A regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, Conn. was held on Wednesday, November 7, 1956 in the Cafeteria of the Walter Dolan Jr. High School, Toms Road, Glenbrook. The meeting was called to order by the President, Mr. George V. Connors, at 8:10 P. M.

INVOCATION was given by Rabbi Robert J. Marx, of Temple Sinai.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 27 present and 13 absent. The absent members were: William Brett, Irving Snyder, Mary Bankowski, Vincent Vitti, Salvatore Giuliani, Robert Lewis, Eugene Barry, Edward Czupka, Helen Peatt, Charles Bradbury, John DeForest, John Lilliendahl and Rutherford Huizinga.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of October 1, 1956.

MR. FREDERICKS called attention to page 1385, fourth line from bottom of page, on vote taken re Lakeview Drive and Brook Run Lane. He requested the vote on this be changed to read: "Re-committed to committee by unanimous vote."

MR. MACRIDES MOVED that the Minutes, as corrected, be approved. Seconded by Mr. Georgoulis and CARRIED unanimously.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Steering Committee:

Mr. Connors, Chairman, presented the following report of his committee:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT

Meeting held October 22, 1956

The Steering Committee of the Board of Representatives met in the Mayor's office, City Hall, at 8 P.M. The following members were present: Alanson Fredericks, Joseph Iacovo, Norton Rhoades, Joseph Milano, John Macrides, Helen Peatt, Rutherford Huizinga, Clement Raiteri, Jr., George Georgoulis, William Kaminski and George Connors, Chairman. The absent members were: Stephen Kelly, Robert Lewis, Irving Snyder and Vincent Vitti. Mr. Thomas Topping acted as replacement for Mr. Vitti, who is ill.

The following communications were acted upon:

(1) Letter dated October 19, 1956 from Mr. Walter Wachter, Director, Planning and Zoning Boards, regarding appeal from decision of ZONING BOARD on application of George Grunberger Holding Corp.

Referred to the Legislative & Rules and Planning & Zoning Committees.

(2) Letter dated October 18, 1956 from Mr. John Hanrahan, Corporation Counsel, in reply to motion made by Mr. Huizinga at the October 1st Board meeting, (passed by unanimous vote) requesting a reply advising the Board that no bond will henceforth be issued contrary to Ordinance No. 54 supplemental. Said letter encloses copies of performance bonds used by the Planning Board.

Copy sent to Mr. Huizinga and letter to go on Agenda under Communications.

(3) Carbon copy of letter dated October 18, 1956 from Mayor Quigley to all interested parties re meeting with State Water Commission on Friday, October 26th. Ordered filed.

(4) Carbon copy of letter dated October 12, 1956 from Board of Finance regarding reduction of requested appropriation for Veterans' Day Celebration to $2,750. which was passed at their meeting held October 11th.

Referred to Fiscal Committee.

(5) Photostatic copy of letter dated September 25, 1956 from State Highway Commissioner in regard to site for armory and release of State-owned land for that purpose.

Referred to Public Works Committee, and filed.

(6) Letter dated September 10, 1956 from Mr. Nosal, Vice President of the Stamford Historical Society, asking for action by the Board of Representatives to enable them to receive a requested grant of funds for inclusion in the 1956/1957 Budget.

The Secretary was requested to write, explaining that this is a private building problem and does not come within the jurisdiction of this Board.

(7) Letter dated September 25, 1956 from the Citizens Committee for Improvement of Cove Pond requesting certain improvements.

Referred to Public Works Committee.

(8) Petition dated September 4, 1956 from 84 residents of Cove Pond area requesting restoration of the existing dam.

Referred to Public Works Committee.

(9) Letter dated October 4, 1956 from Joint Committee on Parks and Recreation regarding protection to Cove Island property.

Referred to Public Works Committee.

(10) Proposed amendment to the Rules of Order of the Board of Representatives, presented by Mr. Fredericks in regard to publication of information under consideration by committees prior to their report to the Board.

Referred to Legislative & Rules Committee, and ordered placed on Agenda.

(11) Mimeographed letter of September 28, 1956 from Board of Education in regard to school sites.

Referred to Education, Welfare & Government Committee.

(12) Ditto copy of letter of August 28, 1956 from Citizens Committee on School Sites.

Referred to Education, Welfare & Government Committee.

(13) Letter dated September 28, 1956 from Stamford Community Council, Inc. relative to copies of Minutes of Board of Representatives.

Secretary directed to reply, stating that copies of the Minutes of the Board will be placed in the Ferguson Library for use by the various organizations throughout the city.

(14) Letter dated September 26, 1956 from Clifford Waterbury, 4th District Representative regarding availability of pension funds contributed by police and firemen resigning prior to retirement.

Referred to Personnel Committee to take up with Personnel Commission and Commissioner of Finance.

(15) Letter dated September 28, 1956 from Alanson Fredericks, 18th District Representative, enclosing petition from residents of Crystal Lake Road, requesting permission to change name of Road.

Referred to Legislative & Rules Committee.

All petitions for road acceptance were referred to the Planning & Zoning Committee.

All requests for additional appropriations, necessitating the approval of another committee were referred to the various committees involved.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

George V. Connors,
Chairman
Steering Committee

vf

MR. CONNORS announced that before the next order of business was to be taken up, there had been a request to call on Mr. Raiteri. Permission was given for Mr. Raiteri to speak.

Re: Precinct No. 2:

MR. RAITERI: "In conferring with the Minority Leader, I find that it will be necessary to re-submit this at a later date."

Fiscal Committee:

Mr. Kaminski, Chairman, presented the following report of his committee:

FISCAL COMMITTEE REPORT

A meeting of the Fiscal Committee was held Monday, October 15th, 1956, at 8:00 P.M. in the Mayor's office. Members present: Mrs. Doris Zuckert, Messrs. Rutherford Huizinga, Edward Wynn, Jr., Charles Bradbury and William C. Kaminski, Chairman. Absent member: William Brett.

Also present were: Mr. Neuwien, Superintendent of Schools and Mr. Aaron Chase, Public Works Department.

