

The Regular Meeting of the 25th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford will be held Monday, March 6, 2000 p.m. in the Legislative Chambers of the Board of Representatives in the Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, Stamford, Connecticut.

Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 p.m.

INVOCATION: Given by Rep. Cannady

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG: Led by President Carmen L. Domonkos

ROLL CALL: There were thirty-seven members present; absent and excused were Reps. Skigen, Spandow and Alswanger. Reps. Spandow and Skigen arrived shortly after the start of the meeting.

MACHINE TEST VOTE: The machine tested to be in working order. The machine failed to register the first vote and was not used after the taking of roll call.

PAGES:

MOMENTS OF SILENCE: For the late:

Francesco A. Tarantino, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Catherine Watters, by Rep. Loglisci; Catherine C. Caselli, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Mary M. Giannitti, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Stanley Pietrkiewicz, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Arnold Vacca Sr., by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Antoinette Guiliani by Rep. Loglisci; Michael McNally, by Reps. White and Lyons; John Libby, By Rep. Zelinsky; Henry Caselli, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Philip Raus, by Rep. Giordano and Zelinsky; Guido T. Caporizzo, by Reps. Fortunato, Fedeli, Giordano and Zelinsky; Anthony D. Sabia, By Rep. Boccuzzi; Salvatore J.

Cerulli, by Reps. Giordano and Zelinsky; Emilio Calandrelli, by Reps. Giordano and Zelinsky; Antoinette L. Carlucci, by Reps. Giordano, Loglisci and Zelinsky; Frances L. Mulhall, by Reps. Giordano and Zelinsky; Vito W. Capazzo, Jr., by Reps. Giordano and Zelinsky; Vincent Copeland, by Rep. O'Neill; William Cross, by Reps. Giordano, Summerville-McAllister and Zelinsky; Michael P. Lanuch, Sr., by Reps. Giordano and Zelinsky; Judith Ann Prince Caviness, by Reps. DePina and Summerville-McAllister; Lucy R. Ciuffo, by Rep. Loglisci; Angelina M. Lovallo, by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Stanley A. Twardy, Sr., by Reps. Loglisci and Zelinsky; Robert A. Guinta, by Rep. Zelinsky; John L. DeForest, by the 25th Board of Representatives; Thomas J. Nolan, by Rep. Zelinsky; Raymond Treadway, by Rep. Zelinsky; William H. Nevins, by Rep. Zelinsky; Marie Clear, by Rep. Zelinsky; Genevieve S. Ross, by Rep. Zelinsky; Ana C. Vargas, by Rep. Zelinsky; Frances L. Mulhall, by Rep. Zelinsky; Joseph A. DeCrescanzo, by Rep. Zelinsky; Antoinette L. Carlucci, by Rep. Zelinsky; Evelyn B. Weiner, by Rep. Zelinsky; and Vita W. Copazzo, Sr., by Rep. Zelinsky.

STANDING COMMITTEES

STEERING COMMITTEE: Meeting: Wednesday, February 16, 2000
([Report](#)) 7:00 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room

Upon motion duly made and seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote, the Steering Committee Report was waived.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE Paul A. Esposito, Chair
Annie M. Summerville, Vice Chair
Meeting: Tuesday, February 22, 2000
6:30 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room
- and -
Meeting: Tuesday, February 22, 2000
Committee of the Whole - 8:15 p.m.
- and -
Meeting: Tuesday, February 29, 2000
6:30 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room
- and -
Meeting: Monday, March 6, 2000
6:30 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room

Chair Esposito reported that the Appointments Committee met three times this month. The first meeting was on Tuesday, February 22, 2000, the next meeting was on Tuesday, February 29, 2000 and the third meeting was held this evening at 6:30 p.m. Present at the February 22, 2000 meeting were Reps. Esposito, Summerville, DePina, Loglisci, Mobilio, Corelli, Mellis, Boccuzzi, Fortunato and Nanos. Also attending was Rep. Giordano.

1. A25.112	<u>Personnel Commission</u> Leroy Terrell (D) 500 Lakeside Drive Stamford, CT 06903 Term Expires: 12/01/02 01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/22/00 - Committee approved 5-3-1	Reappointment (exp. 12/01/99)	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE (27-10-2) <i>(Reps. Corelli, Day, DeLuca, Mobilio, Loglisci, Fedeli, Sherer, Imbrogno, Kernan & Gasparri opposed; Reps. Summerville & Zelinsky abstained)</i>
------------	---	----------------------------------	---

Chair Esposito moved the item; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Mobilio stated: “I voted against the reappointment of Mr. Terrell for the Personnel Commission. He appeared in front of the Appointments Committee for the purpose of reappointment, which means that the Appointments Committee is going to be asking him questions, and from the very first question that went his way, he seemed very arrogant; he was very rude. Representative Loglisci was asking him questions, and at one point, Mr. Terrell wouldn’t answer one of his questions because he had answered that same question two years ago, the last time he was up for reappointment. That prompted Rep. Boccuzzi to tell Mr. Terrell that there were some new members on the Appointments Committee who were not present two years ago, and therefore, it was appropriate that these questions come up because some of these members may be hearing the answers for the first time.

“I felt he was very rude, very arrogant, both towards Rep. Loglisci, but I think towards the Appointments Committee in general. The representatives there were acting in their official capacity, they weren’t talking about the weather or baseball scores, we were interviewing him for reappointment, and he was very angry at a lot of our questions.

“Another thing that bothered me was we interviewed Mrs. Kathleen Swanson-Lombardo at the same time, and as she was giving her views on what she thought would help the Personnel Commission, and she was in favor of certain things. While she was speaking, he was interrupting, telling her not to talk to us. One of his quotes was, ‘you shouldn’t be talking to them’ (meaning our committee – the Appointments Committee). So I thought he was not only rude toward the representatives, but he was very intimidating toward Mrs. Lombardo as she was attempting to answer a question that a committee member posed to her. He was rude and arrogant to Rep. Loglisci, but if it was somebody on the democratic side, I would feel the same way. I just thought his behavior was very inappropriate, and I think his behavior and his answers and his interrupting Mrs. Lombardo, telling her not to speak to us, demonstrated a total lack of respect and just a total disdain for the Board of Representatives in general and the Appointments Committee specifically, and to our committee and our procedures. I urge my colleagues to vote no for his reappointment.”

Rep. DePina: “I have to disagree with him. I don’t feel he said anything to the young lady at all, I think it was a hostile environment when he walked in. I thought he was a great candidate, and to his defense, I just don’t think that is correct.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Thank you, Madam President. I think these are very serious comments. I was not at the meeting, I don’t know, but I would ask, and certainly they don’t have to, but any other member of the Appointments Committee that was there to interview this particular candidate, I would ask them to clarify if indeed this individual was, as was stated, arrogant and not cooperating with the committee, because this concerns me. I don’t know the gentleman, and in all my years on the Board, I have never voted against someone, but it concerns me that someone would come before a legislative body (one of their committees) and have an attitude that they just don’t care. He may be the most qualified individual for that particular position, but he still should show respect to the legislative members of that Committee. So I would ask any committee member that was there that would like to clarify whether he was or was not arrogant so that this would help me to know whether I will vote yes or no on this particular appointment. Thank you, Madam President.

Rep. Summerville stated, for the record, that Reps. Skigen and Spadow have arrived. We now have 39 members present.

Rep. Esposito: “I would like to give my perspective on it. I was all the way down at the other end of the table, so I didn’t notice or hear this candidate say anything to Ms. Lombardo, but I was at the other end of the table. I was also one of those people who was not there the last time Mr. Terrell was interviewed for this committee, and therefore, I was in the dark as to what the issue was, but it became apparent very early on – during the first question – that there was a history between Mr. Terrell and some of the representatives. I did not feel that Mr. Terrell’s attitude was directed toward the Committee as a whole, I believe and feel his attitude was directed toward the questions that were asked directly to him by some members of the Committee. Yes, his reaction was inappropriate as a candidate coming before the Appointments Committee, but again, my perspective was that he was not being arrogant toward the Committee as a whole, he was reacting to questions that were being directed to him that had some history to it.”

Rep. Boccuzzi: “In the beginning, I think Mr. Terrell felt he had already answered questions previously and that they shouldn’t be asked again. But, I think after it was explained to him that we had members of the Committee who were not available or who were not on the Committee the first time he came around for an appointment, I think after that his attitude changed a little, and he did answer the questions.”

Rep. Corelli: “Thank you, Madam President. I think that we have a process here, and everyone that comes before us, that the Appointments Committee can ask a question, except Mr. Terrell, I guess. I was one of the people that was there, and I definitely heard him tell Ms. Lombardo not to talk to the Appointments Committee. I don’t know where Mr. Esposito was, he was right – he was at the end of the table and probably didn’t here

it. When anybody comes before us, regardless of who they are, there is a process to be followed, and if you don't want to follow or answer those questions, then you do not come before the Appointments Committee. Because of that reason, I intend to vote no."

Rep. Skigen: "Thank you, Madam President. I wasn't at the Appointments Committee meeting, so I can't speak to Mr. Terrell's actions on that night, however, I have attended a large number of Personnel Commission meetings over the past five years, and I think that Mr. Terrell does a credible job there. He is currently serving as chairman, does a good job of running the meetings, and I think that is the real test here. It may be, and I have seen when we have had the Personnel Commission in to meet with the Personnel Committee, that there is often a hostile relationship, and maybe Mr. Terrell brought that to the table, and maybe that was inappropriate, but I think that his actions that I have seen over the last five years speak louder than a fifteen-minute interview, so I would urge his reappointment."

President Domonkos asked for any other comments.

Rep. Mobilio: "Thanks, Madam President. I would just like to briefly add that prior to that night, I had never met Mr. Terrell, I had no idea what he looked like or anything about him, so when he walked into the room, I didn't even know who he was, so that experience was my first seeing him, hearing him, and I never met him before. I also just want to state briefly that I was sitting directly across Ms. Kathleen Lombardo, and I clearly heard him tell her that he shouldn't be answering the question that she was answering at that time. I also was watching her behavior as she was looking out of the corner of her eye at him, almost as if she was intimidated or afraid to keep speaking, so that was directly in my view. Thank you."

President Domonkos stated we would vote by machine. The machine was not in working order so a vote was taken by a show of hands. (Reps. Corelli, Day, DeLuca, Mobilio, Loglisci, Fedeli, Sherer, Imbrogno, Kernan and Gasparrini opposed; Reps. Summerville & Zelinsky abstained). The President announced there were 27 in favor, 10 opposed and 2 abstentions and the motion has passed.

2. A25.120	<u>Personnel Commission</u> Kathleen Swanson-Lombardo (R) 65 Hickory Road 12/01/99) Stamford, CT 06903 Term Expires: 12/01/02 01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/22/00 - Committee approved 9-0-0	Reappointment (exp.	APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA
------------	---	------------------------	---

The president stated she saw no hands.

3. A25.114 Smith House Board of Directors **APPROVED**
Sy Feinland (D) Rep. Gasparrini **ON CONSENT**
37 Clifford Avenue (exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06905
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/29/00 - Committee approved 6-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

4. A25.107 Smith House Board of Directors **APPROVED**
Mark J. Verrastro (R) Rep. Hermann **ON CONSENT**
219 Club Road (exp. 12/31/97) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06905
Term Expires: 12/31/00
01/07/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

5. A25.111 Board of Ethics **APPROVED**
Howard Kaplan, Esq. (D) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**
72 Timber Mill Road (exp. 06/30/99) **AGENDA (Rep.**
Stamford, CT 06903 **Corelli abstains)**
Term Expires: 06/30/04
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 9-0-1

The president stated she saw no hands.

