. It will continue to work as it has worked in the past. This is a simple improvement in the language.

MR. PAVIA Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to delete Section 1-60-5 and reinstate Sections 1-60-3 and 4. APPROVED by 18 yes and 15 no votes.

Everything that is being done is a recommendation, but will be deleted when it goes to the Commission.

MRS. NAKIAN: Page 8, Section 1-70-3 Terms of Office of Elective Officers. The Committee recommended to change to: The terms of office of the Mayor, the Town and City Clerk, the Constables and the members of the Board of Representatives shall be two (2) years. The terms of office of the Registrars of Voters and each member of the Board of Finance shall be four years.

MRS. McINERNEY asked about the tenure of the Board of Education members.

MRS. NAKIAN said it states that the term of office of each member of the Board of Education shall be three (3) years. No change here.

MRS. McINERNEY asked why the Registrars of Voters was not included before.

MRS. NAKIAN said that she checked and did not know whether it was by ordinance or resolution that the Board of Representatives gave them a four-year term. She assumed that it was done after this Charter provision was put in. Four-year term was suggested to be put in so that people would know their term of office.

MRS. McINERNEY said she was not talking about the tenure. She was talking to the question of are they a requirement of municipal authority or state requirement, therefore, is that the reason they have been precluded from past Charter Revision Commissions incorporated within the terms of elective officials?

MRS. NAKIAN said that she was not sure but believed they were State mandated, but many officers are State mandated. What we do is determined by the State but did not know if the Registrars of Voters was any different.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said she thought the Registrars were mandated by the State. She said the executive officer of the City of Stamford could be a city manager; it does not have to be a mayor. We can delete some positions in our wisdom as a legislative body in the future, but cannot delete the Registrars of Voters because it is mandated by state law.

MRS. McINERNEY said she did not know why it was being incorporated now since it was never addressed in the past. She did not think this was necessary.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to delete the Registrars of Voters from the recommend change. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on Mrs. McInerney's Motion. DEFEATED.

MR. RUBINO: Page 8, Section 1-70-3. Mr. Rubino Moved to accept the Commission's recommendation with respect to the term for mayor for all the reasons stated in Mrs. Santy's original Motion to accept the entire proposed Charter. Seconded.

MR. WIDER wanted clarification on the mayor's term in this section.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN stated that the Commission proposed a four-year term and the Committee recommends a two-year term. Mr. Rubino's Motion is to accept the Commission's recommendation.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said that if a four-year term for mayor is established, we would be the only city in Connecticut of our size and form of government that has done so. He said the Board of Finance has four-year terms and elected every two years and if the mayor has a four-year term, forever, half the members of the Board of Finance will be never elected on the same time the mayor is elected. Mr. Martin said rather than change everything, stay with what we have now which is working.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that he did not agree that the mayor should have a four-year term and the Board of Representatives a two-year term. He thought the terms should be the same. He was not in favor of the Motion as it now stands; the mayor for four years.

MR. DUDLEY asked Mr. Rubino if he could amend his Motion to include the Board of Representatives for four years.

MR. RUBINO said that that would be fine.

MR. DUDLEY Moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked the Parliamentarian Mr. Donahue if that was an acceptable Motion.

MR. DONAHUE said that he believed that it was acceptable. However, he said that we are going to run into a situation where we have to be very clear. If there are going to be other amendments to also consider the Board of Finance, and other amendments to consider the Board of Education, another amendment to consider the Constables, and he believed what we may be recommending is too complicated to vote in this process. Mr. Donahue said that it may be more appropriate to make a recommendation that the Charter Revision Commission look at this issue again and to look at all locally elected officials if that be the wish of this Board. It seems to be the intent of many people if that is the case.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said an amendment to an amendment is acceptable which is to change the four year term of office of the mayor to read four year term of office for the mayor and four year term of office for the Board of Representatives. We will be voting on incorporating a four year term for the mayor and a four year term for the Board of Representatives.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that if this is done, we are instituting a lack of sufficient accountability. When both the executive officer and the legislative body elected for four years, that is a long period of time. She said that we should retain the two-year period. *all corrected remarks attached to these minutes*

MR. PAVIA said that Mrs. Maihock said it. He was not in favor of this amendment.

MR. RUBINO said that he originally agreed with Mr. Dudley but was won over to the Commission's point-of-view by Mr. Schropfer. If a four-year Board of Representatives is allowed, that means that if the voters become disenchanted with the mayor's policies, which may also be the Board of Representatives, they would have to wait four years to voice their disapproval. It was elegant reasoning by the Commission to keep the two-year Board of Representatives as a safety valve against a tyrannical mayor.

MR. LYONS said that if we follow that reasoning, the Board should have a four-year term and the mayor should have a two-year term.

MR. DAVID MARTIN said that we should represent the people every two years.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that as elected officials we should go before the voters every two years. She could not understand the rationale of the mayor's term for four years and the legislative body for two years. She was against the amendment.

MR. SIGNORE Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that we are voting on Mr. Dudley's amendment which is a four-year term for the Board of Representatives along with a four-year term for the mayor. If that is defeated, we will vote for Mr. Rubino's amendment which is that the mayor serve a four-year term. If that is defeated, the Committee's recommendation will stand unless another Motion is brought before the Board.

Voting on a four-year term for the Board of Representatives and the mayor.
DEFEATED by a vote of 34 no and 1 yes vote.

Voting on the first amendment to reinstate the Charter Revision's Commission recommendation to have a four-year term for the mayor. DEFEATED 30 no, 4 yes, and 1 abstention.

MR. SIGNORE suggested that an hour be set to cut out this evening and start again tomorrow evening.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that at some point, we can recess or the Majority and Minority Leaders can discuss it.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. PAVIA: Page 9, Section 1-80-1, Motion to cut the Board of Representatives to 20 members. Seconded.

Mr. Pavia said that in the event the four-term questions comes before the voters, and in the event, the voters accept this, what will protect our status. Mr. Pavia said that if one person is elected from a district, the media would pay more attention, the people would pay more attention to that person, and the people should decide.

MR. JACHIMCZYK said that two years ago when this was before the last Charter Revision Commission, he was in favor cutting the Board in half, however, he is now dead set oppose to reducing the Board. The people in the city get better representation with more representatives, and a certain sense of the old town meetings is retained. For the main reason of accountability, he would be opposed to reducing the Board.

MRS. SANTY said a disservice would be done to the city if the Board is not reduced. We need a 20 members efficient Board. We are one of the largest city councils in the country. She said not to be afraid of reducing the Board.

MR. WIDER said that one representative cannot take care of all the problems in a district. He was opposed to reducing the Board.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on cutting the size of the Board of Representatives from 40 to 20 members. The Motion was DEFEATED by a vote of 23 no, 11 yes and 1 abstention.

MR. RUBINO asked if it was proper to send a question back to the Commission with respect to any section rather than making a specific proposal?

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked Mr. Rubino to expatiate a bit and then we may be able to work something in.

MR. RUBINO: Section 1-80-5 (page 10) with respect to the Board of Education; Mr. Rubino said language or mechanism has not been worked out yet, would be assuring representation to sectors in neighborhoods of the city, perhaps, by electing Board of Education members on a district basis.

MR. RUBINO made a Motion to direct the Commission to prepare a proposal to that effect or to reject the idea. Seconded.

MRS. McINERNEY asked for a definition of district representation.

MR. RUBINO said that one idea could be to have one from each two local districts; 10 members of the Board of Education.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if this would encumber more members on the Board of Education?

MR. RUBINO said that it might or might not. He wanted to know that the Commission would say regarding this question. He said it was an interesting concept.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. WIDER said that we do have a good city-wide election for the Board of Education members and he preferred that it remain as it is. He said that some districts are predominantly minority and he would not like to see that he had only a minority to vote for. He wanted the privilege of voting for anyone he would want.

MRS. NAKIAN said the Board of Education is adamant that it represents all the children in the city. She did not think that they wanted to be put in a position that they represent the children of one district more than children in another district. She would be against the Motion.

MS. FISHMAN said she believed that the Board of Education is elected under state statutes, and we are bound by that.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he disagreed with Mr. Rubino. He said with that the number has to be greater.

MR. RUBINO said that Mrs. Fishman was incorrect. The Board of Education can be elected in any manner under state statutes; either by district or at-large.

MR. SIGNORE said that he served on the Board of Education and it was not an easy Board to serve on.