(1) Mayor's letter of October 11, 1956

Resolution Authorizing $1,239,000.00 Bonds to Finance Capital Projects in 1956/1957 Capital Budget. (Resolution attached)

The Fiscal Committee recommends approval of the bonding resolution, as forwarded in the Mayor's letter of Oct. 11, 1956.

(2) Mayor's letter of September 25, 1956

Re: Amendments to 1952/1953 Capital Budget and 1956/1957 Capital Budget School Sites

The Fiscal Committee recommends approval of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an amendment to the 1952/1953 Capital Projects Budget in order to change the designation of Item 7 on Page 10 thereof from the "Northwest Junior High" to Item 3 on Page 19 of the 1956/1957 Capital Projects Budget, known as "Northeast Area School Site" for site acquisition and preliminary planning therefore.

(3) Mayor's letter of September 20, 1956

Re: $29,399.70 to cover deficit which exists with respect to Code GG 489, Contributions to Fairfield County.

The Fiscal Committee recommends approval of $29,399.70, Code GG 489.

(4) Mayor's letter of October 3, 1956

Re: $2,957.00 additional appropriation for Public Works Department

Code 410.1 Salary, Telephone Operator (8 mos.).....	$1,976.00
Code 410.22 Equipment, Telephone installation and service for 8 months.....	981.00
	$2,957.00

The Fiscal Committee recommends approval of these items.

(5) Mayor's letter of September 26, 1956

Re: Additional appropriation of $2,750.00 - Code 486.70B, Veterans' Day Celebration

The Fiscal Committee recommends that we rescind our action taken at the October 1st meeting on the total requested appropriation of $3,500.00, as requested in letter dated September 25, 1956 from the General Chairman of the Veterans Day Celebration, and approve the amount of $2,750.00 as approved by the Board of Finance on October 11, 1956.

(6) Mayor's letter of October 2, 1956

Re: Amendment to Capital Budget of 1956/1957 in the amount of $13,500.00 Stamford Museum and Nature Center

The Fiscal Committee recommends the approval of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives approve an amendment to the 1956/1957 Capital Projects Budget by the addition of an item to be known as "Stamford Museum and Nature Center, Improvement to Roads and Entrances", and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Representatives approves an appropriation in the sum of $13,500.00 to cover cost of such improvements.

(7) Corporation Counsel's letter of July 31, 1956 attached to Mayor's letter of July 31st.

Re: $20,000.00 - Plans for New Incinerator

This item was deferred at our October 1st meeting. The Fiscal Committee recommends the approval of $20,000.00 Plans for New Incinerator and recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

> BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives approves an amendment to the 1956/1957 Capital Budget by the addition of an item known as "Plans for New Incinerator", and
>
> BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives approves an appropriation in the amount of $20,000.00 to cover cost of such plans.

(8) Board of Education letter dated June 29, 1956

Re: Additional appropriation of $10,000.00 for two speech and hearing teachers, transportation, Equipment and supplies.

This item was deferred at our October 1st meeting.

It is the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee that the Board of Representatives deny the Board of Education's request for an additional appropriation of $10,000.00, covering salary of two speech and hearing teachers, their transportation, equipment and supplies.

This decision was based on the fact that the Board of Representatives does not have the power or authority to reduce Board of Education appropriations for specific expenditures, and therefore they cannot grant additional appropriations for a specific expenditure.

At the beginning of the year, when your Fiscal Committee deliberated the possibility of a further reduction in the Board of Education budget, we were advised that the distribution of funds appropriated was solely within the jurisdiction of the Board of Education and that the Board of Representatives had no authority to even suggest how the total appropriation was to be spent.

The decision of the Board of Education in NOT allocating $10,000.00 out of their total appropriation of over $5,000,000.00 for the employment of two speech and hearing teachers is a decision which many taxpayers no doubt will justifiably criticize, particularly when two-thirds of the expenditure would be refunded by the State.

We do not believe the Board of Education is justified in requesting an additional appropriation for this specific item, because in so doing, it incorrectly creates the impression in the minds of the taxpayer that the employment of these two additional teachers is dependent upon the action of this Board, whereas the employment of these teachers is dependent solely on the decision of the Board of Education.

It is the sincere hope of this Committee that the Board of Education will reconsider the allocation of their expenditures, in order that these teachers may be employed immediately.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is the recommendation of this Committee that this additional appropriation of $10,000.00 be DENIED, and I SO MOVE.

(9) Mayor's letter of September 5, 1956

Re: Amendment to 1956/1957 Capital Budget - North Glenbrook Storm Drains $58,563.03 (This item was deferred at the October 1st meeting)

The Fiscal Committee recommends the approval of the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an amendment to the 1956/1957 Capital Budget by the addition thereto of an item to be known as "North Glenbrook Storm Drains", and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an appropriation of $58,563.03 for the "North Glenbrook Storm Drains" which amount is to be transferred from the Bond surplus in the "Bedford Street-Sixth Street to Urban Street, Storm Drain" in the 1954/1955 Capital Projects Budget.

William C. Kaminski,
Chairman, Fiscal Committee

WCK:vdf

(1) Resolution authorizing $1,239,000.00 bonds to finance Capital Projects in 1956/1957 Capital Budget. (See Mayor's letter of October 11, 1956)

Mr. Macrides said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in the recommendation for approval.

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED by unanimous vote of 27 in favor.