6. A25.110 Board of Ethics - Alternate **APPROVED**
Sarah F. Summons, Esq. (D) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**
108 Fourth Street (exp. 06/30/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06905
Term Expires: 01/01/04
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

7. A25.108 Zoning Board **APPROVED**

Harry L. Parson, Jr. (D) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**
29 Trailing Rock Lane (exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06903
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

8. A25.126 Environmental Protection Board - Alternate **APPROVED**
Peter M. Conetta (R) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**
41 Martin Street (Term exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/26/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

9. A25.119 Water Pollution Control Authority **HELD IN**
George E. Lohse, Jr. (D) Reappoint. **COMMITTEE**
1622 Newfield Avenue (exp. 01/01/99)
Stamford, CT 06905
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Held in Committee

Chair Esposito stated that Mr. Lohse could not make the meeting, so this item was held.

10. A25.118 Planning Board **APPROVED**
Duane E. Hill (D) Repl. Rozier **ON CONSENT**
36 Den Road (Term Exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06903
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

11. A25.115 Economic Development **APPROVED**
Joanna Gwozdzowski (D) Repl. Hunter **ON CONSENT**

15 Stamford Avenue (exp. 12/01/98)
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 12/01/01
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

AGENDA

The president stated she saw no hands.

12. A25.122 Director of Health and Social Services
Anthony B. Iton, MD, JD, MPH
38 Volunteer Lane #3J
Greenwich, CT 06830
Term: Five Years
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/22/00 - Committee approved 10-0-0

**APPROVED
ON CONSENT
AGENDA**

The president stated she saw no hands.

13. A25.116 Social Services
Michael C. Jachimczyk, Esq. (R) Repl.
Chizmadia
706 Bedford Street (exp.
12/01/00)
P.O. Box 2442
Stamford, CT 06906-0442
Term Expires: 12/01/00
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

**APPROVED BY
UNANIMOUS
VOICE VOTE
(Reps. Skigen and
White abstain)**

Chair Esposito stated the reason Mr. Jachimczyk was not on the Consent Agenda is that during the meeting it became known that he is on another commission, and it was requested that he resign from that commission effective with his approval of appointment to the Social Services Commission. Chair Esposito moved Item No. 13; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Skigen: "I ask the chair if we have received that resignation letter."

Rep. Esposito: "I did not see it tonight. No."

Rep. Skigen: "I don't think we can make an approval contingent on the submission of a resignation. Either the resignation is in our hands or it is not. I think if we approve him tonight and he decides not to submit his resignation, then he is approved."

Rep. Summerville: “In all respect to the candidate that is before us, he did state, as other candidates have stated before, that if he is approved tonight, he would rather serve on the Social Services Commission. So, it is understood – we didn’t ask him for the resignation tonight – we asked for an understanding with him, which he agreed to. We said to him that we would get back to him to find out if you can serve on two boards, because he chose to. Then I found out today from a conversation with the office, that it appears there is nothing precluding him from serving on two commissions, and actually, the Committee felt he should not serve on both. He is willing to resign from the Commission on Aging and serve on the Social Services Commission if he is approved tonight.”

Rep. Martin: “So I basically agree with Ms. Summerville, I don’t believe there are any legal restrictions, we do not have his resignation in hand, but quite frankly, and we have gone in circles in issues relating to this – if a candidate has made their statement that they are willing to resign, if that is our wish, and clearly, it is my understanding that it is the Appointments Committee’s wish that we not have him serving in dual capacities (and it is personally my wish), so I am happy to support his appointment with the understanding that I anticipate that he will be resigning from the first committee. That is fine by me. I trust people on their word.”

A voice vote was taken; all representatives voted in favor with Reps. Skigen and White abstaining. The president stated the motion is passed.

14. A25.123	<u>Sewer/Water Commission</u> Thomas C. Romas (R) 13 Van Buren Circle Stamford, CT 06906 Term Expires: 12/01/02 01/18/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0	Reappointment (Term Exp. 12/01/99)	APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA
-------------	--	---------------------------------------	---

The president stated she saw no hands.

15. A25.124	<u>Commission on Aging</u> Robert A. Boender (D) 71 Strawberry Hill Ave. #514 Stamford, CT 06902 Term Expires: 12/01/01 01/26/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/29/00 - Committee defeated 0-7-0	Repl. Segall (Term Exp. 12/01/98)	DEFEATED BY VOICE VOTE (without prejudice)
-------------	--	--------------------------------------	---

Chair Esposito stated that because Mr. Boender could not attend the meeting, the Committee voted to deny his appointment, without prejudice. Chair Esposito moved the item; said motion was seconded.

President Domonkos stated that the vote would be on Mr. Boender for appointment to the Commission on Aging.

Rep. Martin stated that technically our motion is still to approve and the motion should be to approve this gentleman, but the Committee's recommendation is to not approve it.

President Domonkos stated that if you are in favor to approve Mr. Boender, you would vote yes; if you want to oppose, without prejudice, which means he can be resubmitted, you would vote no.

The president announced that the motion was defeated, with zero in favor, all opposed and no abstentions.

16. A25.125	<u>Zoning Board - Alternate</u> Sheldon Fox (D) 94 Bentwood Drive Stamford, CT 0603 Term Expires: 12./01/01 01/26/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0	Repl. Hunter (Term Exp. 12/01/01)	APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA
-------------	--	--------------------------------------	---

The president stated she saw no hands.

17. A25.121	<u>Environmental Protection Board</u> Gary H. Stone (R) 199 Webbs Hill Road Stamford, CT 06903 Term Expires: 12/01/02 01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0	Reappointment (exp. 12/01/99)	APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA
-----------------------------	--	----------------------------------	---

The president stated she saw no hands.

18. A25.127	<u>Personnel Appeals Board</u> Margaret Northrop (D) 155 Mill Brook Road Stamford, CT 06903 Term Expires: 12/01/02 01/31/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0	Reappointment (Term Exp. 12/01/99)	APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA
-------------	---	---------------------------------------	---

The president stated she saw no hands.

19. A25.128 Environmental Protection Board **APPROVED**
Howard R. Graber (D) Repl. Morris **ON CONSENT**
196 North Street (Term Exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06901
Term Expires: 12/01/02
01/31/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

20. A25.129 Health Commission **APPROVED**
Eugene Conrad (R) Repl. Mobilio **ON CONSENT**
237-1 Strawberry Hill Avenue (Term Exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 12/01/02
02/09/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

21. A25.130 Health Commission **APPROVED**
Kate McCabe (R) Repl. Mastrangelo **ON CONSENT**
123 Harbor Drive, Suite 512 (Term Exp. 12/01/97) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 12/01/00
02/09/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 6-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

22. A25.131 Transit District **APPROVED**
Sybil Taccone (R) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**
188 Skyview Drive (Term Exp. 12/01/99) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 01/01/03
02/09/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

23. A25.132 Golf Authority **APPROVED**
William R. Lombardo (R) Reappointment **ON CONSENT**

96 Boxwood Drive (Term Exp. 01/01/00) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06906
Term Expires: 01/01/03
02/09/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

24. A25.133 Personnel Commission **APPROVED**
Lois Lipoth PontBriant (R) Repl. Rinaldi **ON CONSENT**
112 Northwind Drive (Term Exp. 12/01/98) **AGENDA (Rep.**
Stamford, CT 06903 **Mellis abstains)**
Term Expires: 12/01/01
02/10/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 6-0-1

The president stated she saw no hands.

25. A25.134 Sewer/Water Commission **APPROVED**
Nicola Tarzia (R) Repl. Johnson **ON CONSENT**
30 Courtland Avenue (exp. 12/1/97) **AGENDA**
Stamford, CT 06902
Term Expires: 12/01/00
02/14/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

Upon motion duly made and seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote, the Consent Agenda, consisting of Item Nos. 2-8, 10-12, 14, and 16-25 was approved. Ms. Corelli abstained on Number 5, and Ms. Corelli abstained on Number 24.

Suspension of the Rules:

Chair Esposito moved to suspend the rules; said motion was seconded.

President Domonkos noted that Mr. Loglisci left the floor for the discussion and vote. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Esposito stated: "The reason we need to suspend the rules is that this is an emergency because the Board of Tax Review is beginning its hearing presently, and they need to have a full complement of people on board. Her name just came down, she was interviewed by the Committee last week, she was approved by the Committee 7-0-0, and I so move."

Said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.

26. A25.135 Tax Assessment (Temporary) **APPROVED**
Victoria L. Bradley (R) **BY VOICE**
246 Knickerbocker Avenue **VOTE**
Stamford, CT 06907
02/17/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

Chair Esposito moved to suspend the rules for Item No. 27. Said motion was seconded and approved by voice vote with Reps. White, Nabel, Skigen, Nakian, Mellis, Esposito, and Domonkos opposed. President Domonkos stated that the motion was approved with 31 in favor and 7 opposed.

27. A25.136 Planning Board **APPROVED**
Donna Loglisci (R) Repl. Rich **BY VOICE**
39 Mercedes Lane (exp. 12/1/99) **VOTE (Reps.**
Stamford, CT 06905 **Nakian, Mellis,**
Term Expires: 12/01/02 **Skigen, Nabel,**
02/17/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy **White abstained)**
02/29/00 - Committee approved 6-0-1

Chair Esposito stated that the Committee voted 6-0-1 to approve Item No. 27 above and moved the item. Said motion was seconded.

A voice vote was taken with Reps. Nakian, Mellis, Skigen, Nabel and White opposed. The President announced the motion passed.

FISCAL COMMITTEE David Martin, Chair
Bobby E. Owens, Vice Chair
Meeting: Monday, February 28, 2000
7:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair Martin reported that the Fiscal Committee met on Monday, February 28, 2000. Present were Committee members Martin, Owens, Giordano, Lyons, Loglisci, Mellis, Nanos, Poltrack, Green-Carter and Sherer.

1. F25.231 **ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (Operating**
\$47,281.00 **Budget); Police Department; Employee Assistance** **APPROVED**
Program; to increase account as current spending **ON CONSENT**
trends are greater than budgeted amounts. **AGENDA**
12/30/99 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
01/13/00 - Approved by Board of Finance
02/07/00 - No action taken

02/28/00 - Committee approved 9-0-0

Secondary Committee: Public Safety & Health

Concur

The president stated she saw no hands.

- | | | |
|------------|--|--|
| 2. F25.221 | REVIEW; of accounting and overtime related to the City of Stamford's maintenance contract with the Board of Education.
11/22/99 - Submitted by President Domonkos
12/20/99 - Committee voted to hold
02/07/00 - Report Made & Held in Committee
02/28/00 - Report Made & Held in Committee | REPORT
MADE &
HELD IN
COMMITTEE |
|------------|--|--|

Secondary Committee: Education

Chair Martin stated: "The Mayor and Acting Director of Operations, Tim Curtin, primarily came down and presented additional information on this continuing item. That information that was presented to the Committee has been passed out to the full Board, which essentially provided more information about the number of items that they are taking care of, which are beyond 30, 60 and 90 days. I won't go into the specifics right now, due to the lateness of the hour. Unfortunately, the budget director was ill that evening, and so we did not receive any real additional information on the primary purpose, which was the accounting and overtime. So, while we had a report, I will give more details next month when we wrap this up, hopefully, with the additional accounting information which was charged to the Fiscal Committee."

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| 3. F25.236
\$147,135.00 | ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (Special Revenue Fund); Day Care Grant; Salaries; funds represent increased State allocation; to pay salary for Day Care Center program.
01/31/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/10/00 - Approved by Board of Finance
02/28/00 - Committee Approved 7-0-1 | APPROVED
ON CONSENT
AGENDA |
|----------------------------|---|---|

Secondary Committee: Education

App 4-0-1

The president stated she saw no hands.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| 4. F25.235
\$6,073.00 | ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION (Special Revenue Fund); Health Department; WIC; funds represent increased State allocation.
01/31/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy | APPROVED
ON CONSENT
AGENDA |
|--------------------------|--|---|

02/10/00 - Approved by Board of Finance
02/28/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0

Secondary Committee: Public Safety & Health

Concur

The president stated she saw no hands.