MRS. McINERNEY said that state statute does not have a mandate how the people are elected.

MR. WHITE said that there was some justification to Mr. Rubino's suggest, but with destruction of the neighborhood school, that ended the need that Mr. Rubino is talking about.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote that a recommendation go to the Commission that it review Section 1-80-5 for a review to have district representation on the Board of Education. By a voice vote, the Motion was DEFEATED.

MRS. NAKIAN: Page 12, Section 2-10-1, second sentence, delete sentence: No enumeration of powers...specifically provided and move to Section 2-20-1 where it was originally.

Page 13, Section 2-10-4, reinstate paragraph but to read: The President of the Board, after consultation with the Clerk and the Majority and Minority leaders, may change the time of a regular meeting provided that at least one regular meeting is held each month.

Mrs. Nakian said that this was the Commission's original suggestion. After the Public Hearing they held, they deleted it and put in this section under Rules of Order. We are asking that they put it back as they originally had it.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked if the Board will have in that the Board by resolution change the time for holding a meeting? Also, would Section 2-10-4 be reinstated with the addition of the president, the clerk and the leaders?

MRS. NAKIAN said she did not think of it in those terms. Yes, you would change by resolution. The meaning would be that the President of the Board with the consultation of the majority and minority leaders and the clerk can change the time of the meeting rather than having to call a special meeting for the entire Board to vote by resolution to change the date of a meeting.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said she did not concur that section 2-10-4 Change of Meeting Date should be deleted. She said that every representative should have the right to have input on change of meeting dates. This has been done prior to a succeeding meeting. She felt that this should be retained as originally in the Charter. (MR. BOCCUZZI is now Chairing the Meeting)

MRS. McINERNEY said she would speak against the recommendation of the Committee and make a Motion that that section, Change of Meeting Date, as presently in our Charter be retained. She felt that the leaders of a legislative body do not have the right to usurp the rights of other members of the Board. In the past, adequate time was had for the Board to change the time for holding meetings by resolution. It is seldom that a special meeting is necessary to change the date. Motion seconded.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN said she agreed with Mrs. McInerney's Motion. Mrs. Goldstein said that Section 2-10-4 should be restored. Mrs. Goldstein would like another section place there stating that in addition, when necessary, the President of the Board, after consultation with the Clerk, Majority and Minority leaders may change the time. It is important that 2-10-4 remain in the Charter. The other part can be considered separately.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that that was the message from the Committee. The Chair may have been confused, but that was the recommendation of the Committee.

MRS. McINERNEY said that the material supplied to the Board and the material that we are voting on, is not to that affect. It has to be clarified with a vote.

MR. BOCCUZZI said that each will be voted on separately. The first is to reinstate 2-10-4. The Motion was seconded. By voice vote the Motion was APPROVED.

MRS. NAKIAN made a Motion to add to Section 2-10-4: The President of the Board, after consultation with the Clerk and the Majority and Minority leaders, may change the time of a regular meeting provided that at least one regular meeting is held each month. Seconded.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN wanted to share with the Board why this is an important addition. This comes up rarely, when it does occur, it is confusing and very cumbersome. There are times, such as it happened with the current Board, when a meeting could not be held on the first meeting of the month, and could not have a resolution by the Board because the Board forgot to pass such a resolution, the President had to call a special meeting so that we could have a regular Board meeting that month. There should be some flexibility so that the President with consultation with the Majority, Minority leaders and Clerk be able to on rare occasions, change the date of a meeting. This is not partisan; it is to help whoever sits in the Chair. Mrs. Goldstein hoped the members of the Board would consider this.

MRS. McINERNEY said it should be clarified where in the event of an emergency, the President is empowered.

MR. WHITE said that the ideal is that all members should have in input. The ideal should not be made the norm. When the ideal is made the norm, you take away from the President reasonable flexibility. We should give the President that flexibility

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. WHITE: (continuing) and to put in the stipulation "in an emergency" seems to be a reasonable adjustment.

MRS. SANTY said that was an excellent amendment and Motion. It would add to the efficiency of the Board and she recommended it highly.

MR. LYONS Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

MR. BOCCUZZI called for a vote.

MRS. GOLDSTEIN repeated her amendment to 2-10-4: "In the event of an emergency, the President of the Board, after consultation with the Clerk and the Majority and Minority leaders, may change the time of a regular meeting provided that at least one regular meeting is held each month.

MRS. McINERNEY said that, "In the event of an emergency, the President of the Board shall be empowered" after consultation with the Clerk, the Majority and Minority leader to change the time of a regular meeting provided that at least one regular meeting is held each month.

MR. BOCCUZZI called for a voice vote.

MRS. NAKIAN: Page 13, Section 2-10-7 Rules of Order, delete the sentence which is underlines. Such rules shall include a procedure, etc. Mrs. Nakian said that this was just covered.

Page 14, Section 2-20-1, Added back: No enumeration of powers contained in this Charter shall be deemed to limit the legislative power of the Board of Representatives except as specifically provided in this Charter.

Mrs. Nakian said the following paragraph, the Board of Representatives shall have the following powers which will include but not be limited to. This is a list of powers we have. They tried to make it as inclusive as they could, I realized that they did not add in the power to sell or approve leases or sale of property. The question may come up that if it is not in the list, why didn't they put it in the list.

Mrs. Nakian recommend that the phrase be added.

MRS. McINERNEY said that if it "ain't broke, don't fix it." She did not see any problem with Section 204 of the old Charter; it is working fine. You will be creating and tying the hands of future Boards with questions to Corporation Counsel as to what authority we have; where are our legal limits? Mrs. McInerney made a motion to keep the Powers of the Board of Representatives as it is presently in the Charter. Seconded. Mrs. McInerney's motion was to delete Section 2-20-1 as proposed on pages 14 and 15, and substitute the old language.

MRS. NAKIAN said that it was the intent of the Charter Revision Commission to try in dealing with all departments and boards, not just the Board of Representatives, to list their duties so that someone looking would have a clear idea of what department, board or commission was doing. This is an example of it. She did not think that they were wrong to do this. It is useful to see what the board does. She would not want the Board to be limited. She would like to see it stay this way but to include language to not limit it.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. BROMLEY said that the process was somewhat confusing. She asked, "What problem has come up in the past because this language was not here?" She said that we were not writing a new document; we were reviewing, and that was the word used in this document; something that currently exists. She said that nobody on the Committee and the Board have said that the following problems have come up because we have not enumerated the duties of. She said she was having trouble supporting the revision even though she supports the process of review because she doesn't know to what end many of these revisions are taking place.

MR. LYONS used an example: 2) on page 14, To adopt the Capital and Operating Budgets of the city: He asked if we take them as presented, do we have the right to cut or change; he did not know. He said under the previous language, there was no question on it. He was not sure if the changes being made are being made correctly.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that at deliberations with the Commission, this section was discussed in detail, and her understanding^{of} it was to make it more understandable to the average person; not just for the lawyers. It was changed so that the average person could understand it. Going into these details makes it more simple. She liked the way this way done and saw nothing wrong in doing it this way. She went along with the Commission.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked that Mrs. Nakian read the last sentence she would like to have inserted so that this laundry list shall not become the only list.

MRS. NAKIAN read: "The Board of Representatives shall have the following powers which will include but not be limited to.

Also in Section 1) to reinsert, It is authorized and empowered, by ordinance or resolution, to regulate, amplify and define the corporate powers.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the amendment which is to delete the change and reinstate the old section.

MR. BURKE questioned, "the powers of the Board shall include those of the Town meeting except as modified by this Charter." Would the new amendment eliminate that? If retained, it will be in there. Is it there for a good reason, and if eliminated are we doing a job we don't want to do?

MRS. NAKIAN said that she asked that question and was assured that we have all the powers of a Town meeting. Personally, if anyone wanted to add it back in again, she would not object. She said it would be out under the Committee's recommendation unless a motion is made to add it in.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN stated that under Mrs. McInerney's motion, everything would stay as it was in this section.

MRS. BEGEL thought there was too much speculation. Why have a laundry list and if not limited to it, who is going to add and why.

MRS. McINERNEY said the Mrs. Bromley and Mrs. Begel said it well. This process is not a process committed to change; it's a process committed to review and study. She did not see anything that has seriously gone wrong with the Board of Representatives over the years with the Powers of the Board.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY said you are now limiting the power by putting in a "laundry list." There will be a time when this Board will be hampered by that. The powers presently expressed in the Charter have been working well for many years, and she did not think that it was necessary to change them.