Resolution No. 241
Resolution Authorizing $1,239,000.00 Bonds to Finance Capital Projects in 1956/1957 Capital Budget

WHEREAS, in Accordance with Section 630 of the Charter, as amended, this Board has received a written request from the Mayor, approved by the Board of Finance, to authorize bonds to finance all of the Capital Projects contained in the Capital Budget for the current fiscal year, except such projects as are to be paid for with funds raised by current taxation or from other designated sources and except bonds to finance the Bell Street Parking project.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. There be and hereby is authorized, under and pursuant to the Charter of the City of Stamford and any other general or special statute thereto enabling, the issue and sale from time to time of general obligation, coupon serial bonds of the City of Stamford in an aggregate principal amount of One Million Two Hundred Thirty Nine Thousand ($1,239,000.00) Dollars for the purpose of paying for capital projects, consisting of the several public improvements or other municipal works of a permanent character, all as hereinafter more fully described. Each of said capital projects is included in the duly adopted capital budget for the current

fiscal year and reference is hereby made to said capital budget for a more complete description of the particular projects hereinafter designated. The said capital projects and the extent to which they are to be financed with the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized are as follows:

Department of Public Works	
Sanitary Sewer Construction	
West Beach Area	300,000.00
DePinedo, Acosta & Nobile Streets	75,000.00
Storm Drains Construction	
Springdale	50,000.00
North Glenbrook	50,000.00
Flood Control - Rivers & Small Streams	50,000.00
McMullen, James & Owen Streets	10,000.00
Cove Road, Givens & Palmer Avenues	10,000.00
Turn of River Road	15,000.00
Black Swamp - Pipe	5,000.00
Eighth Street	8,000.00
Forest Lawn Avenue	5,000.00
Hoover Avenue	4,000.00
Downs Avenue	5,000.00
Ocean Drive East	7,000.00
Stillwater - Hubbard Heights	7,000.00
Cold Spring Road - Old Barn Road	4,000.00
Burwood Avenue	5,000.00
Cummings Park	25,000.00
Whitmore Lane	8,000.00
Virgil Street	10,000.00
Woodledge Road	8,000.00
Roxbury Road	10,000.00
Webb Avenue, Houston Terrace, Waterbury Avenue, Home Court and Birch Street	15,000.00
Board of Education	
School Construction	
Ryle School Addition	200,000.00
Land Acquisition Site for West Hill, Stillwater, Roxbury School	75,000.00
Land Acquisition Site for Northeast Area School	75,000.00
Board of Health	
Health Building	165,000.00
Ferguson Library	
Construction of Addition (Plans and Specifications)	20,000.00
Welfare Department	
Construction of Sunset Home (Plans and Specifications)	18,000.00
TOTAL	$1,239,000.00

2. Said bonds shall be issued in the name of and upon the full faith and credit of the City of Stamford and shall be issued as two or more separate bond issues and in the manner and in the principal amount that the Board of Finance may determine from time to time, including without limitation the determination of the form, date, date of payments of principal and interest, manner of issuing, by whom signed and all other particulars and said Board of Finance or, if authorized by the Board of Finance, the Finance Commissioner, may determine the rate of interest to be paid on said bonds, **provided**, however, that the bonds to finance the sewer projects shall be as follows: one issue in the amount of $375,000. for sanitary sewers; one issue in the amount of $311,000. for storm sewers.

3. Each of the capital projects hereinbefore described and contained in the capital budget for the current fiscal year is hereby confirmed as a duly authorized capital project of the City of Stamford.

FURTHER RESOLVED:

That with respect to any issue of bonds hereinbefore authorized, there be and hereby is authorized, under and pursuant to Section 365d of the 1955 Supplement to the Connecticut General Statutes, the city charter and any other authority thereto enabling, but within such limitations, if any, as may be imposed by resolution of the Board of Finance, the making of a temporary loan or loans by the issue and sale from time to time, as funds may be required, of a temporary note or notes of the City of Stamford in anticipation of the money to be received from the sale of each such bond issue and the renewal of the same by the issue and sale of a temporary renewal note or notes, provided, however, that the aggregate principal amount of temporary notes or renewal notes at any one time outstanding shall never exceed the principal amount of the bond issue in anticipation of which such notes were issued and provided, further, that the date, maturity, rate of interest or discount, the form, manner of sale and other particulars of such temporary notes or renewal notes shall, within such limitations as may be imposed by law or by resolution of the Board of Finance, be determined by the Commissioner of Finance with the approval of the Mayor.

(2) Amendments to 1952/1953 Capital Budget and 1956/1957 Capital Budget, School Sites (See Mayor's letter of Sept. 25, 1956 and letter of Oct. 11, 1956)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Nolan.

Mr. Macrides said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee also recommended approval. CARRIED by unanimous vote of 27 in favor.

RESOLUTION NO. 242

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an amendment to the 1952/1953 Capital Projects Budget in order to change the designation of Item 7 on Page 10 thereof from the "Northwest Junior High" to Item 3 on Page 19 of the 1956/1957 Capital Projects Budget, known as "Northeast Area School Site" for site acquisition and preliminary planning therefore.

(3) $29,399.70 to cover deficit which exists with respect to Code GG 489, Contributions to Fairfield County. (See Mayor's letter of Sept. 20, 1956)

MR. TOPPING: "I would like to ask Mr. Kaminski and Mr. Macrides why this cannot be kept in committee for further study."

MR. KAMINSKI: "It has already been deferred once, as it come up at the October 1st Board meeting. As a matter of fact, I, myself, took no particular stand on this recommendation that the request be denied and if you asked me personally how I feel about it I would say 'Yes' but some of the other committee members felt we should take a stand because of the recommendations we made at the time of the adoption of the budget."

MR. TOPPING: "Perhaps the committee could get more information if this was deferred."

MR. KAMINSKI: "At the time of our meeting, Mr. Neuwien was present and we got all the information we needed then."

MR. MACRIDES: "This was referred back to committee once and it is my feeling that we should vote down the committee recommendation at this time and then make another recommendation for the approval of this appropriation."

MR. MURPHY: "I am in accord with the Committee on Education."

MR. FREDERICKS MOVED the question.

VOTE taken on denying the request of the Board of Education for $10,000.00 for two speech and hearing teachers. Result: 10 in favor and 16 opposed. (One member had stepped out for a moment and was not present at the voting) MOTION LOST.

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of the request. Seconded by Mr. Kolich.

MR. MACRIDES spoke in favor of the motion. He said: "We have gone on record as showing some concern about the Board of Education seeking additional funds after the budget has been approved. But, I am sure we all feel the request is a worthy one and should be granted."

MR. KAMINSKI: "The members of the Fiscal Committee should be commended for their consistency, in view of their remarks when the Budget was passed."