Chair Martin moved the Consent Agenda; said motion was seconded. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE Maria Nakian, Chair
William MacInnis, Vice Chair
Meeting: Monday, February 28, 2000
7:00 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room

Chair Nakian reported that the Legislative & Rules Committee met on Monday, February 28, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. Nakian, MacInnis, Esposito, Gasparrini, Skigen, Spadow, Day and Sherer. Reps. Zelinsky, Mitchell and Fedeli were excused. Also present were John Hiddlestone and Michael Cacace representing the Center for the Arts; Atty. Elizabeth Bates for the Bibleway Church of God; Robin Stein of the Land Use Bureau; Michael Zarba of the Division of Highways, and Rep. Susan Nabel.

1. LR25.101 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **HELD IN**
granting a tax abatement to The First Haitian Free **COMMITTEE**
Methodist Church of Stamford, for four lots bounded
by Virgil Street, Dryden Street and Minor Place.
11/04/99 - Submitted by Howard C. Kaplan, Esq.,
Wofsey Rosen et al
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/28/00 - Held in Committee

Chair Nakian stated this matter was held at the request of Atty. Howard Kaplan, the submitter of the request, who was not able to attend the meeting.

2. LR25.059 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **APPROVED**
providing a tax abatement for the Bibleway Church **ON CONSENT**
of God for property located at 152-154 Selleck Street. **AGENDA**
03/23/99 - Submitted by Roberts, Kambas, Rose &
Bates
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/28/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0

The president stated she saw no hands.

- | | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| 3. LR25.097 | PROPOSED ORDINANCE; <u>for publication</u>;
enabling the designation of certain city streets as
“Scenic Roads.”
09/09/99 - Submitted by Rep. Nabel
09/15/99 - Placed on Pending Agenda
02/28/00 - Committee approved 7-1-0 | APPROVED
 BY VOICE
 VOTE (Rep.
 MacInnis
 opposed) |
|-------------|--|---|

Chair Nakian stated: “This ordinance has been re-written by the Law Department to address concerns that had been brought up at previous meetings. It provides that the Planning Board has the authority to designate such roads; there is certain criteria which must be used in the designation and that the owners of the majority of property abutting the roads must agree to the designation. The Committee made one change in the ordinance concerning the type of survey that was required, and that change was sent out to everybody. We approved the publication by a vote of 7-1-0.”

Chair Nakian moved the item; said motion was seconded.

The item was approved by a voice vote with Rep. MacInnis opposed.

Rep. Summerville stated that Rep. Corelli had left the meeting due to illness.

- | | | |
|-------------|--|---|
| 4. LR25.109 | APPROVAL; of agreement between the City of
Stamford and the Stamford Center for the Arts/Palace
Theater increasing the mortgage limit under Deed
Restriction (dated 1/31/94) from \$2,500,000 to
\$9,000,000.
02/16/00 - Submitted by M. Cacace, Esq.
02/28/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0 | APPROVED BY
 UNANIMOUS
 VOICE VOTE |
|-------------|--|---|

Rep. Loglisci requested Item No. 4 be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Chair Nakian stated: “This item is an agreement between the City of Stamford and the Stamford Center for the Arts increasing the mortgage limit under the deed restriction. The deed restriction was filed in the land records when the Palace Theater was purchased in January of 1994. The City required the deed restriction to protect its investment in the property, and the limit put on the mortgage was \$2.5 million, which was the purchase price for the theater at that time. Should the Center for the Arts not operate the Palace Theater as a not-for-profit art organization, the property would revert to the City for \$1. Since that time, there have been improvements to the Palace, there was a major renovation of the stage area. Also, the theater acquired the property adjacent to the theater for expansion, and there will be a new project renovating the exterior and increasing the lobby area, which is projected to cost \$6 to \$7 million. It will be funded by a mortgage loan from People’s Bank and by two state grants,

and this will increase the total amount of the mortgages on the theater to \$9 million. Therefore, the SCA is seeking to modify the deed restriction by increasing the mortgage limit to \$9 million.

“Everything else in the deed restrictions remains the same, and again, you have a new copy of the agreement which makes very plain that the deed restriction is applying not only to 61 Atlantic Street, the original theater property, but the two new properties at 39 and 45 Atlantic Street. The Committee voted 8-0-0 in favor of this, and I so move.”

Rep. Loglisci: “As I understand it, the City put \$1 million up, and what this is saying is that they can now mortgage up to \$9 million, and I assume that the \$9 million is over and above the \$1 million that the City put in.”

Chair Nakian: “I imagine that it is because the City money was not a mortgage.”

Rep. Loglisci: “What that means then is if something should go wrong, the first \$9 million that they have in mortgages, those people would get their money before the City could get its \$1 million, is that true?”

Chair Nakian: “It is my understanding that the Center for the Arts could not sell the building, it would revert either to the City or to the State, which also has a deed restriction on it because of the state grants. There is no other use that can be made of that building, other than being operated by the Center for the Arts or reverting to the City or the State. The City could reclaim it and sell it, but I don’t believe the Center for the Arts could sell it.”

Rep. Loglisci: “I just wanted clarification as to the status of our \$1 million, and I guess really what you are saying is that the City is pretty much protected and it would revert back to us. Is that true?”

Chair Nakian: “Yes, I believe so.”

The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Nakian moved the Consent Agenda, consisting of Item No. 2; said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE Randall Skigen, Chair
 Ralph Loglisci, Vice Chair
 Meeting: Wednesday, March 1, 2000
 7:00 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room

Chair Skigen stated that the Personnel Committee met on March 1, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. Skigen, Boccuzzi, Cannady, Fedeli, Fortunato, Loglisci, MacInnis and Spandow. Rep. Gasparrini was excused. Also present were Superintendent Anthony Mazzullo and John Byrne, Director of Public Safety, Health & Welfare.

1. P25.070 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **HELD IN**
concerning the repeal of Chapter II, Article I **COMMITTEE**
concerning fees for examinations.
12/16/99 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
03/01/00 - Held in Committee

Chair Skigen stated that Item No. 1 was held because the Committee is still waiting for this ordinance to come down from the Law Department.

2. P25.073 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **HELD IN**
changing the application fee for fire and police **COMMITTEE**
department applicants to an examination fee.
02/16/00 - Submitted by Rep. Skigen
03/01/00 - Held in Committee

Chair Skigen stated that Item No. 2 was also held because the Committee is still waiting for this ordinance to come down from the Law Department.

3. P25.072 **APPROVAL;** of employment contract between the **APPROVED**
City of Stamford and Anthony B. Iton, MD, JD, MPH **ON CONSENT**
as Director of Health and Social Services; term of **AGENDA**
contract: 5 years.
01/12/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
03/01/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0

Chair Skigen stated: "The Committee, after receiving comments, negotiated some changes to the agreement with Dr. Iton, all of which were accepted by Dr. Iton. Everybody should have received a revised copy of the contract with a notation, 'revised 3/1/00', and the Committee approved that revised contract 8-0-0. My understanding is that Dr. Iton signed that contract today."

4. P25.065 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **APPROVED**
creating the position of ~~Executive Aide~~ Special **BY VOICE**
Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools. **VOTE (*Reps.***
11/05/99 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy ***White and***
01/12/00 - Removed from Agenda ***Zelinsky opposed*)**
02/11/00 - Resubmitted by Superintendent Mazzullo
03/01/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

Chair Skigen stated: “The Personnel Commission has changed the title of this position, and it is now creating the position of Special Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools. The Committee voted to accept that. Dr. Mazzullo spoke about the need he feels for this position, and the Committee voted 7-0-0 to publish, and I so move.”

Rep. Zelinsky stated: “Thank you, Madam President. Through you, to the chair of the Committee. Am I to understand that the previous position that was within the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools Office was the title of Secretary or Administrative Assistant? Do you know what the title was?”

Chair Skigen: “I don’t know what the title was. There was a secretary who worked for the Superintendent directly.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “And that position was a civil service position.”

Chair Skigen: “That is correct.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Thank you Chairman Skigen. First, let me start by saying that I respect Superintendent Mazzullo. I believe he is doing an outstanding job as our superintendent of schools, however, I feel uncomfortable voting to create a new, non-civil service position that abolishes a previous civil service position. I believe that if we do this this evening, we are setting a precedent that possible department heads in the City of Stamford can also go before the Personnel Commission, and this Board will say, ‘OK, let’s do away with this civil service position, we’ll change the title and we will call it something else, and we’ll create this new position and it won’t be a civil service position and thereby we are really not protecting the classified civil service personnel of our City, and I think this is really a mistake so I really can’t vote to support this item. Thank you.”

President Domonkos asked if there was any further discussion. The matter was approved by voice vote, with Reps. White and Zelinsky opposed and no abstentions.

Chair Skigen moved the Consent Agenda; said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Skigen thanked Reps. Shapiro and Mellis for their help in reviewing Dr. Iton’s contract and their very worthwhile comments.

LAND USE COMMITTEE Donald B. Sherer, Co-Chair; Patrick White, Co-Chair
Meeting: Thursday, March 2, 2000
7:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair Sherer reported that the Land Use Committee met on March 2, 2000 at 7:30 p.m. Present were Committee Member Reps. Sherer, Shapiro, Spandow, Boccuzzi, Nakian, Loglisci, O'Neill and Hunter. Excused was Rep. White.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|--|
| 1. LU25.036 | APPEAL; of Planning Board's January 11, 2000 decision amending the Master Plan (Change 367), by changing Block Nos. 0007, 0018, 0271, 0263 and 0264 from Land Use Category 6, 5, 4, 3 and 8-D to Land Use Category 13 - Public, Parks.
02/03/00 - Submitted by John Wayne Fox, Esq.
03/01/00 - Committee approved 6-0-2 | APPROVED
BY VOICE
VOTE (Reps.
Summerville,
Loglisci, Imbrogno,
Gaztambide and
DePina opposed) |
|-------------|---|--|

Chair Sherer stated: "A public hearing was held on Land Use Item 25.036, which was an appeal of the Planning Board's January 11, 2000 decision amending the Master Plan. That amendment is known as Amendment 367, and the purpose of that amendment was to change Land Use Categories 6, 5, 4 3 and 8-D to Land Use Category 13, which is Public Parks. The appeal was brought by three land owners in that amendment parameter, and they comprised at least 20% of the land owners in that amendment area, which is what the requirements are for a valid appeal. They presented their appeal to our Land Use Committee. The attorneys for the petitioners presented their case. There was one representative of a petitioner, not an attorney, who participated. The Mayor presented the case for the City of Stamford Planning Board, and subsequent to the rebuttals allowed on both sides, the public had an opportunity to speak. There were over 50 people in attendance and at least 12 people spoke.

"There was a very large majority of the speakers, almost all the speakers, spoke in favor of the Planning Board amendment, spoke opposing the petition to overturn or to change that amendment.

"Subsequent to the public part of the meeting, our Committee did ask questions, and we then debated as we do the merits of the petition and presentation, and it was our Committee's feeling, 6-0-2, to uphold the amendment, because the motion was made to uphold the amendment, thereby rejecting the appeal. And, the vote was six in favor to uphold the amendment. The feeling in our Committee was that the petitioners did not present sufficient evidence which would satisfy the provisions of the ordinances that provide that the presentation show that good cause exists that the studies of physical, social, economic and governmental conditions and trends were appropriate in the consideration of the amendment. The petitioners did not present, our Committee felt, sufficient evidence to show that those things were not carefully incorporated into the thought process of the Planning Board in their decision. Our Committee felt that the Planning Board, and the City itself, who proposed these amendments, actually met the

challenge of the ordinance and did provide substantial studies, all of which our Board has seen presented to us concerning the economic value, the social value, the environmental values of the amendment, and therefore that was the basis for the vote, and I so move this item on to the Consent Agenda.”

The President recognized Rep. Day who requested it be removed from the Consent Agenda. The President asked Chair Sherer to move the item.

Chair Sherer moved Item No. 1, stating: “I would like to move that the Amendment 367 to the Master Plan of the City of Stamford be, and hereby is approved, and that the appeal thereof be denied.”

Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Day stated: “Madam President, I plan to vote in favor of the Amendment and against the appeal. The reason I took it off consent is that I felt it was important that the record show that at least, in the case of this representative, that this vote does not constitute a complete endorsement of every detail of the Mill River Corridor Plan. That plan is very ambitious, I think there is a great deal of work remaining to be done, a great many issues that remain to be confronted with respect to that plan. I feel strongly that the Board of Representatives is entitled to be involved in the resolution of some of those issues. The issues include the cost to the taxpayers versus the benefits to the City, the future of 26 Main Street, and, in my judgment, some of the underlying assumptions about the proposed tax increment financing, the question of whether the City can effectively operate an office building – I would certainly like to know that it can operate an office building better than it operated the train station – and finally, I am waiting for a commitment on the part of this City to maintain the parks that it already has before we go about committing a great deal more of our space and resources to city parks. Having said that, I think there is a lot merit to the concept of the Mill River Corridor vision, but there is a great deal of work that needs to be done, and I wanted just to go on record that this vote does not constitute an approval of the plan that is on the table at this point in time. Thank you, Madam President.”

Chair Sherer: “Yes, thank you, I appreciate Rep. Day’s comments, and I would just like to point out to other members of the Board that right now, this is about the Master Plan, and our Committee felt that the issues that are required under the Charter with regards to amending the Master Plan, were met by the Planning Board and not met by the petitioners of the appeal. I think the issues raised by Mr. Day are more apropos when the time comes for discussing the implementation plan, and that implementation plan, which is far away in the future, will most appropriately come to our Board for review and we will have that type of input.”

Rep. Loglisci: “Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe that when we look at this plan that there are tens of millions of dollars that are going to be spent for a one square block park with a skyscraper in the middle of it, that buying, managing and tearing down a viable building does not make sense, that the TIF financing that seems to be the track that we

are on, which I don't know if people truly understand it, but the TIF financing means that the majority of the additional revenue created by building these new buildings is going to be used in payment of purchasing of lands and creating parks, so that the infrastructure of these new buildings will go to taxes, because we will not get the full benefit because we are bonding this money.

“So, certainly it is going to affect our taxes. We have schools that have to be built and a very expensive water treatment plant that has to be built. We are going to bond all of this, and I don't know if we need to create a second shadow budget, such as the Water Pollution Budget, that is a capital budget worth millions and millions of dollars. So, I believe this will raise city taxes, I don't believe it will cut down our taxes. I don't believe the general public truly understands the costs, and I think that what I really would like is a detailed plan of what will go where, a time schedule for affordable housing, because I think that is the most important part, and there is a desperate need in this City, and I haven't seen that. Before we OK Phase 3, I think we should have a lot of answers, so I am going to vote against this.”

Rep. O'Neill: “Yes, Madam Chairman. I believe it is premature to discuss the financing of particular aspects of this plan. Tonight we are here to vote upon the plan as a concept of expanding our parks system toward the Mill River. I abstained during the committee meeting because there were issues I had with the financing, however, those issues are not before us. Clearly, this is to define the perimeters of where we would like to expand our downtown park in the future. The financing will come later and will be the object of much discussion, I am sure. However, tonight I do not believe is the time or the place to dwell on these issues. We are all concerned about the future costs attached to this project, however, in principal, this is a wonderful project and it is a visionary plan and I think we should support it.”

President Domonkos stated: “If you are in favor of upholding the amendment as proposed by the Planning Board, you vote yes. If you are opposed to the Planning Board's amendment, you vote no. By voting no, you would be approving the appeal. To approve the appeal, you would need 21 no votes. The Board is required to have 21 votes to turn this down. Does everyone understand?” We are voting as the Planning Board voted. Mr. Martin.”

Rep. Martin: “I think you said that very well with one exception and that is that the vote here is to approve, and what is often forgotten is a failure to approve is not the same thing as a rejection. So I believe in the information that you shared with me in the Charter, we need 21 votes to approve. Failure to get an approval would actually, in my opinion, require a vote to reject and we would see if we get 21 votes to reject. Failure to neither approve nor reject as the Charter envisions, then it falls to approval. It is only a technicality, and I think everything is still the same and the question is do we get 21 votes to approve or not.”

President Domonkos clarified the vote on LU25.036 above, stating, “It has been moved that Amendment 367 to the Master Plan of the City be and is hereby approved and the

appeal is denied. That was the vote of the Committee. If you are in favor the amendment as the Planning Board approved it, you vote 'yes'; if you are opposed to the Planning Board's amendment, you would vote 'no'.

The motion was approved by voice vote. Those voting no were: Reps. Loglisci, Imbrogno, Summerville, Gaztambide and DePina. There were no abstentions.

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---|
| 2. LU25.038 | APPROVAL; of naming of entrance to the Ponus Yacht Club (currently listed on city records as "no name road") as Bateman Way.
01/19/00 - Submitted by Ponus Yacht Club
03/01/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0 | APPROVED
ON CONSENT
AGENDA |
|-------------|---|---|

Chair Sherer stated: "The first item on the Agenda, approval of naming the entrance to the Ponus Yacht Club, currently listed on city records as "no name road," as Bateman Way. John Weigold, Commodore of the Ponus Yacht Club, had proposed this for the following reasons. He made a brief presentation at the meeting, and he indicated that for many years there is a road off of Dyke Lane that led into Ponus Yacht Club. When the hurricane barrier was built many years ago, that road was discontinued and a road was built over the hump of the hurricane barrier as an entrance to the Ponus Yacht Club and ultimately to Yacht Haven. It never had a name, and in the past few months, there has been an agreement with Northeast Utilities to exchange some property with Ponus Yacht Club and to grant an easement to Yacht Haven to facilitate a future large development project at Brewer's Yacht Haven. At that time it was suggested that the entrance or road have a name. The membership of the Yacht Club went through a series of proposals for names, and he one that was chosen was Bateman Way.

"Mr. Bateman was a lifelong resident of the South End as was his family, and was very active in the Ponus Yacht Club and ran childrens' events. After he graduated college, he moved to Darien and became a Darien police officer, and many of you may know, that around 1981, he was killed in the line of duty, and that murder still remains unsolved. As a matter of fact there are posters around time recently proposing a reward for the capture of his murderer. Because of that and because of his activities in that part of the community, the club felt it was important that it be named after him and the Brewer's Yacht Haven principals also agree.

"Our committee voted 8-0-0 to approve the street as Bateman Way with the understanding that it is strictly for naming the street, having nothing to do or granting any approvals as an accepted city street, which right now it is not."

President Domonkos stated she sees no hands.

- | | | |
|-------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 3. LU25.037 | RESOLUTION; requesting acceptance of Georgian Court as a City Street Under Charter Part 8, Budgetary | APPROVED
ON CONSENT |
|-------------|--|--------------------------------|

Procedures - 6; Special Assessment.
02/11/00 - Submitted by Rep. Nable
03/01/00 - Committee approved 8-0-0

AGENDA

Chair Sherer stated: "The second item is a resolution requesting acceptance of Georgian Court as a City street under Charter Part 8, and it has been our recent policy that when a petition is made to the City for approval, that our Board passes a resolution first instructing the Engineering Department to proceed to study the feasibility or begin the process of accepting that street. Ultimately, we are also indicating that the petitioners will be responsible for all fees incurred in that investigation. Our Committee voted 8-0-0 to approve the resolution."

President Domonkos stated she sees no hands.

Chair Sherer moved the Consent Agenda; said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Sherer stated: "I would like to thank my Committee for spending long hours, we were here until after 1:00 a.m. Thank you very much."

Suspension of Rules:

Rep. DeLuca moved that Item No. 2, URC25.006 be taken out of order. President Domonkos stated that this would require a 2/3 vote for approval. Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Lyons stated: "Madam President, I would just like to point out that there are other people out in the gallery waiting for the Public Safety item on anti-blight to be discussed, and perhaps, in the matter of expediency, we should move several items out of order, or maybe we should just stick with the original agenda."

The motion was approved by voice vote with Reps. MacInnis and Lyons opposed.

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| 2. URC25.06 | REVIEW; of matter regarding a resolution to extend the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southeast Quadrant Urban Renewal Project Connecticut, R-43, expiring March 4, 2000.
02/16/00 - Submitted by President Domonkos
02/29/00 - Committee approved 5-0-1 | APPROVED
BY ROLL CALL
VOTE (23-15-0) |
|-----------------------------|--|---|

Chair Shapiro stated: "The Committee met on Tuesday, February 29, 2000. Members present were Committee Member Reps. Shapiro, Gasparini, Nakian, Day, Corelli, Summerville. Mr. MacInnis was excused due to confusion over the timing of the meeting. Reps. Martin and Mobilio were not present.

"Item number 2, the matter of extending the Southeast Quadrant Urban Renewal Project for a period of four months in accordance with the resolution that all members have, was approved

5-0-1. The Committee noted that the owners of Curley's Diner, and it didn't take rocket scientists to figure this out, are currently in litigation with the URC. The Committee did not want to disturb the relative rights of the parties and wanted to preserve the status quo in the whole Southeast Quadrant while the URC and Curley's got to the merits of their case. Many members, myself included, hope that Curley's is treated very fairly by the courts. I myself am a customer and so are many other members of the Committee, and there were strong emotions about this. We hope that, in the end, they are satisfied with the outcome of the court. But, most felt that this Board should wait until this legal process had run its course until the future of the Southeast Quadrant was re-assessed. Finally, we were advised strongly by the City's Corporation Counsel, that if we did not extend the Southeast Quadrant project, we would open ourselves to a whole slew of litigation from other owners in the quadrant and other forms of chaos, and this could have a real negative effect on taxpayers in the end. So, in order not to meddle in an ongoing court case, although most of us felt very strongly and emotionally about this, we voted to extend the status quo in the Southeast Quadrant until the legal process had run its course. That completes my report, and I so move."

Said motion was seconded.

Rep. DeLuca: "I plan to vote against the extension for several reasons. The first one being, the URC commission members and the director did not attend our Board of Representatives URC Committee meeting. To me this is typical of the URC, which is noted for its arrogance in the past, the present, and I am sure it will still be arrogant in the future. I do not like their powers of eminent domain, the way they attack the little guy. I am not in favor of the extension which would allow the URC to take over Curley's Diner. At least Jessie James at least stole from the little people and used a gun. The URC does it with high powered attorneys. They wear down the little person who cannot afford the legal fees. The owners of Curley's should be commended for taking on someone as powerful as the URC. You heard the comment that hopefully the courts will treat them fairly, why must it be that the courts treat them fairly, why couldn't the URC do this up front, instead of going out there like gangbusters to take them over. It's a joke that we talk about the City that Works, but yet when it comes to the little person, the City doesn't work for them, but it sure as heck works for the wealthy developers. We just got through approving the Master Plan, which is going to benefit the wealthy developers. We approved something for Dreyfuss, we did it real fast like Swiss Bank, but when it comes to somebody like Curley's Diner, we say 'forget about it.' We are not interested in preserving Curley's Diner for the people that can afford a decent meal at a decent location. Are we going to destroy another American dream. By approving the Master Plan change, we disrupt potential small businesses that would relocate on Main Street after their businesses were burned down. The Chamber of Commerce and the administration bombarded us with fancy brochures and numerous reports to approve the Master Plan and the Mill River Corridor. And yet, the Chamber of Commerce and the administration did nothing to impress upon the Board of Representatives that they should help out Curley's Diner. Are we going to ignore the fact that we have 7,000 signatures supporting Curley's Diner. Are we going to tell these people, 'forget about it, you don't rate, we are not interested in keeping your type of a diner the downtown area, we just want the highest of places.' We are not interested in somebody going in there who cannot afford a lunch, but yet the owners of Curley's Diner sees to it that these people have something to eat.