MR. WIDER Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the question is to delete the new section 2-20-1 and reinstate the old section. The President called for a vote. A no vote does not support the amendment which is to delete with the Commission recommends. A yes vote is to reinstate. APPROVED, 16 yes, and 15 no votes.

MRS. NAKIAN said that none of the proposals in this section need be considered because the old language has been reinstated.

The Traffic Director will be taken up in its appropriate place.

PAGE 16, Minor change to delete "at least 8 hours" prior to a meeting that an ordinance must be read in full. The new language would be, "final reading of such ordinance shall be in full and unless a written or printed copy thereof shall have been furnished to each member of the Board prior to the meeting." It's only deleting the reading "in full" nothing else if that passes.

MR. RUBINO asked if this amendment is the recommendation of the Committee?

MRS. NAKIAN said she thought the Committee voted on it. She apologized.

MR. RUBINO said that it was a negative vote. It was voted to keep in the requirement for the 8 hours prior to the meeting. The vote was 3 to 3; motion was defeated.

MRS. NAKIAN said she stands corrected.

MRS. FISHMAN said that she kept a record of all the voting and this was not mentioned.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said if it was not mentioned, why is it being proposed?

MRS. MAIHOCK said that she distinctly remembers discussing this. She said it was difficult to come to the meeting and find all new information on the desk with no time to review the new material. The least thing that can be done is to give ample time to consider the material.

MRS. NAKIAN apologized. Mrs. Fishman was out of the room, and that is why Mrs. Nakian did not write down the vote. Mr. Rubino is correct, and this should not be before us.

MRS. FISHMAN apologized.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked if anyone wanted to make a Motion. It will remain; there is no change and no need for discussion.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 17, we would have to reinstate the power to investigate administrations which had been moved to section 2-20-1, #11.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said there is no need for a Motion; Mrs. McInerney's original motion was approved, therefore, 2-20-8, the Power to Investigate Administration will be reinstated unless anyone wants a change.

MRS. McINERNEY said that to insure that that power which is so important, has to clearly have a vote that it is reinstated. We are assuming that one action voided that and she recommended that we vote to have this section re-included. Moved. Seconded. Carried.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 18, section 3-10-3, the Committee recommended was to delete this because the power to appoint an assistant is already in section 3-10-2.

MRS. McINERNEY, section 3-10-2, The Mayor has authority to appoint any assistants, she would like to have the work "Special" retained. She did not know whether it was necessary to retain, "All such assistants shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor."

If he is creating certain positions, that can be done in a budgetary process, unless you are talking in terms of adding more cabinet members.

Mrs. McInerney made a motion to add the word "Special": The Mayor has authority to appoint any special assistants that he the Mayor may deem necessary....Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on the above motion. APPROVED. Special will be inserted.

MRS. McINERNEY made a motion to delete: "All such Assistants shall serve at the pleasure of the Mayor." Moved. Seconded.

MR. BURKE asked if we were speaking of a contractual situation? He was annoyed that when an employee is removed from the City's payroll, it winds up in court. If we put to "serve at the pleasure of the Mayor" irrespective of what that pleasure may entail, it would be a safeguard for us. He favored to leave this sentence in.

MRS. McINERNEY withdrew her motion.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 21, section 3-10-15, to restore the one hundred dollar fine. Reason is the power for penalty for hindering the Mayor does not exist anywhere other than in this section which comes from the special act of the original charter which cannot be amplified. To retain the power, we have to retain the \$100 fine.

MRS. McINERNEY, page 22, would like to see the original words retained, "Planning and Zoning Board" take the words "Commission" out throughout the entire section and retain the "Planning and Zoning Board." Seconded.

MRS. NAKIAN said she would prefer to wait until we discussed the whole land-use issue. If it is decided that we retain the present language in the land-use chapter, we would ask the Commission to delete all references to a combined Board throughout the charter.

MRS. McINERNEY said that would be alright.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN, page 25, 5-80-2, (b) add, the Director of Traffic and Parking; The Mayor shall appoint the Chief of Police, the Chief of the Fire Department, the Director of Health, and the Director of Traffic and Parking.

In addition, it was the recommendation of the Committee, that we add back from the deleted paragraphs, b, c, and d, the Chief of Police and the Chief of the Fire Department, the Director of Health, and the Director of Traffic and Parking who are appointed by the Mayor and the Board of Representatives shall be removed by the Mayor with the approval of the Board of Representatives.

We would be adding back the appropriate language from each of the three deleted paragraphs.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 26, section 5-80-3, paragraph (b) to read, "The Personnel Commission with the approval of the Board of Finance and Board of Representatives shall establish a pay plan."

It was felt that since we have the approval of the budget, we should approve the ways in which it was spent.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that she remembers that the Corporation Counsel's office seemed to have a problem with permitting an appointed Body to be initiating salaries. Discussion was had under 5-80-3 under Salaries. To begin, "The Board of Finance with the approval of the Board of Representatives may increase or decrease the salaries of the Town Clerk, etc." Moved. Seconded.

MR. BURKE said that he was going to speak to the inclusion of the "Board of Representatives" approving a pay plan, but was not clear on the motion.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked Mrs. Maihock if her motion was to delete the Personnel Commission and have it read, "The Board of Finance with the approval of the Board of Representatives?"

MRS. MAIHOCK said that that was correct; as it appears under 5-80-3; delete "at the request of the Mayor" and continue the old prior version.

MRS. BEGEL said that any request for salaries originates with the Mayor.

MRS. McINERNEY said that the Board of Representatives does not have the power to initial any funding. It starts with our executive head and that is the Mayor.

MRS. MAIHOCK that it says, "The Board of Finance with the approval of the Board of Representatives may increase or decrease the salaries of the Town Clerk, etc." She said that that is what we do.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked Mrs. Maihock if her reasoning for the change, and the Commission's reasoning also, is that Mayor is part of the process and the Mayor should not initiate a request for his own salary, and this is a limited number of positions.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. MAIHOCK said that she was quoting that the Corporation Counsel's office had been against an appointive agency such as the Personnel Commission, for initiating it. The Mayor does it now.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked if Mrs. Maihock wanted to delete the new wording which is (a) and (b) and reinstate "the Board of Finance" and delete "At the request of the Mayor", and begin the paragraph, "With the Board of Finance".

MRS. MAIHOCK said to leave it as the version was in the old charter; section 5-80-3 and made a motion. Seconded.

MRS. FISHMAN said that the Personnel Commission is not initiating the increase or decrease. It is setting a pay plan in which people are fitted at their level.

MR. DONAHUE said that this Board initiated a pay plan a number of years ago which is now in place. It is working well and at a future date, we may want to include other positions, or the Personnel Commission might see fit to include. The Mayor is not coming in at this point in time, and asking for a raise for himself; we put a stop to that. We would not want to go back to the old wording where the Mayor would have to request the funds.

MR. BURKE said that we are going from one subject to another. He wanted clarification on the subject we were addressing.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that Mrs. Maihock make a motion to delete the new wording and reinstate section 5-80-3. This would be deleting (a) and (b) and going back to the original.

MR. BURKE said that he would speak to (b). He said that he trusts that the Board of Representatives realizes what they are getting into when they are talking about approval a pay plan. This is a quasi-scientific situation when you are dealing with job evaluation; job grading, and within those job grades, merit steps of various percentages. He said that the Personnel Commission is the place where this plan should be devised, and come to the Board for approval afterwards, but certainly not start on the Board; we do not have the expertise, time or information to develop a pay plan.

MRS. BEGEL said that she agreed that we should retain the former language.

MR. PAVIA Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the motion was to delete (a) and (b) under section 5-80-3 and reinstate the former section. The motion APPROVED 17 yes and 12 no votes.

MR. BURKE Moved that (b) of section 5-80-3 be reinstated.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that a motion must be made to reconsider; it was just voted down.

MR. BURKE voted on the prevailing side and he Moved for reconsideration. He wants to amend (b).

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. DONAHUE, PARLIAMENTARIAN, said the motion to reconsider by Mr. Burke would be appropriate. If that motion carries, then Mr. Burke could make a motion to amend what we would reconsider to delete part (a) and include part (b).

MR. BOCCUZZI asked for a Point of Information. He asked if such a motion is made and carried, and then when Mr. Burke adds (b) to the top section and is defeated, where would we stand?