MR. GEORGOULIS: "Does the Rehabilitation Center have a speech and hearing teacher?"

MR. MACRIDES: "I haven't made an investigation, but I have spoken to a number of individuals in regard to this and I do not believe there is anything offered."

MR. KAMINSKI: "I think there is a definite need for this type of instruction."

MRS. ZUCKERT: "The only reason for the Fiscal Committee going on record as denying this request was we wanted to bring to the attention of the Board of Education that we are not allowed to pass on specific items for the Board of Education and were informed by them at Budget time that we could only pass on their entire budget - not on any specific item, and now they are asking for an additional appropriation for a specific item. If we can only pass on their entire budget request and not on any specific amount, why is it proper now when it wasn't before?"

VOTE taken on motion to approve item No. 8 and CARRIED, 26 in favor and one opposed.

(9) Amendment to 1956/1957 Capital Budget - North Glenbrook Storm Drains - $58,563.03. (See Mayor's letter of Sept. 5, 1956) (Deferred at Oct 1st meeting)

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Hearing

and CARRIED by unanimous vote of 27 in favor. Mr. Topping said the Public Works Committee recommended approval.

RESOLUTION NO. 245

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an amendment to the 1956/1957 Capital Budget by the addition thereto of an item to be known as "North Glenbrook Storm Drains", and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives hereby approves an appropriation of $58,563.03 for the "North Glenbrook Storm Drains" which amount is to be transferred from the bond surplus in the "Bedford Street-Sixth Street to Urban Street, Storm Drain" in the 1954/1955 Capital Projects Budget.

Legislative & Rules Committee:

Mr. Raiteri, Chairman, presented the following committee report:

REPORT OF MEETING OF LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Legislative and Rules Committee was held at Avignone's Restaurant, Wednesday evening, October 24, 1956. The meeting convened at 8:30 P.M. with Chairman Raiteri presiding. Messrs. Nolan, Russell, Baker and McLaughlin were present. Mr. Plotkin was absent.

The following subjects were considered and action taken as indicated:

1. Request for change in name of a portion of Crystal Lake Road

   (References: A. R. Fredericks' letter of September 28th with attached petition - App. 1)

   The Committee requests that this matter be recommitted for further discussion with the Corporation Counsel.

2. Request for change in name of Daycroft Road to one of the several options

   (Reference: Petition signed by Hall M. and Josephine K. Deming, with supporting letter from Board of Trustees of Daycroft School-App. 2)

   The Committee recommends that the request be denied on the basis that the alleged confusion can be eliminated through installation of an appropriate sign at the intersection of Daycroft and Blachley Roads, indicating direction to Daycroft School. In view of this opinion, the Committee feels the many changes involved in City and postal records would not be warranted.

3. Proposed amendment to Board Rules by the addition of a new Rule No. 14 (copy attached hereto as App. 3)

   The Committee recommends rejection of the proposed amendment on the grounds that the present practice:

(a) Helps Board members to formulate opinion,
(b) Is in keeping with State Legislature custom,
(c) Is consistent with principles of representative government, and

that the proposed rules would not be enforceable.

Respectfully submitted,

APPROVED: Ellis B. Baker, Clerk

C. L. Raiteri, Jr.
Chairman

(1) Petition from residents of Crystal Lake Road to change name to Sherry Lane
Mr. Raiteri explained that an investigation had been made of the road in question and it was found that a barrier had been erected across the road to prevent anyone from having access to a continuation of this same road on the other side of the barrier - that this barrier was man made and not a natural one and perhaps if the barrier were removed the cause of most of the annoyance to the residents would be eliminated - that of cars turning into this road and when confronted by the barrier, having to turn around and go back and find another road having access to the continuation of Crystal Lake Road.

MR. FREDERICKS: "Can you force people to make it a public street?"

MR. MURPHY: "I am familiar with the road in question and the barrier is definitely a man made one and not a natural barrier."

Mr. Topping remarked that the same condition also existed on Meadow Park North.

MR. GEORGOULIS MOVED this be recommitted to Committee. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED unanimously.

(2) Request for change in name of Daycroft Road to one of several options.

Mr. Raiteri read from the Committee report of this request (see above) and MOVED that this request be denied for the reasons given in the report. Seconded by Mr. Baker and CARRIED by unanimous vote.

(3) Proposed amendment to Board of Representatives' rules:

To amend the rules under the heading of "Committees" by the addition of a new Rule No. 14:

14. No Committee, nor any member thereof, shall release for publication any information concerning matters considered by such Committee, including the actions taken by the Committee, until the Committee shall have presented its formal committee report to a meeting of the Board of Representatives.

Mr. Raiteri read from the Committee report on this (See item #3 in report of Committee above) and said the Committee recommends rejection of the proposed addition to the rules.

MR. RAITERI MOVED this suggested amendment to the Rules of the Board of Representatives be rejected.

MR. FREDERICKS said that although he had sponsored this contemplated change to the rules, he hoped that various committees would be more circumspect in the future and he therefore seconded the motion. CARRIED unanimously.

(4) Elimination of Precinct No. 2

MR. RAITERI MOVED this be recommitted to Committee for further study. Seconded by Mr. Rhoades and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RAITERI: "Perhaps a meeting could be arranged between the people in the District affected and Chief of Police Kinsella. After all, we now have consolidation and they all come under the same protection now."

(5) Resolution regarding Police protection in the City of Stamford

MR. RAITERI MOVED for suspension of the rules in order to take up this question. Seconded by several voices and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RAITERI MOVED for adoption of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Milano and CARRIED unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 246

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED, and it is hereby

RESOLVED: That the Board of Representatives calls upon the Mayor and the Board of Public Safety to make a complete and detailed review of the manpower requirements of the Police Department, and to present to the Board of Finance and Board of Representatives a full report, together with appropriate recommendations concerning the authorization of such additional men as may be indicated.

Public Works Committee:

Mr. Topping, Chairman, presented the following committee report:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

Meeting held on October 29, 1956 at 28 Lenox Avenue. Members present were: Alan Ketcham and Thomas Topping. Anthony Kolich could not attend because of a business engagement.