“I just have two questions. This is directed to the Chair, Jim Shapiro, is it possible that we can do something with this, by making an amendment to the extension whereby Curley’s Diner is permitted to stay where it is, or is it possible that they can be moved over to the vacant site on Washington Boulevard? Are we allowed to do that?”

Chair Shapiro: “ I will have to ask our parliamentarians about that.”

Rep. Martin: “I think that in theory, yes, I think that we could make changes to the URC that would protect certain properties. However, exactly how to do that, I am certainly unprepared as to how to do that. I don’t think we can simply make an amendment now on this extension, because the action with regard to Curley’s property is part of another set of actions which were independently approved by this Board. While I think in theory that what Mr. DeLuca says is possible, and certainly we could vote on it, I would think it would be extremely unwise and impractical. I am not the attorney, I just think it is fraught with all sorts of unknowns, and that is just an opinion rather than any parliamentary view. Do you (referring to Rep. Sherer) feel similarly?”

Rep. Sherer: “Actually, I have a contrary opinion, Mr. Martin. In order for an amendment to be made, it has to be germane to the issue at hand, and I think you have to be very introspective, and in this particular case, the actual motion is to extend the life of a body, and amending a plan, which is not germane to the life of the body is really a stretch, and I think it would probably be an inappropriate motion in accordance with Robert’s Rules.”

Rep. DeLuca: “Can we make an amendment to more or less send an accompanying memo saying we extended your life, but we would hope that you would seriously consider leaving Curley’s where it is or to move it to Washington Boulevard?”

President Domonkos: “Mr. DeLuca, under Robert’s Rules, the definition of germane, it says: ‘to be germane, an amendment must in some way involve the same question that is raised by the motion to which it is applied. We are not voting on a specific issue that relates to the diner. We are voting on an entire URC plan that gives them powers and authority. We are not voting on a land disposition agreement in regards to the URC. We are voting on the document that was sent out to all of you that does not mention any piece of land or any property. So this is really not germane to our issue tonight.”

Rep. Nakian: “Having done this several times in the past, it is my recollection that we have always done amendments to the plan according to a process, which included public hearing and so forth. This is not the Urban Renewal plan that we have, this is just a resolution extending the date in the plan. The plan itself is a very highly technical document, if I remember correctly. I don’t see how we can amend anything without having the proper information and going through the proper process. I think David is correct. Yes, it can be amended, but I don’t believe it should be amended without our knowing what we are doing, and I, for one, would not like to start making amendments to a Plan that I can only barely remember. I just wouldn’t feel comfortable doing that.”

President Domonkos: “It’s just not really germane to this issue.”

Rep. DeLuca: “Is it possible then, if we can’t do it this evening, is it possible at the next meeting that maybe the Board of Representatives could draft up a resolution making certain recommendations to the URC as it regards Curley’s Diner. I would like to see something like that. I’ll draft up a resolution and see what happens at our next Steering Committee meeting. Also as part of that resolution, I would like to see done is – because in my judgment, I think the URC has seen its day and it is time to dissolve the URC – because we have an Economic Development Director, we have land use boards. I see somebody shaking their heads...”

President Domonkos: “Mr. DeLuca, I have to make a point here. We are not voting on the life of the URC. We are voting on their contract for the Southeast Quadrant. So, this is not putting them out of business, even if it is turned down. It is extending their plan.”

Rep. DeLuca: “I plan on voting no because I don’t think they deserve to be extended.”

Rep. O’Neill: “Yes, Madam Chairman, as a point of order I wish to suggest that the way this is written in our agenda as a review matter rather than a resolution matter, is a bit misleading. It is basically stated that we are voting to review a matter regarding a resolution. If we are in fact voting regarding a resolution, then in fact, it should have been stated accordingly.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Yes, thank you, Madam President. My fellow representatives. Tonight we are going to be voting on whether the landmark, Curley’s Diner, which has been on West Park Place for 57 years stays in business for our residents or goes out of business. We have the final say tonight. First of all, our president wrote a letter to Mr. Stephen Osman, Chair of the URC, on Friday, February 16. To quote from the letter: ‘The Board of Representatives has not received any communications from the URC regarding the extension of the URC as the designated agency responsible for this plan. We are inquiring whether the URC’s intentions about this matter and have placed the item on the Board of Representatives’ March agenda. This matter will be addressed at the Board’s March Urban Redevelopment Committee meeting.’

“According to the Chair of our Urban Redevelopment Committee, Ed Steinberg, Bruce Goldberg and Stephen Osman, all of the URC, were invited but never showed. This would leave me to conclude they either have no interest or they just don’t care. I question also why the chairman of our Committee did not invite the owners of Curley’s Diner and their attorneys to the meeting. From a legal standpoint, the Urban Renewal Plan for the Southeast Quadrant Urban Redevelopment Project, Connecticut R43, expired March 4, 2000, that was Saturday, two days ago. Today is March 6. The deadline has passed. It may not be legal for us to extend its life after it died on March 4. This opens other Pandora’s boxes. Our resolution says the extension shall be in full force and effect as of March 4, 2000. We can’t go back and approve something that has already passed. The authority of the URC can be given to other city agencies. Our director of legal affairs, Mr. McDonald, was quoted in our local paper, the Stamford Advocate, as stating that ‘if negotiations with Curley’s had not been concluded as expected, the URC would not have needed nor asked for the deadline extension.’” But he said the URC has ‘neither voted for an extension nor made a formal request for one to the Board of

Representatives.’ The only property left to be acquired under the Plan is Curley’s Diner at 62 West Park Place.

“We all received a letter from one of the owners and a copy of the petition. Basically, it reads, and I am not going to read the whole thing, just a couple of points: ‘Tonight you are making a decision that will affect many lives. I am presenting you with over 7,000 signatures on a petition to keep the diner, which has served our City of Stamford well and the surrounding towns since 1941. People care. Voting yes will deprive your constituents, the people of Stamford, of this landmark and rob me of my livelihood.’ The petition mentions that Curley’s has been a center of family gatherings since 1946. It is a place revered by thousands of our Stamford residents and also out of town visitors. Thousands of residents in the area depend upon Curley’s for a low cost, nourishing meal. It is almost cheaper than eating at home for city workers from the Government Center, the police force, hospital personnel. It is open all night for late shift doctors and nurses, emergency crews from Northeast Utilities, gas and electric companies, fire and police force. Curley’s is a deterrent to crime in the area because it is open 24 hours a day. There are homes for the aged, such as Augustus Manor and low cost housing buildings maintained by the city as well as rent subsidy buildings, like St. John’s Towers, who also depend on Curley’s.

“I also received a personal letter which was delivered to me at the Board meeting tonight, and I am not going to say who sent it, but it is a constituent in Stamford who I know and respect, and basically what he says in the letter is: ‘as a resident of Stamford, I wish to ask the URC not to have its authority extended by the Board of Representatives for the purposes of acquiring Curley’s Diner. What Curley’s represents for me and for many people a restaurant which still manages to bring to the City a sense of home. It makes many gestures over a period of time to develop a feeling of gratitude for a little diner. For me personally, a key moment was when Maria, the owner, offered to my family a year ago, a whole cheesecake at cost on Christmas Day when all stores and bakeries were closed. It was a simple gesture, but many years later, my relatives who are visiting from out of state still remember and ask about Curley’s Diner.’ In the meantime we need to know that our leaders and guardians of the Constitution along with citizens – we need the human touch that Marie and Curley’s Diner bring and represent to us.

“This is a fight like the legendary David and Goliath. We all know that Curley’s is like David. We will hear that if we vote not to approve the extension, it will affect other properties. This is just not so. All other properties have been concluded. Curley’s Diner is the only one left. Do not be fooled. I ask my colleagues to search their souls and ask yourselves, do you want to put a small business owner out of business in the name of progress. Or do we have the courage to stand up tonight and vote what is right for our residents who need this business and for the owners to continue to earn their livelihood. I ask you to look at the people in the gallery tonight, our residents, our constituents. They are here at 10:30, taking their time to show us that they want to save Curley’s Diner. Let’s do it. Thank you.”

Rep. Skigen: “Madam President, I just want to note for the record that when this item was first brought to the Board by the president, that it was done independent of any court action that might have been taking place. As a matter of fact, I personally wasn’t aware of court

action until this evening when I received a copy of a decision that Judge D'Andrea handed down on Friday. We are acting under our legislative authority tonight, and it has nothing to do with the authority of the court, which on Friday, granted in essence, an extension to allow the parties to exercise their rights in the court, and I plan to vote tonight to extend the plan and allow the parties to pursue their remedies in court. As the court wrote, 'since there has not been any hearing at all on the merits of plaintiff's claims, it is yet to be determined if they are meritorious.' I think the court is the proper place for that determination to be made."

Rep. Lyons: "Madam President, I too would like to vote to extend the plan and note that contrary to our colleague, Mr. Zelinsky's comments, there are many parcels of land that are affected within the quadrant. It is merely a 120 day extension of a plan that has been in effect for 20 or so years, and there are many, many other parcels that come into play besides Curley's Diner, and my vote in support is not a vote against Curley's Diner or against the establishment or against what it does for the community, it is merely a vote to give a 120-day extension to the Urban Renewal Plan."

Rep. Mobilio: "I just want to briefly just echo the same words as Rep. Zelinsky and DeLuca. You know, we represent the people of our districts, and I have had a lot more people come up to me and call me and stop me to say 'save Curley's Diner' than 'let's get rid of it.' You know, Curley's is Curley's, but I also think, in a lot of people's minds, represents the little guy – the mom and pop stores that we all grew up with, which are, unfortunately, rare these days. So, I think saving Curley's is a sort of a cry to minimize what government is doing in terms of bulldozing over people's lives and businesses. You know, people tell me they like New York City where it is and they want to have some input into what happens to downtown Stamford. They want Stamford to remain as Stamford, they want some input. They tell me they like midtown Manhattan exactly where it is, about 40 miles away from here, and they don't want another midtown Manhattan in our downtown Stamford, so I am also going to vote no on the extension in favor of saving the little guy downtown."

Rep. Boccuzzi: "Move the question."

Said motion was seconded. The motion was passed by unanimous voice vote.

President Domonkos stated: "We are going to have a roll call vote. Our machine is not working, I'll have the Clerk call the roll. If you are in favor of extending the URC plan for the Southeast Quadrant, and this will be through resolution, you vote yes. If you are opposed to extending the URC plan for the Southeast Quadrant until July 5, 2000, you vote no, or you may abstain. The vote requires a majority of those present and voting. Ms. Summerville, will you please call the roll. Ms. Fortunato and Ms. Fedeli will be taking the count."

Clerk of the Board Summerville: "Madam President, I just want to verify the number of representatives that are present. It appears to me that there are 38 present."

Clerk of the Board Summerville read the roll call. The name and response are as follows:

Rep. Alswanger: Clerk Summerville stated Rep. Alswanger is absent.

Rep. Biancardi: Pass
Rep. Blackwell: No
Rep. Boccuzzi: Yes
Rep. Cannady: No
Rep. Corelli: Clerk Summerville stated Rep. Corelli left due to illness.
Rep. Day: Yes
Rep. DeLuca: No
Rep. DePina: Yes
Rep. Domonkos: Yes
Rep. Esposito: No
Rep. Fedeli: Yes
Rep. Fortunato: Yes
Rep. Gasparrini: Yes
Rep. Gaztambide: No
Rep. Giordano: Yes
Rep. Green-Carter: No
Rep. Hunter: Yes
Rep. Imbrogno: No
Rep. Kernan: No
Rep. Loglisci: Yes
Rep. Lyons: Yes
Rep. MacInnis: Yes
Rep. Martin: Yes
Rep. Mellis: Yes
Rep. Mitchell: No
Rep. Mobilio: No
Rep. Nabel: Yes
Rep. Nakian: Yes
Rep. Nanos: No
Rep. O'Neill: No
Rep. Owens: Yes
Rep. Poltrack: No
Rep. Shapiro: Yes
Rep. Sherer: Yes
Rep. Skigen: Yes
Rep. Spandow: Yes
Rep. Summerville: No
Rep. White: Yes
Rep. Zelinsky: No
Rep. Biancardi: Yes

The motion was approved by a roll call vote was taken and the results are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

1. PS25.020 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for Final Adoption** **APPROVED BY**
Republication; dealing with blighted properties in **UNANIMOUS**
the City of Stamford. **VOICE VOTE**
05/07/99 - Submitted by Reps. DeLuca and
Fortunato
11/02/99 - Report Made
12/22/99 - Committee approved 6-0-0
01/04/00 - Approved for Republication
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
03/02/00 - Committee approved 6-1-0

Chair Fortunato stated: "This item was approved 6-1-0. However, during the course of today, in conversations with Mr. Martin and Mr. McDonald, it was suggested that we request publication and submit four amendments to the anti-blight ordinance."