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that if Mr. Burke's motion to reconsider is passed, then what we have before us is Mrs. Maihock's motion to put back into the Charter the old section and take out (a) and (b). During the course of that discussion, Mr. Burke can amend Mrs. Maihock's motion by adding (b). We can take a vote on adding (b). If that goes down, we're back to the original motion. We are dealing with very complex issues.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to reconsider. APPROVED by a voice vote.

The motion on the Floor now is Mrs. Maihock's motion which is to delete (a) and (b) and to reinsert the old language.

MR. BURKE Moved to amend Mrs. Maihock's motion by taking the present section 5-80-3 and adding to that subsection (b) as printed in the book. Seconded.

MR. BOCCUZZI said he disagreed with Mr. Burke. Mr. Boccuzzi did not want the Personnel Commission deciding on a pay plan. He said that as the Legislative Body, we have the right to approve or disapprove monies spent by the city. Under the old section, this Board has in place a pay plan that this Board agreed upon. Mr. Boccuzzi felt that if the Personnel Commission has the power to increase salaries, it will have a domino effect on the salaries of other department heads in the city, and eventually will get back to the Personnel Department and he did not want that to happen.

MR. HEINS said that he agreed with Mr. Boccuzzi that the Board have the opportunity to evaluate those types of decisions; as long as we add (b) with the approval of the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives, that solves both of our problems which allows the Personnel Commission to do a lot of the work that we don't want to do in terms of details, but give us the opportunity for the final say.

MR. DONAHUE said that this section, if reinstated, only covers to the best of his knowledge, 6 positions now within the city. When it comes before the Board, it is impossible to separate the person from the position; so whether or not this be the solution, this Board has to act to make sure that a fair pay plan is established. If they can be included in the resolution passed by the Board, that is fine, but it is very necessary that we do this in some form. Perhaps, we can send this back to the Commission to try to devise a fair system. The current system is not fair.

MRS. McINERNEY said she agreed with Mr. Boccuzzi. The word "shall" will take away the right and give the power to the Personnel Commission. If you want to change the word "shall" to "may" then that does not empower you to vote for whatever they approved.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN proceeded to a vote to amend Mrs. Maihock's motion by adding (b) along with the words "with the approval of the Board of Finance and the Board of Representatives." APPROVED 20 yes and 10 no votes.

MR. LYONS Moved to amend section 5-80-3, paragraph (b) to replace the word "shall" with the word "may." Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on Mr. Lyon's amendment. APPROVED.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved for a five-minute recess to confer with the Majority about a possible recess to another night.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked that a vote be taken on Mrs. Maihock's motion which is to delete (a) and reinsert section 5-80-3 Salaries, the old language along with (b) as amended. This vote was voided.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to approve the amendment proposed by Mrs. Maihock as further amended; to delete new paragraph (a) and to insert the original language in section 5-80-3 Salaries, as well as (b) as amended to read, "The Personnel Commission may establish a pay plan with the approval of the Board of Representative and Board of Finance, etc." APPROVED by a vote of 26 yes, 3 no votes and 1 abstention.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved for a five-minute recess. Seconded. Carried.

The meeting reconvened. It was the feeling of the Board to continue.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 27, (6) ordering the removal of trees within highway rights-of-way or adjacent to sewer lines when the Commissioner deems it necessary. This is given as a responsibility of the Commissioner of Public Works. Currently, it is with the Superintendent of Parks. This issue is a complicated one as to who has the right to remove trees. The Committee recommends that it stay with Parks.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 28, this is an issue that we do not have definite language for. The Committee is asking the Commission to come up with the language. Currently, the Building official is in the Public Works Department. There is a great deal of feeling from the Commission, members of the public, that the Planning and Zoning Department, have a Zoning Enforcement officer, yet there is testimony that cannot be disputed that says that currently there are 20 people working on zoning and one person could not possibly do all the work.

We have an opinion from Jon Smith saying that while the Zoning Board would like the Zoning Enforcement Officer, they really don't want what this Commission is giving them which is the power to issue building permits. Therefore, the Committee is asking the Commission if they can work out language so that the duties that the present building official has, stay with that department, but there can be some kind of compliance officer in the Zoning Department who would deal with the cases that do not deal with build permits or construction.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PREIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that the recommendation was rather than having specific language is an overall philosophical recommendation and the Committee wishes the Commission to deal with the language.

MRS. NAKIAN said that the Commission felt that they could do that.

MR. WHITE said that he would like to see a Zoning Enforcement Officer whether the Zoning Board wants one or not; they should have one. He believed that the building inspector's office should be separated from the Zoning Enforcement Office. He said a zoning permit should be granted before a building permit is granted. However, there is a problem. If you touch the land-use apparatus in the Charter, you may very well lose the right of legislative review. That is the most important thing, and before the land-use apparatus is touched, we have to straighten-out the question and issue, if we have to by a special act of the legislature, to retain the power of legislative review, if we change the land-use apparatus. Mr. White said that we should leave it the way it is in respect to the home-rule law and the power of legislative review.

MRS. NAKIAN said that the Commission is aware of that problem, and they would not do anything with the Zoning Enforcement Officer if it compromised the whole land-use powers. She would prefer to deal with that section when we get there. Mrs. Nakian said that if we feel that there cannot be a zoning compliance officer, then that suggestion would not be made.

MR. WHITE said that he did not think that the Commission was particularly aware of the need of legislative review and that they do not particular care or want it.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked Mrs. Nakian if she know if retaining the zoning enforcement officer for building construction would in any way compromise our right of legislative review.

MRS. NAKIAN said that retaining the building official in the Public Works Department has nothing to do with our use of land-use.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 29, section 5-80-15 Bureau of Sanitation. This was a request from Commissioner John O'Brien. Currently, there is a superintendent of the Bureau and there is a head of the Division of Liquid Waste and a head of the Division of Solid Waste. He would like to do away with the superintendent so that each division can be headed by the person who has the greatest expertise in that field.

What the Commission in agreeing to is suggesting that the wording be changed to just delete the reference to the superintendent. (See page 2 of the Committee's recommendations of April 6, 1987 attached to these Minutes)

MRS. McINERNEY asked regarding the zoning enforcement officer, if she was right that the Committee deleted the recommended proposed change recommended by the Commission or was this retained.

MRS. NAKIAN said that this was not deleted. The Commission was asked to clarify the language.

MRS. McINERNEY said that the best suggestion to come from the Commission was to delineate the two and let them act as they should be acting; one as building inspector and one as zoning inspector.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN said that the Committee agreed that if it can be worked out that there are two people not duplicating duties but working together. That position was needed.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 30, no recommendations. Section (9) dealing with sewer will be dealt with when we come to the Sewer Commission.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 31, Police Department. First, there is a recommendation to the Commission (4) that they investigate further whether the Police Commission makes all appointments and promotions or only those of the police force, and clarify the language whichever way it should be. This suggestion came from Corporation Counsel.

Mrs. Nakian said that anything that goes for the Police Department would go with the Fire Department which is the next section.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 32, it should read, "Administratively suspending or disciplining members."

Section 5-80-21, (b) is the Special Police. Mrs. Nakian said in a meeting with the Commission members, a compromise was worked out between the language that they proposed, the language of the present charter, the request of the Special Police, and the request of the Police Commission. The Committee tried to include and see if a suggestion could be worked up that was amenable to all these parties. It was in the interest of the city to do it this way.

MR. LYONS said that he was not sure a compromise was reached with the Commission. A compromise was reached within the Committee.

MR. ZELINSKI commended the Committee for trying to reach a compromise. However, Mr. Zelinski Moved that on page 32, section 5-80-21 (b) be reinstated as it was in the old charter, and delete the new language. Seconded.

He said he did not know the reason the Commission decided to change this. Basically, the new language reads the same as the Commission originally wanted it changed. That is, the Special Police may be appointed by the Police Commission and shall have the powers determined by the Police Commission which in essence is dictating that the present or any future Police Commission can decide for themselves which Special Police officer(s) can have that power.

In the compromise, unfortunately, it reads, "have the powers of the regular police including the apprehension and arrest of criminals in the service of process" then they are adding, "determined by the Police Commission to be appropriate to the level of trained training achieved by each member of the Special Police." Mr. Zelinski said that we were putting it in the different type of wording but it means the same. We are saying that the Police Commission shall have the sole power to discriminate against members of the Stamford Special Police force.