The following fiscal matters were discussed and voted to be approved:

(1) $2,957.00 - Public Works Dept. (Mayor's letter Oct. 3, 1956)

Telephone Operator----------	$1,976.00
Telephone Switchboard----------	981.00
	$2,957.00

(2) $13,500.00 - Stamford Museum & Nature Center, Bridge, parking and road (Mayor's letter Oct. 2, 1956)

(3) $20,000.00 - Plans for New Incinerator (Mayor's letter July 31, 1956, enclosing Corporation Counsel's letter same date)

Recommended by this Committee in April of 1954.

(4) $58,563.03 - North Glenbrook Storm Drains (Mayor's letter Sept. 5, 1956)

This will allow partial completion of this project and allow the sanitary sewers to be extended at the same time.

(5) Petition, Mrs. John Burke, re Marion and Elizabeth Streets, deferred from the Oct. 1st meeting was further investigated, and as far as the Committee could discover, the facts are, that although Marion Street appears on old maps of the Town area, it has never been laid out as to grades and drainage. Mr. Burke apparently used the grade as it was when he improved the road. There is no record in the City Engineer's office of an application to have the grade and drainage established. An application would have to be made and the road built to the grade set, before the City could assume any responsibility concerning this street. (Mr. Ketcham will present a minority report on this.)

(6) Re dredging of Cove Pond, dam, etc.

On the Cove Pond item in question, it is still very much alive. This Committee has two petitions regarding the disposition of the dam and the eventual dredging of the Pond. Also, several letters from interested taxpayers and residents of the area. The first one: From the Citizens Committee for Improvement of Cove Pond, dated Sept. 25, 1956 as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF COVE POND
Stamford, Connecticut

Chairman: Mrs. Robert Greenwood
219 Weed Avenue

September 25, 1956

Messrs. T. F. J. Quigley, Mayor
and George Connors, Pres., Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Conn.

In re: Contract for Cove dredging entered into by the City of Stamford and DeLeo Bros., Inc., under bid of June 27, 1956

Sirs:

The subscribers whose names are written underneath, being owners of property

directly affected, respectfully petition you and the local Board of Representatives for a certain local improvement, to wit:

1. Dredge the million yards of "material" referred to in above mentioned contract from Cove Pond, which urgently requires cleaning and dredging, in such manner that there be no spot dredging or stockpiling so that said Pond will be safely usable for boating and other aquatic sports.

1A. Or, failing that, we petition you as the representatives of the City of Stamford, present owner of Cove Island and Cove Pond Dam, to take the necessary steps for rehabilitating the Dam, which was erected in 1792 by Messrs. Fitch and Holly under authority granted in 1791 by Stamford (Darien then being a Parish of Stamford and only becoming the present Town of Darien in 1820) and maintained until the tidal wave of 1938.

2. Repair and/or rebuild the Weed Avenue sea wall as a flood protection measure.

3. Correct and/or improve the present inadequate storm drainage system along Weed Avenue and surrounding area.

4. Build two piers on Cove Pond having access from Weed Avenue, one at a point in the vicinity of Birch Street, and one near a point opposite a lane fronting on Weed Avenue leading to the Monjo property, suitable for fishing and mooring of small boats.

5. Clean and improve appearance of any and all City-owned Weed Avenue property.

And, we hereby request that you promptly submit this petition to the said Board, and do all such other acts as may be required of you by law in order that the above described local improvement may be accomplished.

(SIGNED BY 79 PETITIONERS)

Refer to item #1 in above letter:

Dredging of the million cubic yards of material from the Pond was considered too expensive. While the Army Engineers are the government agency that would be expected to do the dredging of the Pond, it has been our experience that the City is expected to pay one-half of the cost of any dredging.

At present, the Army Engineers are dredging the channel into the lagoon at Cummings Park. The City is paying one-half of the cost, or $32,000.00.

Refer to item #1A in above letter:

This Committee recommends that the dam be rebuilt to retain enough water in the Pond to cover the mud flats at low water and the gates be replaced. This item to be referred to the City Engineer and the Planning Board for possible inclusion in this years Capital Budget.

Refer to item #2 in above letter:

2045

Referred to Flood Control and Erosion Committee for Study and Correction.

Refer to item #3 in above letter:

Refer to Public Works Department for integration into the 1957 Storm Drain program.

Refer to Item #4 in above letter:

Refer to the Park Commission.

Refer to item #5 in above letter:

Refer to Public Works Department for action.

The second petition on this subject, dated September 4, 1956 on Cove Pond was also referred to this committee and reads as follows:

September 4, 1956

Mr. George Connors, President
Board of Representatives
City Hall
Stamford, Conn. Re: Cove Pond

We, the undersigned, as residents of the Cove area, do hereby petition that restoration of the existing dam be made at Cove Pond. This, or some other means by which water will remain in Cove Pond would not only enhance the beauty of the community, but will also provide much needed recreational facilities. To allow this to remain a mud flat, would, in our opinion, be a tremendous waste of what could be a useful and beautiful site, and would likewise tend to decrease the present property values.

(SIGNED BY 84 PETITIONERS)

The above petition was referred to the City Engineer and the Planning Board.

Re: Letter dated October 8, 1956 from Mrs. Wm. E. Barry, Weed Circle, in support of Item IA in previous letter from Citizens Committee for Improvement of Cove Pond.

Referred to City Engineer and Planning Board.

Re: Letter dated October 3, 1956 from Citizens Committee for Improvement of Cove Pond:

"Members of the Board of Representatives
City of Stamford
Stamford, Connecticut

Gentlemen:

Because the subject is of such City-wide interest, we are attaching for your information copy of petition which was referred to the Steering Committee at your meeting Monday night without being read because of the lateness of the hour. (We were there, ourselves, until 1:00 AM).

Committees are suggesting that the City spend $1,600,000 to improve Cove Island Park -- commendable, but costly. It is our opinion that too little attention is being given once beautiful Cove Pond that is now rapidly wasting away. Proper dredging of the Pond under the existing dredging contract will not cost the City or the taxpayers a cent. And, wasn't there an appropriation of $70,000 made some years ago to restore the Dam?