President Domonkos stated that we would republish this ordinance, and asked Chair Fortunato to move the item.

Chair Fortunato moved the ordinance; said motion was seconded.

Chair Fortunato moved the following amendment; said motion was seconded.

1. Page 2, ***Blighted Property or Blighted Properties***: replace "or by its Director of Health" for "or by Health Department reports".

The above amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Fortunato moved the following amendment; said motion was seconded.

2. Page 3, ***Neighborhood***: Change the definition to read: "shall mean an area of the city comprised of all properties or parcels of land, any part of which is within a radius of four hundred (400) feet of any part of another parcel or lot within the city."

The above amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Fortunato moved the following amendment; said motion was seconded.

3. Page 5, ***Level One Hearings***: Insert "(b) In the event that a property owner has obtained a demolition permit for the subject property, then the Anti-Blight Offer shall not enforce the provisions of this ordinance against said property or the property owner while action is pending on said permit."

The above amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote; Rep. Owens abstained.

Chair Fortunato moved the following amendment; said motion was seconded.

4. Page 5, *Level One Hearings*: Insert “(c) The Anti-Blight Officer shall take all grace periods for Code compliance that have been granted to the property owner by the City of Stamford, or the State of Connecticut, into consideration when making the determination as to whether or not to include a certain property on the list, including, but not limited to the Building, Health, Fire and Zoning codes and/or regulations.

The above amendment was approved by unanimous voice vote; Rep. Owens abstained

Chair Fortunato stated that two of these changes were based on the public hearing the Committee held.

The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

2. PS25.026	RESOLUTION; requesting the State Legislature to adopt legislation enabling cities to enact ordinances banning smoking in restaurants and bars. 02/08/00 - Submitted by President Domonkos, Reps. Lyons and Skigen 03/02/00 - Committee approved 6-1-0	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE (25-13-0) (Reps. Summerville, Day, Imbrogno, Loglisci, Fedeli, Mobilio, Mitchell, DePina, Owens, Cannady, Martin & Sherer opposed)
-------------	---	--

Chair Fortunato stated: “The Committee discussed the proposed resolution which asked that the public health and well-being statutes, Section 19a-342 be revised to either prohibit smoking in all public places statewide or to be modified to allow locally-elected bodies to enact such ordinances in individual towns. This was approved by the Committee 6-1-0 and I so move.”

Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Day: “Notwithstanding my respect and affection for the sponsors of this resolution, and I am sincere in that, I strongly oppose this. For me it goes to the fundamental issue of personal freedom and liberty. The libertarian in me is violently opposed, but I am not that radical. I just honestly feel that issues such as this smack of big brotherism, the free market, I think, would be an effective mechanism to sort out the smoking issue. I realize this is a resolution, but there may be actions on it, there may be ordinances which follow, and I just believe the free market is the way to go. Certain restaurant owners can have smoking establishments, certain others can have no-smoking establishments and yet others can have mixed arrangements, and people have the freedom to choose which establishment to patronize.

“The logical extension of this type of thinking, in my mind, is that the next step is to tell the restaurants that they cannot be serving Creme Brulee and Bananas Foster for desert, because those things, too, are manifestly bad for one’s health, so where does it all stop? So, I strongly urge the Board to refrain from going down this path. Where do we draw the line? Where do we ultimately end up? Thank you.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Yes, thank you, Madam President. I am strongly in favor of this resolution. As I mentioned in the democratic caucus, the previous Acting Health Director, Dr. Harris, a few months ago, had sent out a letter to all the restaurants in Stamford requesting them to consider a non-smoking policy in their establishments because of the severe health hazard that smoke and secondary smoke does have, and I believe the figure of approximately 60 restaurants have complied with that, so I don’t think it is something people don’t want. I think it is something that is possibly long overdue, and again, all we are asking is for the state legislature to adopt legislation enabling cities like Stamford to enact an ordinance banning smoking, if we so desire. And, of course, there would be a public hearing, and the public would be allowed to speak, and we could get their input until any final decision is made. Thank you.”

Rep. Sherer: “While I am vehemently opposed to smoking in restaurants, and I do find it particularly personally uncomfortable, I really have a hard time with this item because in meetings passed we have attempted to raise issues that I believe and some other people believe, are best raised at different levels. I believe this belongs at the State level, and I believe it is up to the State delegation to make these proposals and not the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford to tell the State what they should put in their State statutes, because I don’t believe we are ever going to be able to do it on our own. I believe that it is not within our jurisdiction. I remember in times past, people have attempted to make resolutions telling our United States government how to carry out foreign policy, and in those particular occasions, I thought that was a little off base, as I think in this particular case. I also would like to comment that with all these heartfelt discussions we have had in the last half hour about the small guy and the big guy and everything else, I would submit that some very tiny eating establishments who currently allow smoking on their premises, would be really put out if they weren’t allowed to have smoking on their premises, and in all probability would lose a great percentage of their customers. I think we ought to be careful about who we are trying to hurt around here, and I find it very ironic that the very same people who make huge speeches about helping out the small guy, in effect, could be the same people who could end up hurting the small guy. So, I oppose this.”

Rep. Mobilio: “Thank you, Madam President. I just want to echo the same sentiments here. I think we need to keep government out of our choice of restaurants. My wife, for example, has asthma, so you are not going to find us going to a cigar bar for dinner. So, I mean, we choose other options. We go to places where we know don’t have smoking or have a no-smoking section. So, I think it should be up to the individual to decide which restaurant to go to or not to go to, and I think government should stay out of it, and I am going to vote no on this.”

Rep. Lyons: “Madam President, I would just like to add a few comments. You know, we have rules and regulations regarding public health. You are not allowed to go into a food service establishment with no shirt, you are not allowed to go in with no shoes, but yet you can go in with tobacco in your pocket and light up a cigarette and poison innocent people. I find it funny when people say you can eat fattening deserts, you can drink alcohol beverages. That person personally chooses to imbibe in those things. A second hand smoke victim doesn’t choose to smoke and doesn’t choose to breathe the air that is being polluted. When I go somewhere with my child or an elderly person goes to Duchess or a person sits in a book shop or in a donut shop and they have to breathe contaminated air, it is not right. All throughout the government, Federal, State and municipal, unequivocally, you don’t find smoking any more in the Year 2000. However, in public establishments that have food service licenses, you still find it. It is clear, and you can see it in many studies on the Internet, in newspapers – in the New York Times just last week, the New York City Council is ratcheting up its anti-smoking law. They had numerous bar owners and restaurant owners and tavern owners who appeared in front of them and said they saw no drop off in revenues or decrease in business. In fact, some of them said their patrons appreciated it more. So, before we get into the habit of not telling Hartford what to do, which I clearly don’t envy or suggest as a full-time basis, it is clear something needs to kick-start our local and state government into safeguarding the public health and the contaminated air that people are forced to continually breathe with a lack of an ordinance enforcing second-hand smoke.”

Rep. Loglisci: “I am not a smoker, but I really cannot support this. Again, it just smacks of big government getting involved in things that really go beyond its purview. So I am just going to vote no.”

Rep. Biancardi: [Microphone not turned on.] “Quick question, and I do not know who can answer this or the sponsors could possibly answer this. If a restaurant had an outside eating area on a main fareway, where there were buses and cars and trucks passing by, and there was a no-smoking ordinance in effect, would that person be asked to put out their cigarette? I guess I am getting to the ludicrousness of this. I understand, for instance, in places like Hollywood and sections of L.A. you can’t smoke, and I know someone who was told to put out a cigarette at a corner where there were diesel buses going by because the restaurant area had a no-smoking policy. I think I agree with Mr. Day and Mr. Sherer that this is going to put people out of business, and they can handle it better on their own. I think it is absurd, and I think it makes us look like we don’t have a whole lot to do. Thank you.”

Rep. Skigen: “Just to address Rep. Biancardi’s question. If you read the resolution, you will see that this does not enact a no-smoking ordinance. We currently lack the power to enact a no-smoking ordinance; the state does not give us that power. All this ordinance ... excuse me, Representative Biancardi ...

President Domonkos: “Mr. Biancardi, please, order. You have had your opportunity to speak. It is now Mr. Skigen’s, please control yourself.”

[Rep. Biancardi's comments are not heard on the tape as his microphone was turned off.]

Rep. Skigen: "The point of the resolution is to give us the authority to enact an ordinance if this Board should so decide at a time when the State gives us such power. At that point, we can address Mr. Biancardi's ludicrous assertions regarding outdoor eating establishments. I would also note that it is not Hollywood that banned smoking, it is the entire State of California. You cannot smoke in a restaurant, you cannot smoke in a bar in the State of California. There have been numerous economic studies conducted in California since that was enacted over a year ago showing that there has been no drop off in business, and I think that this is an entirely appropriate response in response to Rep. Sherer's concern regarding foreign policy. Foreign policy does not have a direct impact on the citizens of Stamford – secondhand smoke does."

Rep. Boccuzzi: "I am going to vote in favor of this resolution to go upstate, and I have to agree with what Mr. Skigen says. All this does is have them give us the opportunity, if they so desire, to enact an ordinance. I think, when that time comes, that is when we should sit down and decide what we want to do. We could take into consideration how many people are in a restaurant, how many seats have to be there to have it, etc. That is the type of things we could work on in the ordinance not only so that it works for the public but so that it also works for the business people. All this does is ask the State to give us this opportunity to do it, if they so desire, and that is when we should work on the ordinance itself. Thank you."

Rep. Shapiro: "Can we move the question?"

Said motion was seconded and approved by voice vote (Rep. Loglisci and Biancardi opposed; Rep. Gasparrini abstained). The motion was approved 26-12 by voice vote; Reps. Summerville, Day, Imbrogno, Loglisci, Fedeli, Mobilio, Mitchell, DePina, Owens, Cannady, Martin and Sherer opposed.

3. PS25.027	RESOLUTION; requesting the State delegation to enact enabling legislation to allow police officers to utilize defibrillators. 02/16/00 - Submitted by Reps. Corelli and DeLuca 03/02/00 - Committee approved 7-0-1	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE (Reps. Summerville, Sherer, Skigen, Nakian & Mitchell opposed; Reps. Green- Carter, Spadow and Nable abstained)
-------------	--	---

The president recognized someone who asked that this item be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Chair Fortunato stated: “The meeting discussed the resolution passing enabling legislation to provide the means for Stamford Police officers to obtain AED certification by meeting similar training requirements mandated by the State of Rhode Island. This resolution was approved 7-0-1.” Chair Fortunato moved the item; said motion was seconded.

Rep. Skigen: “I was the abstention on this matter, and the reason I abstained was at the time of the meeting, Deputy Chief Priolo was unable to tell us whether Dr. Turnbull of Stamford Hospital, who is in charge of emergency medical services, was in support of this. The chair has just handed me an e-mail and discovered that Dr. Turnbull is out of the office until March 8, 2000. Although I am supportive of the legislation, I think it is premature of us to recommend specific standards until we know what the chief of emergency medical services for the City feels is appropriate training for police officers to use defibrillators. I would move to hold this until we have an answer from Dr. Turnbull.”

Said motion was seconded.