Mr. Zelinski said the original wording was fine. He said that when a regular police officer is first appointed, has all the powers of a experienced police officer who has been on the force for 20 years regardless of the training. If this change is approved, we are still giving the right of a present or future Police Commission the right to discriminate against individuals or even an entire group. They could say that none of the police officers have reached the appropriate level.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. ZELINSKI (continuing) said that he hoped we would go back to the original language in the charter.

MR. WIDER said that after serving 25 years as a Special Policeman, he had serious problems with this. He saw discrimination in the Police Department even when the Mayor made the appointments. He could not see putting Commissioners who have no training, in charge of the police or to judge them. The Special Police sacrifice their time and should be given the same power as officers walking the streets; a bullet meant for a policeman doesn't hit a Special policeman any harder.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that most of the new language came from the Special Police. They said they had no problems with receiving the same training as the regular police. They said they would like to see changes in appoints; instead of an automatic appointment, they suggest they be reappointed only on good behavior. These suggestions came from the President of the Special Police Association along with a letter from their attorney. This section has to be tightened-out a bit. The Specials and the Commission compromised here. The Specials said they especially like the appointments because now it is an automatic two-years regardless of what. They stressed good behavior for reappointment.

MR. PAVIA Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Mr. Zelinski's motion that in Section 5-80-21 (b) to delete the Commission's changes and reinsert the old language. DEFEATED by a vote of 23 opposed and 7 in favor.

MR. ESPOSITO made a proposal to modify the suggestion of the Committee. The change to read, "Special police shall be appointed by the Police Commission according to the same psychological, physical and education standards required of the regular police force and shall have those powers of the regular police, including the apprehension and arrest of criminals and the service of process" continuing on to say, "there shall not at any time be more than 200 Special Police unless otherwise provided by the Board of Reps at the request of the Mayor," and finally, "The Special Police shall hold office during good behavior and may be dismissed for just cause."

Mr. Esposito said that that may be a "meeting of the minds" here.

MR. ESPOSITO said he was eliminating the sentence after "process." He was eliminating the following, "that are determined by the Police Commission to be appropriate to the level of training achieved by each member of the Special Police" and he was in favor of the sentence proposed the Committee which says, "The Special Police shall hold office during good behavior and may be dismissed for just cause." Moved and Seconded.

MR. ZELINSKI concurred with that 100%.

MRS. McINERNEY felt that the sentence "including the apprehension and arrest of criminals and the service of process." She said that we were trying to create a police force within a police force. She felt that the powers of the Special Police should be given and determined by the Police Commission, yet she agreed that it was hard for her to distinguish a Special officer from a regular officer. A requirement of psychological, physical and educational standards should be required. This would be a safeguard for the city. The powers of a full police officer belong with the full regular police department.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. McINERNEY asked if Mr. Esposito would take an amendment deleting that section.

MR. ESPOSITO said he would not.

MR. LYONS said that the Police Commission requires the Special Police to take 500 hours of training. This is the same type of training that regular police officers receive. The Police Commission is going to be involved in the training of these officers and they will designate how they are trained and the time they would have to put in. His concern was that there are no requirements for them, and now there are requirements; psychological, physical and educational standards. Mr. Lyons was in favor of Mr. Esposito's amendment.

MRS. NAKIAN said that Mrs. McInerney was right. If appointed as the regular police, and they hold office for the same term which is good behavior and they have all the powers, why are they not regular police. We are not differentiating in that case; we are making them regular police without the title. The purpose of this was to use them in situations that were appropriate for the training they had. They are part-time people; they do not get all their training at once. To put them on the street without all the training is a liability. All the special police officers now do have the training. The new ones will not have the training, and we have to be aware of that. She was against the motion.

MR. WIDER said the late Chief Cizanckas immediately set up a regular training program for the special police. Many took off from their jobs to go to school before they could be certified to carry a gun in the City of Stamford. He said the special police must know what authority they have.

MRS. FISHMAN said the reason the levels are wanted in appropriate to the level of training because they are part-time and it takes a while to get trained. They can be assigned to different jobs appropriate to their training until training is finished.

MR. PAVIA Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said the question is on deleting from the Committee's recommendation the words "that are determined by the Police Commission to be appropriate to the level of training achieved by each member of the Special Police." The President called for a vote on this deletion. DEFEATED, 15 opposed and 12 in favor.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if what the Commission recommended in Section (b) page 32, intact?

MRS. NAKIAN said that it was her understanding that we had the recommended change on page 3 of her Committee's recommendations.

MRS. McINERNEY Moved to delete "including the apprehension and arrest of criminals in the service of process." Seconded. This would be deleted from the Committee's recommendation.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on this deletion. DEFEATED by a vote of 23 opposed and 7 yes.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. RUBINO said that his concern was with (a), the first sentence, "All members of the regular police force shall hold office during good behavior." He said that he did not see a mechanism in the charter for the removal of a police officer who falls below psychological and physical standards. He was told that it was in state statutes. He has not looked for it. He would like to see a direction to the Commission to make sure such a mechanism exists or else address putting this in the charter.

Mr. Rubino's motion is to direct the Commission to determine whether or not such a mechanism exists in state statutes, and if not, address the question of including it in the charter; whether there is a mechanism for removing a police officer who falls below accepts physical and psychological standards. Moved. Seconded.

MR. BURKE wanted to remind everyone about collective bargaining; this subject is subject to bargaining. Even if in the charter, it is a proper subject for a labor contract.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Mr. Rubino's motion as stated above. The motion was APPROVED by a vote of 15 yes and 9 no votes.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 33 and page 34 had the same recommendations as made for the Police Department.

MR. HEINS, page 36, Section 5-80-42 Qualifications of the Director of Health. Mr. Heins said that he hoped the same standards would be maintained in the new charter as in the old charter; with the new diseases cropping up and with demands required for a Director of Health, he said that it was in our best interest to maintain the standard of having a medical doctor as at least one of the qualifications in that position. He Moved that we keep the charter as written. Seconded. This is to delete the new language and retain the old language.

MR. PAVIA asked if this agreed with the Committee's recommendation?

MRS. NAKIAN said the Committee's recommendation was two in favor of reinstating, 3 against and 1 abstention. It did not carry in Committee.

MRS. BEGEL believed strongly that the Director of Health should be a physician. She reiterated what Mr. Heins said; to have a prospective from a licensed physician.

MRS. FISHMAN said there was nothing in the new paragraph that precluded have a physician. It says that somebody has to have the public health qualifications. If a physician applied for the job and proved to be adequate for the job, he would get it.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if anyone knew what the qualifications were in the state statues and public health code?

MRS. FISHMAN replied that this is the qualification in the state statues. They do not require a person to be a physician.

MRS. McINERNEY asked what the public health qualifications were?

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. FISHMAN said that they have to hold a public health degree.

MRS. McINERNEY asked what is the length of education required for a public health degree?

MRS. FISHMAN said that it was at least a Master's Degree in public health.

MR. ZELINSKI also believed that we should go back to the original wording in the charter. It would not be appropriate for the city to have a Director of Health that is not a licensed physician in the State of Connecticut.

MR. RUBINO Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the motion to delete the new language and reinstate the old language. APPROVED 16 yes and 13 no votes.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 39 Parks and Recreation Department. Mrs. Nakian said that the reason the Commission combined the Parks and Recreation Departments was for greater efficiency. There is much duplication between the two departments. Mrs. Nakian said that the testimony heard gave good reasons separating the departments and retaining them as they are currently.

The Committee voted to ask the Commission to change it back so there is a Parks Department and a Recreation Department and two corresponding commissions.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved that Parks Department and Recreation Department be joined into one department. Seconded.

MR. LYONS said he heard about the efficiency and costs on having the department combined. No one took into consideration the Parks Department as passive recreation and the Recreation Department is active recreation for the people. If these are combined, one department will eventually be the head and one the tail. If Board of Recreation, there will be ballfields where the parks were and if it's parks, parks where the ballfields were.

Mr. Lyons said our system of parks and recreation is probably one of the finest in the state. We would be taking a risk in changing them. He said that his constituents would be willing to pay a little more to keep these separate.

MR. PAVIA said he was in favor of keeping them separate; however, he felt that this was one of the questions that should go before the voters, therefore, he would vote tonight to combine them.

MRS. FISHMAN said that if a new position of Director of Parks and Recreation was set up, we would be looking for somebody that has experience in both; passive and active recreation to balance the two.