We take this opportunity to commend you for the manner in which you conduct your meetings and the praiseworthy efforts each of you expends in the interests of the City of Stamford and its taxpayers.

Very truly yours,

M. Barry, Secretary
CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF COVE POND"

The following letter was referred to the City Engineer and the Planning Board: This, also was from the same Committee:

November 1, 1956

Mr. Thomas J. Topping, Chairman
Public Works Committee
Board of Representatives
28 Lenox Avenue, Glenbrook
Stamford, Conn.

Dear Mr. Topping:

Subject: Cove Pond - Cove Dam
State Water Policy Commission
Hearing, October 26, 1956

It is the desire of the majority of our members who attended the above mentioned hearing that Cove Pond be thoroughly dredged for sanitary reasons and for the purpose of providing a small boat basin.

However, in the event there is no immediate prospect of complete and proper dredging, we request that the now partially destroyed dam be modified and repaired, as outlined in the proposal of Mr. A. C. Wall of the Noroton Manor Property Owners Association, provided said plan is found to be practicable --such repaired dam to serve to retain some water in the Pond at all times to overcome present downgrading of area properties, due to prevailing unsightly mud flats and until such time as complete and proper dredging of the Pond can be arranged. We wish to express our utmost thanks for the time and attention you have devoted to this matter.

Very truly yours,

M. Barry, Secretary
CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR IMPROVEMENT OF COVE POND

Re: letter from the Joint Committee on Parks and Recreation dated October 4, 1956 was also read and contents noted:

Mr. George V. Connors, President
The Board of Representatives
The City of Stamford
Stamford, Conn.

Dear Mr. Connors:

The Joint Committee on Parks and Recreation notes with approval the unanimous action taken by the Board of Representatives at its meeting on Monday evening, October 1st, relative to the dredging which has been done in areas adjacent to Stamford's Cove Island property.

The Joint Committee commends the Board of Representatives and it's Public Works Committee, Mr. Thomas Topping, Chairman, for their leadership in requesting that steps be taken by the Administration to fully protect the interests of Stamford citizens in Cove Island property.

Certainly, with Stamford's very limited beach areas, every effort should be made to prevent any reduction in area, either by the forces of nature or by any other means.

The Joint Committee feels that such steps should be taken prior to the potential and/or actual damage being done to Stamford's beaches. To replace lost or damaged beaches is an expensive charge which is added to the tax bill all citizens pay in form or another, directly or indirectly.

Yours very truly,

Robert O. Stevens, Chairman
The Joint Committee on
Parks and Recreation

Re: Noroton Property Owners Association:

73 property owners are in favor of restoring the dam.

Re: Resolution #240 (See Page 1383 of Oct. 1, 1956 Minutes) Removal from Cove Island of Gravel Belonging to City of Stamford, Conn.

(1) Letter from Mayor Quigley dated Oct. 8, 1956, to Mr. Fogarty, Corps of Engineers, USA and Mr. Wm. S. Wise, State Water Commissioner.

(2) Reply to above letter dated October 22, 1956 from Miles L. Wachendorf, Corps of Engineers, USA.

(3) Letter from Mayor Quigley dated November 5, 1956, to President of the Board of Representatives, enclosing copies of above letters. (See: "Communications from the Mayor" for above letters)

As you will notice, Mr. Wise stated that Darien had taken 43,000 cubic yards as per the permit issued.

This was a group composed of Mayor Quigley, Mr. Wise, Mr. Kerrigan and myself. I answered that I would rest on the 43,000 cubic yards, and requested Mr. Wise to confirm this statement in writing. To date, no confirming letter has arrived from

Mr. Wise.

As you can understand from Col. Wackendorf's letter, the Army Engineers are only concerned with matters regarding navigation, and not with where material is taken orwhat is done with it, as long as the taking does not create a menace to navigation.

Obviously, the taking of this material will have no adverse effect on navigation. Therefore, the Corps of Engineers will take no action. Mr. Wise' statement to the effect that 43,000 cubic yards of material were taken in conformance with the requirements of the permit, would seem to peg the quantity taken at the 43,000 mark, but it does not indicate where it was taken from.

Whether or not any investigation has been made to determine if any of this material was taken from the taxable waters of Stamford, I do not know.. It does seem to me that this Board should be entitled to any answer to that part of the resolution before further dredging is started.

Mayor Quigley has stated in his letter of November 5, 1956, that Darien paid $23,000.00 to have 43,000 cubic yards dredged and placed on their beach. This would make the cost about 50¢ per cubic yard on the beach. Trucking and handling costs would be extra.

Using these figures, Mayor Quigley's plan to remove the spit and dredge 400,000 cubic yards from Cove Harbor would cost for dredging alone - $200,000.00, plus trucking and handling. That would be, it seems to me, quite a drain on the budget of the Public Works Department. As I understand, the Mayor plans to use the Public Works men and equipment to do this work.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Topping
Chairman, Public Works Committee

(1) Re petition from Mrs. John Burke, Marion and Elizabeth Streets

MR. KETCHAM said that about 3/4 of the streets in the city have never been accepted and that he disagreed with the arguments of the City Engineer and thought they were not valid in this case.

MR. TOPPING: "The grade would have to be set by the City Engineer." In answer to the question as to whether he had checked with the Corporation Counsel on this matter, he stated that he had not done so.

Mr. Chase being present, was asked to speak in regard to this problem. He said that these are old developments upwards of 50 years. He said it is so much lower than St. Charles Avenue that there is about a six foot drop. He said he would advise that he contact the City Engineer and fix it so the roads will not be flooded out.

MR. MURPHY said he agreed with Mr. Topping's report.

MR. CHASE: "This never was a road originally - the name was used for tax purposes only - you have several of them right now on your hands."

MR. RUSSELL: "Where does the problem rest - on the City or on the owner of the property?"

There was a great deal of discussion at this point as to who was the responsible one - the City or the developer.

2043

MR. TOPPING MOVED that Mr. Burke should be informed by this Board that he should make application to the City Engineer to settle the whole difficulty. Seconded by Mr. Baker and CARRIED unanimously.