Rep. Boccuzzi: “Do I understand that the doctor will not be back in her office until March 8, 2000? If we approve this and send it upstate, by the time they act on it, I am sure it will be after March 8. I think at that time we could have input from the good doctor and find out what she thinks about it, and if it is something that she feels can be used within the Police Department. So to hold it because she is not there doesn’t seem necessary since we are not going to get it back until long after March 8.”

President Domonkos stated that the Board is discussing holding this item.

Rep. Loglisci: “I agree with John, I think we should vote on it.”

Rep. Sherer: “I would just like to point out, I have been actively working with the Legislature advising them on a bill, and I am kind of in tune with what they are doing up there. First of all, this is a short session, they have less than 30 days left in their session. And, unlike our Board of Representatives where we set an agenda, they have set their agenda for the whole term. They have knocked out far more important bills than enabling legislation under the theory that this is a short session, they are not taking things up, and they are not taking things up until next year. So if anyone in this room thinks that the State is going to take this up in the near future, you are totally, totally mistaken. I am not saying naïve, I am saying mistaken. It is not going to happen this year. That is the way it is up there in Hartford.”

Rep. Esposito: “I would just like to reiterate what Mr. Sherer said from the democratic side. They don’t suspend the rules, and probably the deadline has passed when we could submit new legislation, so this wouldn’t be submitted until next January, anyway.”

The motion to hold failed by voice vote (18-20-0) (Reps. MacInnis, Fortunato, White, Boccuzzi, Loglisci, Imbrogno, Day, Fedeli, Mobilio, DeLuca, Martin, Shapiro, Biancardi, Mellis, Giordano, Poltrack, O’Neill, Zelinsky, Nanos, and Lyons opposed).

President Domonkos stated that we are now discussing the main motion. A motion was made to move the question; said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote. The main motion was approved by voice vote (Reps. Summerville, Sherer, Skigen, Nakian, Mitchell and Green-Carter opposed; Reps. Spandow and Nable abstained).

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE Herman P. Alswanger, Co-Chair
Mary L. Fedeli, Co-Chair
Meeting: Thursday, February 24, 2000
7:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair Fedeli reported that the Parks & Recreation Committee met on February 24, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. Fedeli, Cannady, Lyons, Nable, O'Neill and Sherer. Excused were Reps. Poltrack and Imbrogno. Others present were Ralph Tedesco from the Operations Department, Corporation Counsel Andrew McDonald and Laurie Albano from Recreation Services.

1. PR25.047 REVIEW; of marinas including current operating costs per marina; capital project study and projected 2000-1 capital expenditures.
12/06/99 - Submitted by President Domonkos
01/12/00 - Held in Committee
02/24/00 - Report Made **REPORT MADE**

Chair Fedeli stated: "A report is on your desk and a handout from Mr. Tedesco on the progress of the marinas. The outstanding issue is still from Mr. Colleluori, which is the cost per marina. He has not gotten that to me yet, and I will follow up with him tomorrow."

2. PR25.048 APPROVAL; of Recreation Services Program Fees for 2000.
01/19/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/24/00 - Committee approved 6-0-0 **HELD IN COMMITTEE (Rep. Shapiro opposed)**

Chair Fedeli stated: "Originally this was on the consent agenda, and I would like to take it off. During the meeting, Ms. Albano had given me Exhibit A, which was the fees for 2000, and we approved them based on the fact that it said there are no increases to the fees. We specifically went over this and we went over a couple of them in particular, which people had questions on, and she said there were no increases. Today, thanks to Mr. DeLuca, we now have a second set of fees that do have increases on them. So, I don't know why they did this, and I am confused, so, therefore, I would like to hold this item, and I so move."

Said motion was seconded and approved by voice vote (Rep. Shapiro opposed).

3. PR25.049 APPROVAL; of lease between the City of Stamford and Halloween Yacht Club; term of lease: 5 years; rent: \$20,000 per year. **APPROVED ON CONSENT AGENDA (Rep. White abstained)**
02/04/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/24/00 - Committee approved 6-0-0

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Consent Agenda, consisting of Item No. 3, was approved (Rep. White abstained).

EDUCATION COMMITTEE: Ellen Mellis, Chair
Philip Giordano, Vice Chair
Meeting: Monday, February 28, 2000
6:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair Mellis reported that the Education Committee met on Monday, February 28, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. Day, Green-Carter, Giordano, Imbrogno, Poltrack, Nable, Shapiro and Mellis. Rep. Fedeli was absent. Other representatives present were Rep. Zelinsky, Sherer and Skigen. Deputy Chief Lou DeCarlo represented the Police Department; Superintendent Mazzullo, Assistant Superintendent Chardavoyne, David Merkle and Dudley Williams and Martin Levine were in attendance from the Board of Education; Bureau Chief Glen MacWilliams was in attendance in addition to John Christopherson from the Advocate.

1. E25.033 **PROPOSED ORDINANCE; for publication;** **APPROVED BY UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE**
concerning truancy and habitual truancy.
12/15/99 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy
02/07/00 - Held in Committee
02/28/00 - Committee voted 6-0-0

Chair Mellis stated: "Deputy DeCarlo explained the ordinance is a tool for the police becoming more proactive in questioning school-aged children who are truant. The Committee voted 8-0-0 for publication, with an amendment eliminating number five of the ordinance, which would have set a fee of \$20 for violation of the ordinance."

President Domonkos asked Chair Mellis if the revised ordinance was sent out to the Board members after the Committee meeting.

Chair Mellis replied: "It had not, it was mentioned in the report, and the report was issued today. The Committee approved to amend it eliminating the fine of \$20 and then for publication of the ordinance, as proposed by the Committee." Said motion was seconded.

The item was approved by unanimous voice vote.

2. E25.034 REVIEW; of Stamford Public Schools enrollment estimates and facility plans for school expansion. **REPORT MADE**
02/08/00 - Submitted by Reps. Mellis and Shapiro
02/28/00 - Report Made

Chair Mellis stated: "These questions weren't actually answered. Dr. Mazzullo focused on the imbalance between Westhill and Stamford High School and what he plans on doing about it, mainly setting up the technology academy at Rippowam, hoping to draw 400-500 students to that for the Fall. He went on to explain how that would be done. There is a report on everyone's desk. He said if those plans don't accomplish his goal, he will be back looking at a third high school."

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE Jim Shapiro, Chair
Joseph Gasparrini, Vice Chair
Meeting: To be determined

1. UR25.004 REVIEW; of the Urban Redevelopment Commission's actions regarding the Mill River Corridor Project, including its Statement of Policy and the Delineation & Eligibility Report. **HELD IN COMMITTEE**
09/11/98 - Submitted by E. Steinberg, Executive Director, URC
05/03/99 - Report Made
02/29/00 - Held in Committee

Secondary Committee: Land Use

HOUSING/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/ SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE Elaine Mitchell, Chair
Anthony Imbrogno, Vice Chair
Meeting: Tuesday, February 29, 2000
6:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair Mitchell reported that the Housing/Community Development/Social Services Committee met on Tuesday, February 29, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. Blackwell, Cannady, Green-Carter, Gaztambide, Giordano, Imbrogno, Mellis and Mitchell. Also present was Loretta Waldman of the Stamford Advocate.

1. HCD25.29 RESOLUTION; regarding the Blue Ribbon **APPROVED BY**

Commission on Affordable Housing
recommendations.
02/16/00 - Submitted by Rep. Mitchell
02/29/00 - Committee approved 7-0-0

**UNANIMOUS
VOICE VOTE**

Chair Mitchell stated: “The Committee approved the resolution 7-0-0 to support the Blue Ribbon Commission’s recommendation and to encourage Speaker Lyons, Majority Leader Jepsen to exercise their leadership to support the Blue Ribbon Commission’s recommendations. Everyone should have received a copy of the resolution with the twelve recommendations. I would like to move the resolution.”

Said motion was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote.

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE Gabe DeLuca, Chair
Peter C. Nanos, Vice Chair
Meeting: Wednesday, February 23, 2000
7:30 p.m. - Republican Caucus Room

Chair DeLuca reported that the Transportation Committee met on February 23, 2000. Present were Committee Member Reps. DeLuca, Giordano and Zelinsky. Also present were Rep. Summerville, Deputy Police Chief Priolo, Moira McNulty, Tom Bruccoleri and Tobin Coleman of the Advocate.

1. T25.020	PROPOSED ORDINANCE; <u>for publication</u>; amending Chapter 231, Section 6, Vehicles and Traffic, regarding parking violations fees. 01/19/00 - Submitted by Mayor Dannel P. Malloy 02/23/00 - Committee approved & waived pub.	APPROVED BY VOICE VOTE <i>(Rep. Spandow opposed)</i>
------------	---	--

Chair DeLuca stated: “The Committee voted 3-0-0 to waive publication for the amendments submitted by Moira McNulty.”

President Domonkos stated that the ordinance must be voted on first and then a vote to waive publication would take place.

Rep. Martin stated that he strongly opposes Mr. DeLuca’s and the Committee’s suggestion that we waive publication.

Chair DeLuca stated that the Committee voted to waive publication to try to save the City \$1,000.

Rep. Martin stated: “The legal process, as unfortunate as it may seem, as you as a fiscal member and myself, the cornerstone is not saving money on newspaper advertisement, the cornerstone is informing the public what we are doing, so I am very much opposed to

this – this particular cost saving move. While I am in favor of the general scheme of things, I am very much opposed to waving publication.”

Rep. Nakian stated: “I appreciate Rep. DeLuca’s attempt, and I am sure I have tried the same thing in the past, and I am sure Mr. Martin has raised the same thing in relation to it. The criteria is an emergency nature and not saving money, and I don’t believe we should break that rule at this point.”

Rep. DeLuca stated: “The rationale behind all this here is that the changes being made primarily affect the out-of-towners. We just want to increase the fines.”

Chair DeLuca moved the item; said motion was seconded. President Domonkos stated that the Board is voting to waive publication. The motion failed by voice vote (Reps. Zelinsky, DeLuca, Mobilio, Loglisci, Imbrogno, Giordano, Kernan and White in favor). The vote on the motion to approve the ordinance for publication was approved by voice vote; Rep. Spandow opposed.

2. T25.021	REVIEW; of safety measures on Washington Boulevard to protect pedestrians. 02/16/00 - Submitted by Steering Committee 02/23/00 - Report Made	REPORT MADE
------------	--	------------------------

Rep. DeLuca stated: “This was an interesting meeting. I first want to thank Annie Summerville for her many concerns about the safety. As we all know, there have been five traffic fatalities there, and one of the concerns is that it appears that the police are not being sensitive to the people who are involved in the accidents. The fact that they interviewed the person who caused the accident, and instead of taking them down to the police department, they just let the person who was responsible for the accident just go on his own.

“Tom Bruccoleri emphasized it is difficult to change people’s habits about jaywalking, speeding, but they will make plans to set the traffic signals up in a way that people and cars are going in the same direction, which would help some of the problems.

“Our committee came up with eight recommendations to submit to the State Department of Transportation, and if these eight recommendations are implemented, we feel they would go a long way toward safety of the people and make Washington Boulevard a safer place to walk and travel. For example, parts of Washington Boulevard are 35 miles per hour and parts are 25 miles per hour. We are saying just extend the 25 mile per hour speed limit all the way down Washington Bouelvard, install portable high-visibility signs indicating yield to pedestrians at Main and Washington Boulevard and at Tresser; install crosswalks at Bell Street, Washington Boulevard, Division Street.

“The Board of Representatives took the initiative by putting this on our agenda, we had our meeting on the 23rd, we came out with our recommendations, and the next thing we know, other people are getting involved, and now I understand that on March 20, the Department of

Transportation, along with Crystal Truglia, the Mayor and Police Chief Dean Esserman are going to walk Washington Boulevard. I request that if the Board goes along with these recommendations that our president would suggest to the mayor that members of the Transportation Committee should be involved – as well as other representatives. I move that the Board accept these eight items that are on my report for submission to the State.”