MR. WHITE said that as far as a Director that would balance the two, he would not be his own man; he would take orders from whatever commission it happened to be. Mr. White said if these departments were joined, for twenty years you may have a very balanced board but if for four or five years the active recreation is on top, you will have your green parks disappear under stadiums, ballfields, etc. Once the parks are gone, they are gone; once the ballfields are gone, they are gone. Mr. White thought these departments should be kept separate.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MR. RUBINO Moved the question. Seconded. Carries.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on combining the Parks and Recreation Departments as recommended by the Commission. DEFEATED, 17 no and 11 yes votes, and 1 abstention. The recommendation is for the language to remain the same and the Parks and Recreation Departments be two separate departments.

MR. BURKE asked for a Point of Information. He asked if this means that the citizens of Stamford will not have the opportunity of voting on this?

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that it is our recommendation to the Commission that they reconsider because our Board felt it was not in the best interest of the City. If the Commission agrees and chooses not to come back with separate departments, the citizens will have a chance to vote on it.

MRS. McINERNEY, referring to the Committee's recommendation sheet, page 39, 5-80-60 2. Question of liability referred to Corporation Counsel. Wording may need to be changed. She wanted to know if that was still going to Corporation Counsel or is it a moot point?

MRS. NAKIAN said she was not sure what the old language is in the old section that was just reinserted. Several people on the Committee felt that by saying the Director was responsible for the control, direction and supervision of all organized activities, the city was assuming liabilities for things such as little league, Babe Ruth, etc. She was not sure what the wording is that was just reinstated, but did not think it was the same.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if this would be pursued with Corporation Counsel?

MRS. NAKIAN said if the Commission comes back with the same combined proposal, they should check that with Corporation Counsel and clarify the language.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 40, it was already agreed to the deletion of the Commissioner of Public Works ordering the removal of trees.

Page 41, section 5-80-72 Rules and Regulation: This was not a Committee recommendation, however, Mrs. Nakian Moved that this paragraph be reinstated. Seconded.

Mrs. Nakian said that what the Commission did was to add language which is on page 43, saying, "The Director shall propose rules and regulations for the Civil Service." She said she had no problem with that, however, what was crossed out was saying what the rules shall provide for, and in the future, there is nothing to say if this is crossed out what the Civil Service rules will contain. They will not have to contain any of these things. Corporation Counsel's opinion says that this definitely should be added back. The Committee was confused at this point, and it did not get added back.

MRS. BEGEL said that she agreed with Mrs. Nakian. Mrs. Begel believed that all the rules and regulations should be spelled out. The words "shall propose" leaves it wide-open. Detailed information should be in the charter so we cannot do as we like.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked Mrs. Nakian if her Motion on 5-80-72 to reinstate the original language is saying that we should also delete (a) and (b)?

MRS. NAKIAN said that (a) and (b) says that the Personnel Commission can propose rules and regulations; that is what they currently do. She said that is what was crossed-out and it may have been inadvertent, was saying what the rules should provide for. She said she saw it as one working with the other.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if (a) and (b) as recommended, or at least (a) as recommended, indicates that rules and regulations of Civil Service shall have the force and effect of law. She wanted to know if the Committee wanted to include that: "force and effect of law."

MRS. NAKIAN said that that is what it currently says.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked if (a) "The Director shall propose rules and regulations for the Civil Service," he wanted to know if that included the Merit Rules?

MRS. NAKIAN said that it was the Merit Rules.

MR. BOCCUZZI asked about the Merit Rules; who approves them, did the Board approve them and what Merit Rules are being worked under?

MRS. NAKIAN said she read this very carefully and found no mention that the Board had the right to approve the Merit Rules.

MRS. McINERNEY said that there was a personnel policy in the city prior to 1974, 75, 76, and at that time we had a new Personnel Director, the proposal was to establish rules and regulations. After they were established, we took the power away from the Board of Representatives to approve any changes. We do not have that right anymore.

MR. DONAHUE said that within the Merit Rules, there is a section 6 or section 6.1 where it says that substantial changes to the Merit Rules must be approved by the Board of Representatives. The question becomes, "What is substantial?"

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on Mrs. Nakian's motion to reinstate section 5-80-72. (voice vote) APPROVED with Mr. Burke in opposition.

MR. BOCCUZZI Moved to amend (a) to say that "the Board of Representatives shall approve the Merit Rules as recommend by the Personnel Commission." Should read: (a) The Director shall propose rules and regulations for the Civil Service. After approval by the Personnel Commission and the Board of Representatives, such rules and regulations shall have the force and effect of law.

MRS. BEGEL said that if 5-80-72 is reinstated, we did not need (a).

MRS. NAKIAN said that what she would like is that paragraph (a) remain; at the end of paragraph (a), say, "The rules such provide" and reinsert the things that should be in the rules; these are not the rules and regulations; these are saying what the rules and regulations have to cover. The rules and regulations must include disciplinary suspension, the establishment of eligible lists, etc.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN proceeded to a vote on Mr. Boccuzzi's motion to insert, in section (a) after the approval of the Personnel Commission "and the approval of the Board of Representatives". APPROVED by a voice vote with Mrs. Nakian being opposed.

MRS. MAIHOCK said that in view of the fact that 5-80-72 was reinstated, was there a good reason why 5-80-72 and 5-80-74 should not be reinstated?

MRS. FISHMAN said that in her opinion it was not necessary because this is in the Classified Service Rules.

MR. LYONS said that those rules could be changed.

MRS. NAKIAN Moved to reinstate section 5-80-73 and 5-80-74. Seconded.

MRS. FISHMAN said that she felt that she did not want to lock this into the charter; you would want to be able to change these things as conditions apply. The Classified Service Rules can be amended as times change.

MRS. MAIHOCK did not see the harm in reinstating this.

MS. RINALDI Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to reinstate 5-80-73 and 5-80-74. DEFEATED, 21 opposed and 6 in favor.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 45, section 5-80-76, (b) reinstate members of Boards, Commissions and Committees serving without pay and delete "Unpaid members of any department or agency." The Committee felt it did not cover the situation.

On (c), instead of "one Assistant Corporation Counsel" have it read, "one deputy Corporation Counsel."

on (f), to add, the Director of Health, which is already a classified position by ordinance. Change one Executive Assistant to the Mayor to assistants to the Mayor. Delete "The Coordinator of Human Services."

MRS. McINERNEY said she would like to reinstate "one Executive Assistant to the Mayor." Moved. Seconded.

MRS. FISHMAN said that contradicts what was approved on page 18, which says the Mayor has the authority to appoint any special assistants.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to reinstate "one Executive Assistant". DEFEATED, 20 opposed and 6 yes votes.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 45, Section 5-80-77, the Committee is asking the Commission to clarify other discriminations which are in the state statutes.

Page 53, section 5-80-89. Disposition of Real Estate - There are two recommendations by the Committee. 1) that this read, No purchase or lease of real estate by the municipality... and that the sentence end "or other disposition of such real estate." To be deleted is "provided, however, that any lease, sale or other disposition of such real estate shall be made at the highest and best price on such terms set forth in the ordinance."

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN said the Committee felt that at times it was in the best interest to sell at public auction in order to get the highest and best price as provided in the ordinances. Also, it may prove difficult to sell real estate for less than the best price if that should be the determination of the city.

Also, the Committee recommended that this be moved to the beginning of the charter where it can be more easily found; probably in the section on the condemnation of land. It gets lost here in the middle of the Purchasing Department.

Page 57, the Committee would like to reinstate "with the approval of the Board of Finance " in Section 5-80-103.

MRS. BEGEL, page 58, she said that it was not in the best interest of the city to have the Assessor's office which has been operating under state statutes, under the jurisdiction of a political appointment.

MRS. BEGEL Moved to reinstate the Department of Assessment to the old language. Seconded.

MR. LYONS supported Mrs. Begel's motion. Mr. Lyons said to have the change of command from the Mayor, to the Finance Commissioner to the Assessor would not be in the best interest of good government.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to reinstate the old language to section 5-80-110. APPROVED 20 yes, 3 no votes and 1 abstention.

MRS. McINERNEY asked where "Assessment Day" (page 58) was incorporated?

MRS. NAKIAN said she thought that Assessment Day was now set by state statutes. Also, she thought that paragraph is somewhere in back of the charter in the financial section. Mrs. Nakian said that she believed that Assessment Day is now uniform throughout the state.

Page 62, the Committee recommended to reinstate on 5-80-131, the sentence, "He shall be appointed by the Mayor with the approval of the Board of Representatives for a term of five years." This refers to the Traffic Director.