(2) Re letter dated September 25, 1956 from Citizens Committee for Improvement of Cove Pond

Mr. Topping read from his Committee report on this letter. In regard to paragraph (1) he stated that the City should have to pay for one-half of the cost of this dredging and the committee considers this too expensive to undertake.

Regarding the other items considered in this letter, the recommendations of the committee as given in the committee report were reiterated by Mr. Topping.

MR. TOPPING MOVED that the Public Works Committee report be approved.

There ensued considerable discussion as to the recommendations of the Committee. Mr. Topping said he did not believe this Board should recommend to any other City Board just what they should do, but just refer the question to them to decide.

MR. WATERBURY MOVED the Public Works Committee report be approved. Seconded by Mr. Ketcham and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. RAITERI MOVED that this Board send a letter to the Mayor calling his attention to the last paragraph in Resolution No. 240 which was adopted at the October 1, 1956 Board meeting (See page 1383 of the Minutes). Seconded by Mr. Baker and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. IACOVO requested that Mr. Topping put on his agenda for his Committee to take up the question of the City streets and their cleanliness.

Planning and Zoning Committee:

Mr. Murphy, Chairman, presented the following committee report:

We recommend acceptance of the following roads as public highways:

BOUTON STREET WEST, extending northerly and easterly from Weed Hill Avenue a distance of approximately 950 feet to the previously accepted portion of Bouton Street West.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

BOUTON CIRCLE, extending westerly from Bouton Street West for a distance of approximately 170 feet.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

SUNSET STREET, extending westerly from Bouton Street West, approximately 110 feet.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above street. Seconded by Mr. Nolan and CARRIED unanimously.

GAYMOOR DRIVE, extending easterly from Bouton Street West, to the already accepted portion.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Nolan.

Mr. Russell called attention to a drainage problem and said there was a flooding condition.

VOTE taken on acceptance of GAYMOOR DRIVE and CARRIED by a vote of 26 in favor and one opposed.

GAYMOOR CIRCLE, extending northerly from Gaympor Drive for a distance of 222 feet.

MR. MURPHY said all of the above roads are shown on Map #5364 and Map #5557 which are filed in the Town Clerk's office and have been certified by the City Engineer.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of GAYMOOR CIRCLE. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED by unanimous vote.

LARKSPUR ROAD, extending southerly and westerly from Sky Meadow Drive for a distance of approximately 2300 feet.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED unanimously.

HANNAH'S ROAD, extending southerly from Scofieldtown Road for a distance of approximately 2100 feet.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED unanimously.

COUSINS ROAD, extending easterly from Larkspur Road for a distance of 275 feet.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED unanimously.

VERY MERRY ROAD, extending westerly from Larkspur Road for a distance of 750 feet.

Mr. Murphy said all of the above roads have been certified and are shown on Map #5452, which is filed in the Town Clerk's office.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of VERY MERRY ROAD. Seconded by Mr. Nolan and CARRIED unanimously.

MALVERN ROAD, extending northerly from Vine Road for a distance of approximately 980 feet. This road is shown on a map filed in the Town Clerk's office as Map #4991 and has been certified by the City Engineer.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Nolan.

MR. McLAUGHLIN objected to the acceptance of this road. He stated that it was in very poor condition, full of holes and that he had been on it many times recently and did not think it should be accepted, considering the condition of the road.

VOTE taken on acceptance of MALVERN ROAD and CARRIED by unanimous vote.

LINWOOD LANE, extending southeasterly and southwesterly from Wire Mill Road for a distance of approximately 800 feet and certified by the City Engineer and shown on Map #5159 filed in the Town Clerk's office.

There was some discussion about this road, Mr. Russell stating that he had

personally measured this road and found it to be only 19 feet in width and not up to the usual standard of width and was not in too good a condition.

MR. MURPHY MOVED that acceptance of this road be DENIED for these reasons and that the Planning Board and City Engineer should be so notified. CARRIED by unanimous vote to DENY acceptance of LINWOOD LANE.

ALBIN ROAD:

Mr. Murphy said at last month's meeting when a portion of this road was accepted, there was a mistaken impression that the older part of the street was a public highway. Since then, the discovery was made that no part of Albin Road was accepted. He said that as this road has been certified by the City Engineer in its entirety and is sewered, resurfaced and maintained by the City, it was his recommendation that the entire length of ALBIN ROAD, from Cove Road to Neponsit Street be accepted as a public highway and so MOVED. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED unanimously.

LAKEVIEW DRIVE, from the accepted portion to Brook Run Lane, as shown on Map #5143 in City Clerk's office.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Nolan and CARRIED unanimously.

BROOK RUN LANE, extending northerly and southerly from Lakeview Drive for a distance of 918 feet, as shown on Map #5143 filed in the Town Clerk's office.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for acceptance of the above road. Seconded by Mr. Nolan and CARRIED unanimously.

MR. MURPHY said there was some question about the date for final acceptance of petitions for acceptance of roads and asked that this matter be clarified by the Legislative and Rules Committee.

MRS. ZUCKERT spoke in regard to road acceptances. She said in accepting these roads we are obligating the City to the expense of their upkeep. Then, the Planning Board comes along and requests storm sewers for proper drainage of the roads and we do not have the money and then a request is put through for additional sums necessary to install various storm sewers and drains and the request is denied. Then, the Board is flooded with petitions for the installation of drains, etc. for these roads that we have so quickly accepted as city roads. She said it was a vicious circle.

There was some discussion at this point as to how these matters could be handled.

MR. RHOADES: "It may be that we need to clarify the city's position on acceptance of roads that have never been accepted as public highways."

WOODRIDGE DRIVE:

There was some discussion about this road. Mr. Murphy explained that the City Engineer has not certified this road for acceptance.

MR. MILANO MOVED that this Board should notify the City Engineer to hold up release of the bond on this road until it is brought up to acceptable condition. Seconded by Mr. Russell and CARRIED by unanimous vote.