President Domonkos stated that she would write a letter because we would need a resolution.

Rep. Deluca stated: “One of his representatives, Michael Fedeli, told him to give him a list of proposals, as he is on the Transportation Committee and added that he never had any proposals before from the City.

President Domonkos stated: “If it is all right with the Board, I will send a letter to Mr. Fedeli and the rest of the delegation regarding your recommendations. A copy of the letter will go to all board members.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Yes, Madam President, just two points. Pertaining to the point that Rep. DeLuca mentioned relating to the person involved in an automobile accident, I believe he said that the police would now take the driver of the vehicle that hit a pedestrian down town. That is not necessary so. In the report and what Deputy Chief Priolo said was that they would be more sensitive to the people regarding the questioning of people, they weren’t going to take them down to the police station, because I believe that unless you actually arrest somebody, you can only ask somebody to accompany you down to the police department. If they say no, the only alternative you have is to arrest them, and if they haven’t done anything wrong and the police haven’t determined if they were guilty of doing anything wrong, they can’t arrest him. That is just one point of clarification.

“The recommendations, and I was not at the Transportation Committee meeting when they discussed these eight recommendations, and I agree with all of them except the first one which says, extend the 25 mile per hour speed limit from Bridge Street to Bull’s Head in both directions. I would like to point out to my colleagues that on Summer and Bedford Street, the speed limit is 35 miles per hour, so what we are going to see now is people going 35 miles per hour on Summer and Bedford Street, but Washington Boulevard, which was built to avoid the people from driving through town and through the middle of Stamford to avoid the traffic, we are going to tell them to slow down and go 25 miles per hour. I really have a problem with that, and I really don’t think it is going to accomplish anything. If there is going to be an accident, we really don’t want anybody killed or injured or anything else, but to recommend a 25 mile per hour speed limit from Bridge Street to Bull’s Head was not the purpose that Washington Boulevard was built. Thank you.”

Rep. Boccuzzi: “I would just like to say that the Waterside Coalition, of which Crystal Truglia is a member, this item came up at our Waterside Coalition meeting, and we asked Crystal to have a meeting with the DOT in Stamford with reference to Washington Boulevard and all the red lights on Pulaski Street and Greenwich Avenue and that is how that meeting came about. I think it is in the mayor’s office, but she got involved with it through the Waterside Coalition. I don’t know what time it is, I think it is 1:00, but I am not sure.”

Rep. Summerville: “I can respect what you are saying, Rep. Boccuzzi, but she is involved in it because it is her district also. I want to clarify something, respectfully, that Rep. Zelinsky said. I am not so sure you are correct in your assumptions that one cannot be taken downtown for questioning. There is no rule that says when you go downtown you are going to be arrested. I would like to see that in writing if you have that, because I am quite sure I am correct in my assumption that the police can take someone downtown for questioning at any time that they feel it is necessary and needed, and the intent of taking them downtown was not to arrest them, but to give the appearance to those who are grieving that at least ... I think I used the example of the last death that we had. People were just standing around, people who were interested in what happened, and that this gentleman, who no one is accusing – I feel just as sorry for that person as I do for the family who experienced the loss – simply drove away and got back on the thruway. I am concerned with the appearance of sensitivity.

“I just want to say to you, Rep. Zelinsky, that the policeman that night agreed with me that maybe that is something they can do to make both parties more comfortable. Who knows, if you just accidentally had a tragedy like that, you are not as calm as you would be. So, it is to help both parties, it is not to harm anyone. It might be a good idea to sit down for a few seconds downtown before you continue driving on, anyway.”

Rep. DeLuca: “I just want to thank Annie once again for saying what I was going to say, because never was the intent of Deputy Chief Priolo or DeVito that they were going to take the person downtown to arrest them, and in all due respect to Rep. Truglia, I still feel that the Board of Representatives should be invited to this meeting since we did take the initiative, and we shouldn't be slighted.

“Just for the record, it was interesting to note that these push button signals that we have for crossing the street, the state guidelines determine the time limit based on the width of the street and a walking speed of three feet per second. But the way that light changes, you will never make it across in time. But, that is one of our recommendations, to extend it so that the time to cross is longer.”

President Domonkos confirmed that the meeting is 1:00 p.m. on March 20.

Rep. Zelinsky: “I just want to clarify something. I am not 100% sure of the police procedures, but I think maybe we should get it clarified because it was my understanding that unless someone is arrested, they do not have to accompany the police downtown. Regarding the recent tragedy we had on Washington Boulevard, according to the Advocate, the individual involved in the accidental hitting of that pedestrian, was questioned by the police for three or four hours. He was not just spoken to for five minutes and then let go. Again, I just wanted to clarify that point in being sensitive to the people. Deputy Chief Priolo did not say that they would take someone downtown. He said, as a matter of fact he said they would be more sensitive to the issue of that, but again, the best situation is to have the individual involved in the accident there so they could question him as to where he was when he saw the pedestrian – all facts and information that you need to be at the scene to answer.”

Rep. O'Neill: "Madam Chairman, I move the item."

President Domonkos stated that there is no item to vote on, but that it was agreed she would send a letter to the delegation recommending these things. President Domonkos stated: "when I asked if there was anyone who disagreed with the sending of this letter, no one said anything."

Rep. Zelinsky stated he disagreed with one.

Rep. DeLuca stated that is just one person, and there are 38 people here.

President Domonkos stated that if we are going to have disagreement, she will ask that it be held in Committee for a resolution for next month.

Rep. Martin stated: "We are beginning to open this thing up, and I don't want to go on with this because I think that we do have to make a statement for the need for safety on Washington Boulevard, and I think that a letter from you is very appropriate. With regard to specific suggestions, we are not traffic engineers, and in fact we haven't had a policy level person for traffic engineering in this City for approximately six years, and it is beginning to show in a variety of different ways, and I am not just talking about Washington Boulevard. The other problems that are cropping up are not nearly as serious. I would like to say that over the years, we have systematically reduced our north-south corridors in this City and at the same time traffic has increased. We have made it more difficult to travel up Bedford Street, we did not do the actions that were proposed roughly thirty or twenty years ago up Grove Street and up Strawberry Hill, and that is very tight and narrow. And, Washington Boulevard, long ago, was designated as a way to get around the downtown.

"I think, that I for one, believe that when we have major confluence of traffic – both pedestrian and vehicular – that we need to stop long enough so that everybody gets across. I am absolutely in favor of keeping those lights longer so that people can get across without having to run. I think that is absolutely necessary. Those are bigger intersections, so it is going to take longer. I'll wait. But at the same time, just as we are discouraging drivers, we also need to discourage pedestrians from crossing in the middle of these streets. And, as we are all driving, we find, whether it be a car, a bicycle or whether it be a pedestrian, coming out in some unusual location in the midst of heavy traffic – that is a danger signal, and I don't think the state has moved, as it should – just as it should have longer light times, it needs to have more disincentives for pedestrians to jaywalk.

"Lo and behold, two years ago, we had a very aggressive campaign to cut down on jaywalking, and at least temporarily, we had a reduction in these types of problems. Now we have let them up and sure enough the problem has resurfaced. All I am saying here is we need to balance a number of agendas, we need a senior level policy person in traffic and parking rather than just shooting our ideas off. I am very in favor of us taking some action, we have not been taking any action. The state in particular has not taken any action. But we can't just say, 'everybody slowdown.' It requires a little more thought. I think that there are pieces of this and pieces of that to put together that would give a lot more safety to pedestrians. It is

absolutely paramount, but at the same time, we need to allow people to get from place to place without creating so much frustration with the downtown traffic, which is one of our two top problems in this town.”

Rep. Lyons: “Madam President, a human life is a human life, and if anyone has ever tried to cross Tresser Boulevard from where the Marriott is to the other intersection where the hole in the ground is, you can never make it across that intersection. Go from GTE to over where the mall is, you can never get across that intersection. So, I think, that this needs to be taken to a broader level, and whether somebody gets hit by a car and fatally killed on Washington Boulevard or hit by a car and fatally killed on Tresser or Grove Street or some other dangerous crosswalk or intersection, an item on Steering should be put up for a safety and crosswalk initiative type program to move us forward in conjunction with the city planning.”

Rep. DeLuca: “Maybe we should just put that on the agenda, and it just take it up at our next meeting. At least we are starting off in the right direction, coming up with some recommendations for the DOT.

President Domonkos: “So, next month you’ll come back with a resolution rather than my writing a letter. Is that what you are saying?”

Rep. DeLuca: “No, just write a letter. What do we need a resolution for?”

President Domonkos: “Well, I hear people were disagreeing with some of the recommendations. Does anyone have a problem with my writing a letter enclosing the recommendations the committee came up with? We have about three people.”

Rep. Zelinsky: “Yes, Madam President, you know, I am certainly concerned with safety and pedestrians and not having any more accidents, but I really think we have to give this a little more thought than just shooting from the hip and saying, ‘OK, these are eight recommendations that are going to solve all the problems in the City of Stamford – OK – because as what Representative Lyons said, it is not only Washington Boulevard or Tresser – it could be other dangerous intersections waiting for an accident to happen, and why should we just decide arbitrarily that one section of the City should have these recommendations and not the other. So, one month I think we should give it a little more thought, have a resolution, as Rep. Martin said, maybe have a study to see how this affects the whole city, and whether there are other dangerous intersections, not just one. Otherwise, we are just shooting from the hip.”

Rep. Boccuzzi: “I am hearing all these things. I think we agreed upon a letter with the recommendations in it. That doesn’t mean there can’t be other recommendations or other things that we can do. You people sound like you want to call off the meeting of March 20. That’s what it sounds like.”

President Domonkos: “Why don’t I put in the letter, where feasible, if these items that are being recommended are deemed feasible by ... we do have a traffic director ... he’s not as high a level as we had before, Mr. Martin, but we do have a person who is a traffic

professional. We can state that, where feasible, we are recommending, and indicate that we are not traffic engineers, but that these are some suggestions.”

Rep. DeLuca: “I guess I was a little remiss by not indicating the fact that I did sit down with Tom Bruccoleri, and if anybody knows traffic in the City of Stamford, Tom does. He does a good job of coordinating traffic, problems, and he reviewed the list that I made up, and we sat down together, and he thought each one of those was a good idea. Now, this pertains to a state highway or state road. If we have problems with other streets, like Bedford and Summer, those are city streets, and that should be something to come up under another agenda. Right now, the Committee was asked to review Washington Boulevard. We did, and came up with the recommendations. It was reviewed by Tom Bruccoleri, the eight recommendations were good recommendations, and he sees no problem with it, and hopefully something can be done.”

Rep. Lyons: “Madam President, I have no problems with the implementation of the Transportation Committee’s wish list for the eight points of safety for Washington Boulevard. I would just like to see it broadened in the future. Perhaps, Transportation takes a crosswalk safety review within the City under more stricter guidelines, and I would just reflect these thoughts to the Chair, Mr. DeLuca: I believe Tresser Boulevard is part of Route 1, which is a DOT state road. They snowplow that road during snowstorms, and I think the State deems that as Route 1.”

President Domonkos: “I will send a letter. Thank you for all of your comments.”

ADMINISTRATION & TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE Gloria DePina, Chair
Harry Day, Vice Chair

No report.

HOUSE COMMITTEE Annie M. Summerville, Chair
Meeting: Thursday, February 24, 2000
7:00 p.m. - Democratic Caucus Room
(in conjunction with Operations Committee)

Chair Summerville: “We met in conjunction with the Operations Committee, and we concurred, and the item under discussion is to be further discussed.”

SPECIAL REVALUATION COMMITTEE: Maria Nakian, Chair

No report.

RESOLUTIONS

MINUTES

1. [February 7, 2000 Regular Meeting](#)

**APPROVED BY
UNANIMOUS
VOICE VOTE**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Rep. Martin announced that the budget hearing schedule has been established.

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion duly made and seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 12:03 a.m.

*The proceedings are available on audio tape at the
Offices of the Board of Representatives.*