The Commission deleted this but did not make any provision for who is to appoint the Director of Traffic and Parking. She believed that the Commission meant for this appointment to be made by the Traffic Commission, but this is not said. The Traffic Director is a Department Head who is not appointed by the Mayor.

MRS. FISHMAN said that it should say, "The Traffic Director" and not "he."

MRS. NAKIAN referred to the last paragraph of section 5-80-130, and recommended that we delete the words "may remove." The Director probably has the authority but this would make him the only person in the charter who is expressly given that authority. Moved. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to delete "may remove assistants." DEFEATED 15 in opposition, 11 yes votes and 1 abstention.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. FISHMAN, Point of Information, in reference to the Assessment Day, she said that in section 5-80-114, it says, "dates specified by the General Statutes."

MRS. NAKIAN, page 65, there are things that should be changed because they depend on other votes taken; will be addressed later.

MR. ZELINSKI, page 68, section 6-00-9 Meetings and Expenses, Moved to delete the second paragraph, "No member of any appointed or elected Board shall receive compensation for services as such." Seconded.

Mr. Zelinski said that there has been a great discussion pertaining to compensation whether by salary or expenses incurred and by deleting this sentence, if a Board of Representatives deems fit that some type of compensation, remuneration, reimbursement of expenses, this would allow that to be done.

MR. BURKE said that this is compensation for services as such; it has no bearing on reimbursement of expenses. If the Board in the future, decides to reimburse any members for expenses, it is far from compensation as such which is the way it is written here.

MRS. PERILLO Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on deleting the second paragraph under section 6-009 as stated above by Mr. Zelinski. DEFEATED, 22 in opposition, 2 yes votes and 1 abstention.

MS. McINERNEY Moved to recess this meeting and to continue tomorrow evening at 8:30.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on the motion to adjourn until tomorrow evening. Mrs. McInerney amended her motion to tomorrow evening to 8:00 p.m. DEFEATED, 20 in opposition and 2 yes votes.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 71, Planning and Zoning Commission - Mrs. Nakian said that there were three things that could happen with this. You could make no changes whatsoever to the entire chapter, which is what several Charter Revision Commission's have recommended in the past. Because this is a special act of the Legislative, there is a great deal of legal opinion that if anything is changed, then we go under Chapter 8 of the state statutes and we lose all in the chapter that are unique to Stamford.

We can willingly change everything and go under the state statutes and that is what the Commission proposed. Also, there is an inbetween point-of-view which is that we retain the recommendation of combining the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mrs. Nakian said that after the Commission's public hearing, they did tend to think it would be better to retain the referral process. They did not vote that way. They also put back into the charter the binding Master Plan and several other things unique to Stamford; such as the number of sub-divisions that can be included.

The problem is that it is probably correct that you can do that, but it is not certain that it is correct. We received a letter from Jim Minor at the beginning of our meeting on Friday, and in it he said that under no circumstances can you retain the binding characteristics of the Master Plan if you combine the Planning and Zoning Board and you must delete all those sections. This is probably the area that we should be afraid to tread. There are too many unanswered questions. Most people think the referral process should be retained.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN said that if the Boards are combined, we may certainly lose the binding Master Plan or lose all our zoning laws. Since this was done by a special act of the legislature, it can only be undone by a special act of the legislature.

Another opinion is that combining these Boards can be done by ordinance; it cannot be done by Charter Revision. There are many many questions.

The Committee voted to retain all the language in the charter as it presently is; in the present charter.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 72, section 6-30-2 Enforcement of Planning and Zoning Regulations. This was where it was mentioned that we have a zoning compliance officer under the Planning and Zoning Department and the duties would not be all the duties listed on page 72. No definite language was given to the Commission but asked them to work it out. We can also ask them to check with Corporation Counsel to make sure this is a change that we can make and not lose any of our special act status.

MR. WHITE said that an opinion from Corporation Counsel can be wrong. His point was that a recommendation be made that this not be touched because it is a part of the zoning apparatus. He did not want any zoning apparatus touched. He did not want to lose the power of legislative review.

MRS. MAIHOCK, page 95, section 6-60-2 Powers and Duties of Board of Tax Review. She wanted the citizens to understand the duties and requirements of the persons on various Boards, and the Board of Tax Review is important to many citizens.

MRS. MAIHOCK Moved to reinstate section 6-60-2. Seconded. APPROVED by voice vote.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 96, the Committee recommended to move the subpoena power from 9) to page 97, under Appeals to the Police Commission where it was originally. There is a question on the legality of any of the Commissions having subpoena power. The same would go for the Fire Commission.

Page 97, section 6-80-22 Appeals to Police Commission, Mrs. Nakian recommended that the Commission re-write this paragraph. It was suggested by Corporation Counsel to delete the last sentence, "All hearings shall be open to the public unless the commission finds that an open hearing would be prejudicial." That is contrary to the Freedom-of-Information Act.

MRS. NAKIAN said the hearing cannot be closed because that would be prejudicial. That is part of the Committee's recommendation.

Page 98, last paragraph re section 6-80-22, at the suggestion of Corporation Counsel to delete this paragraph. "Any decision by the Police Commission under this section may be appealed by a sworn member not covered by a collective bargaining agreement to the Personnel Appeals Board in accordance with the provisions of this Charter." A decision from the Police Commission could then be appealed to the Personnel Appeals Board. Corporation Counsel felt this was not wise.

To delete this paragraph is the Committee's recommendation.

MR. BURKE said that because Corporation Counsel did not think it wise, that is not sufficient reason for the Board taking any action.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN, page 98, 99, and 100 are all Fire Commission and whatever was done with the Police Commission, same was done for the Fire Commission.

Page 100, section 6-80-33 Appointment, terms; is a provision that the police and fire commissions may have six members, the sixth member appointed from the previous commission to serve for six months as a sort of continuity. This would be a special mayoral appointment. The Committee voted to delete this.

MRS. NAKIAN said the Committee felt that the person appointed to each commission would not be a voting member. The reason they cannot vote is that you cannot have a majority of one party over another; they had to be non-voting. If you have a non-voting position, it is rather nebulous; you are there but you don't have any right.

MRS. BEGEL, page 101, asked why the Welfare Commission was deleted.

MRS. NAKIAN said that the Department of Welfare has two main charges; one, is to run the public assistance program and the other one is to run the Smith House. All mention of the Smith House was deleted from the charter so that it could be run as it presently is by an outside firm. It is managed very well that way. Since the public Welfare Department is not only managing the public assistance program, it was felt there was no need for a citizen oversight commission. That was the recommendation of the Commission and the Committee agreed with it.

MRS. BEGEL wanted the record to note that she had concerns about eliminating any citizen appointed overseeing board of anything.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 106, section 6-80-77 Grounds for Suspension or Demotion in Rank or Grade or Discharge. Mrs. Nakian said the first minor change is that it should read, "Grounds for Suspension, discipline or demotion." The Committee wished to add this. Mrs. Nakian said in all cases in the charter. they were advised to where it says, "suspension or demotion" to add "discipline."

The Commission took out all the specific grounds for demotion; say that they would be just causes provided in the rules and regulations; the Merit rules, Classified Service rules.

Mrs. Nakian said that the only problem is that what is covering this area from the time this is deleted until the time that the Merit system pick-ups?

The Committee voted to reinstate it.

MRS. FISHMAN said that this section refers you to section 5-80-72, which in turn refers you to the Classified Rules which refers you back to the charter as having the list. The Classified Rules no longer has this list.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that a vote is not necessary because the Committee recommends to reinstate this section.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 108, Sec. 6-80-80 Personnel Appeals Board, middle of paragraph where it says, "except that the Board shall not hear appeals from appellate decisions of the Personnel Commission." The Committee did not have time to go into this to find out why Corporation Counsel felt that there should not be decisions from one Commission to the Personnel Appeals Board.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN said that they would recommend that the Commission pursue this further to find out what the reason is and whether or not this should be in or deleted.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked why was the overlapping taken out of section 6-80-80?

MRS. NAKIAN said in the beginning of the section on Boards, it provides for the manner of electing and overlapping of all commissions; in the general section.

Page 109, section 6-80-81 Appeal, it was suggested by Corporation Counsel that the first sentence be deleted, and the second sentence, "In the event a decision is not rendered..." be moved into the first paragraph so that it would come before the last sentence of the first paragraph.

Page 109, Sewer Commission. Mrs. Nakian said that all the sewer systems at this point, are planned. The putting in of the sewers is done by the Public Works Department. The Commission recommended that the Sewer Commission be abolished. There are many reasons as heard in the Public Hearings, why the Sewer Commission should be kept. One reason is that the contracts still have to be let, and many feel there should be citizen oversight over the letting of the contracts.

The Committee recommended that the Sewer Commission be reinstated.

MR. HEINS Moved that the Sewer Commission deletion as recommended by the Commission be kept. Seconded.

Mr. Heins felt that the voters should have an opportunity to make a decision on this.

MR. PAVIA agreed with Mr. Heins. Mr. Pavia would personally like to keep the Sewer Commission but he wanted to see this change go before the public.

MR. RUBINO Moved the question. Seconded. Carried.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote on deleting the Sewer Commission language as suggested by the Charter Revision Commission. A yes vote is to abolish the Sewer Commission. DEFEATED by a vote of 21 opposed, 3 yes votes and 1 abstention.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 114, section 7-20-1a Trustees of Pension Plans and section 7-20-1b Powers, Duties of Trustees. The Committee recommends in 1a, add deleted language from existing charter, C-712 as suggested by Corporation Counsel: The Commissioner of Finance shall be the treasurer of the funds. All orders upon other respective funds shall be drawn under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Finance may prescribe. The Board of Trustees may prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of the respective funds. The Declaration of Trust and any amendments thereto must be filed in the Office of the Town and City Clerk and with the Corporation Counsel within thirty days of the execution thereof.

Page 114, section 7-20-1b, The Committee recommends to add deleted language in 7-20-5, page 118: The Board of Trustees shall annually report to the Board of Representatives the condition of the respective pension funds; with all receipts and disbursements on account thereof. Whenever these pension funds are found to be insufficient to meet the calls upon them, the Board of Trustees shall request an appropriation to make up the deficiency or any prospective deficiency. The deficiency shall be provided for in the annual appropriations for the Police and Fire Departments, respectively. ALSO: the assets of funds, who [may] shall also consult with the Commissioner of Finance.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

Page 116, some minor changes which are not ^{on} the Recommendation Sheet. The Federal Law now says that you do not have to retire at 65. Changes in the charter must be made to accomodate that. Whatever language in the charter relates to a mandatory 70-year old retirement date, is no longer effective. It is all written out.

MR. RUBINO said he would like the Commission to elicit an opinion from Corporation Counsel as to whether or not that statute applies to municipalities. There is a question as to whether it does or not.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN said that as serving on the Pension Board, they had an opinion from the Corporation Counsel and it applies to municipalities, and private corporations.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 117, section 7-20-4 Board of Trustees, it was recommended by the Committee to reinstate this section.

Page 118, top of the page, this section was moved to 7-20-1b.

MS. SUMMERVILLE said that if she recalled correctly, in section 7-20-7, we added "or increase."

MR. RUBINO said that he believed the Committee voted to take the recommendation of the Commission on that and delete. The vote was 3 to 3. Ms. Summerville made the motion to put the language back in. A tie is a negative vote; the motion failed.

MRS. McINERNEY asked if Mrs. Nakian Moved section 7-20-5 to another area?

MRS. NAKIAN said not the entire section. The sentence on the top of page 118, starting, "the Board of Trustees shall annually report..." That is now in section 7-20-5, page 118.

MRS. McINERNEY wanted to know what happened to the investment of the pension funds? (on page 117, section 7-20-5)

Mrs. McInerney Moved to have section 7-20-5 Investment of Pension Funds reinstated. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on the above motion. APPROVED.

MRS. MAIHOCK asked about section 7-20-6 Size of Funds and section 7-20-7 Pensions should not also be kept.

Mrs. Maihock Moved to reinstate sections 7-20-6 and 7-20-7. Seconded.

MRS. FISHMAN said she thought that these were moved to 7-20-1b.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN suggested that if the language has been covered, there is no need to reinstate. If it has not been covered in the charter, then we would like to see the language reinstated.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a voice vote on the above. APPROVED.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

MRS. NAKIAN, page 121, the last sentence, it was suggested by Corporation Counsel that the wording be changed. This was on the Committee's sheet with minor changes.

MRS. McINERNEY, going back to page 119, section 7-20-2, Retirement on Pension, she wanted to know if that was being changed from 25 years to 20 years?

MRS. NAKIAN said that she believed it is being changed.

MRS. FISHMAN said by contract.

MRS. NAKIAN, page 138, section 8-20-1 and 8-20-2, "Furnish the head of each department, commission, authority and agency," Mrs. Nakian proposed that this be changed to read, "agency and other entity receiving or expending city funds or state or federal funds granted to the city." The reason is that because this was so limited and if department, board, commission, authority and agency, Community Development which is a program receiving federal funds for which the city is responsible was never part of the budget process because it was not specifically mentioned here. The city is liable for the money.

Page 140, section 8-20-9, reinstate original wording: a two thirds vote of those present at the meeting, which two thirds shall not be less than a majority vote of the entire membership.

Page 142, section 8-30-2, Preliminary Budget of the Board of Education, recommend that it read instead of "a preliminary budget," it read, "the total dollars requested by" the Board of Education.

Pages 152 to 160, An opinion was received from Rick Robinson saying that while state statutes covered most of the responsibilities concerning public improvements, these pages contain all the procedures for doing same. If this is deleted, we have no procedure. Rick strongly recommended that all the sections from 8-60-1 to 17 being reinstated.

Page 168, section 9-10-12. Ordinance Overrule; Initiative; Referendum. The Committee felt that this should be deleted.

MR. RUBINO Moved to reinstate 9-10-12. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to reinstate the Commission's recommendation that we have ordinance overrule; initiative; referendum. DEFEATED, 20 opposed, 7 in favor and 1 abstention.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN asked if anyone had an questions on the list showing the minor and technical changes?

The President thanked the entire Committee for their hard work. The President and the Committee will be meeting the Charter Revision Commission on Thursday evening to informally present the Board's recommendations. The President said that it was important for anyone who wishes to give additional input, to come to the meeting: 7:30 p.m. Government Center.

MR. DONAHUE Moved for approval of the recommendations as amended by the Board. Seconded.

PRESIDENT GOLDSTEIN called for a vote to approve the main motion. APPROVED by a vote.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE: (continued)

Note: A copy of the 14th Charter Revision Commission's draft report, the Charter Revision Committee's recommendation for changes in the draft report, dated 4/6/87, and the Committee's recommendations for typographical, minor and technical changes in the draft report dated 4/6/87 will be attached to the official copy of these Minutes.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO ASSESS PRIORITY ISSUES - David Blum & Scott Morris, Co-Chairmen

MR. MORRIS said the Committee met on Wednesday, March 18, 1987, with Joseph Ercalano, Vice President of SACIA. A written report is forthcoming.

1. DISCUSSION ON TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION. Submitted by Reps. Scott Morris and David Blum, Co-Chairmen, Special Committee to Assess Priority Issues 12/29/86. Reports made and Held in Committee 2/2 and 3/2/87.

RESOLUTIONS

1. SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING CHIEF OF POLICE JOHN T. CONSIDINE FOR 30 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE CITY OF STAMFORD. Submitted by Rep. Scott Morris, Chairman, Health and Protection Committee and Members of the Committee, Reps. Thomas Burke, Patricia McGrath, Mary Lou Rinaldi, and James Rubino, 3113/87.

RESIDENT GOLDSTEIN accepted a motion to approve the above resolution. Moved. Seconded. Carried.

2. SENSE-OF-THE-BOARD RESOLUTION HONORING THE STAMFORD KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AUGUSTINE COUNCIL #41 ON THEIR 100TH ANNIVERSARY. Submitted by Reps. Donald T. Donahue, Jr. (D) 8th District and John R. Zelinski (D) 11th District.

HELD IN COMMITTEE

PETITIONS - None

ACCEPTANCE OF THE MINUTES

1. MARCH 2, 1987 REGULAR BOARD MEETING. - APPROVED by voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS - None

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS - None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon a Motion made, Seconded and Carried by voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 1:40 a.m.

By Anne A. Kachaluba
Anne A. Kachaluba, Acting Administrative
Assistant and Recording Secretary
19th Board of Representatives

APPROVED:

Sandra Goldstein
Sandra Goldstein, President
19th Board of Representatives

SG:ak
Enclosures