Education, Welfare & Government Committee

Mr. Macrides, Chairman, presented the following report of his committee:

The Committee on Education, Welfare and Government met at the offices of Macrides, Zesima & Schwartz at 7:00 P.M. on Tuesday, October 30, 1956. Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Macrides were present.

The Committee studied the resolution authorizing bonds to finance capital projects in the 1956-1957 Capital Budget and approved same in accord with the Mayor's letter of October 11, 1956.

The request in the Mayor's letters of September 25, 1956 and October 11, 1956, insofar as they have been approved by the Planning Board and the Board of Finance by the appropriation of funds for the amendment of the Capital Budget to permit the purchase of the Ippolito property for a school site, was also approved by the Committee.

The contributions to Fairfield County, Code GG-489, in the amount of $29,399.70 was also approved.

The Committee strongly urged referral to its minutes presented at the last meeting of the Board of Representatives, wherein it approved the $10,000.00 emergency appropriation to the Board of Education for the hiring of speech and hearing teachers.

Respectfully submitted,

John C. Macrides, Chairman

Housing Committee:

Mr. Longo, Chairman, presented the following committee report:

HOUSING COMMITTEE REPORT
Meeting held Oct. 18, 1956

The Housing Committee met October 18, 1956 in the City Court room at 8 P.M. Members present were: Anthony Kolich, Jr., Gerald Rybnick, Mrs. Doris Zuckert and D. Mr. Snyder was absent. Invited guest present were: Mr. Richard Jone, President of Stamford Good Government, Mrs. Mary E. Malloy, Stamford Red Cross, Mrs. Dwight Marshall, Stamford Community Council and Mr. Charles Mitchell, Stamford branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

I outlined the work of the Housing Committee and the status of the Housing program in our city to the members of these civic organizations. We discussed outside business interests to enter the Stamford housing construction program. Also, the possibility of low interest home ownership -- something like the Bowes type we had a few years ago. Also, the possibility of cooperative housing, which many cities have tried and has been a success.

The housing and civics group thought it would be a good idea to hold a meeting with architects and representatives of agencies who are interested in housing.

We will hold a meeting again with any civics group interested in this housing program.

Frank Longo, Chairman
Housing Committee

MR. LONGO MOVED for acceptance of the above report. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED unanimously.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR:

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

November 5, 1956

Mr. George V. Connors, President
Board of Representatives

Re: Removal from Cove Island of Gravel
Belonging to City of Stamford

Dear Mr. Connors:

Replying to the request of your Board, dated October 8th, pertaining to the above subject, I wish to submit herewith a copy of the letter sent to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, also to the State Water Commission (copy of which was sent to Selectman Kerrigan of Darien).

You will note the report of the U.S. Army Engineers, where THEY TAKE NO ADVERSE POSITION to the work being done by Darien in view of navigation problems which come within their jurisdiction.

On Friday, October 26th, the public hearing was held at the K. T. Murphy School, wherein which the State Water Commission appeared with its membership, as well as its executive director, William Wise.

Mr. Wise publicly stated at the hearing, to your Chairman of Public Works, that their findings were to the effect that approximately 43,000 yards of gravel were removed by the Town of Darien under a permit granted for this work.

My conversation with Mr. Kerrigan, of Darien, also proved that their work was done under an appropriation by the Town of Darien, wherein they paid a contractor $23,000 to do this work.

Accordingly, in view of the self-explanatory letter of the U.S. Engineers, together with the follow-up evidence personally given by Mr. Wise of the State Water Commission, and the facts given to me by Mr. Kerrigan substantiating the removal of 43,000 yards, there does not appear to have been any violation of Stamford's rights.

Very truly yours,

Thomas F. J. Quigley
Mayor

TFJQ/et
Encs

October 8, 1956

Mr. Fogerty
Corps of Engineers, U.S.A.

150 Causeway St.
Boston, Mass

Mr. William S. Wise
State Water Commissioner
State Office Bldg
Hartford, Conn

Gentlemen:

Following my note to you of October 3rd, regarding the request for an alternate plan, together with the request made by our Commissioner of Public Works for copies of plans and specifications, and in view of the attached letter wherein the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford ask that I investigate and check all necessary steps to protect the interest of the City, may I make the following request:

That you dispatch immediately a representative of your office to investigate whether or not the Town of Darien fully carried out the requirements contained in their permit, and whether or not they trespassed in doing so, and if any damage has been caused by the removal of gravel from the Cove Harbor.

Also, whether or not they have stayed within the bounds of the permits granted by your office.

Appreciating your immediate attention to this matter, I am

Very truly yours,

Thomas F. J. Quigley
Mayor

TFJQ/et
cc:Selectman T. Kerrigan, Darien

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER
NEW ENGLAND DIVISION
150 Causeway Street
Boston 14, Mass.

Address Reply To:
DIVISION ENGINEER

Refer to File No.
NEDNP 22 October 1956

Honorable Thomas F. J. Quigley
Mayor of the City of Stamford
City Hall
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mayor Quigley:

2055

This is in reference to your letter of October 8, 1956, requesting that this office make an investigation to determine whether or not the Town of Darien has performed the dredging in Cove Harbor in conformance with the plans approved by Federal permit issued 25 March 1955, to the Darien Park Commission. It is the opinion of this office that, since the question concerns the possibility of encroachment on submerged land owned by the City of Stamford, such an investigation is not required by this Department under the Federal laws governing the issuance of permits.

There is a note on the permit form which summarizes the extent of the interest of the Federal Government in the work authorized. It states that the permit does not give any property rights either in real estate or material or any exclusive privileges; and that it does not authorize any injury to private property or invasion of private rights, or any infringement of Federal, State, or local laws or regulations, nor does it obviate the necessity of obtaining State assent to the work authorized. It merely expresses the assent of the Federal Government so far as concerns the public rights of navigation.

In view of the above it is apparent that no action can be taken by the Department for a determination as to whether or not the dredging performed by the Town of Darien is in conformance with the permit plans, since the dredging will have no adverse effect on navigation. Whether or not the dredged area extends beyond the Darien town line is a matter for determination by local and/or State authorities.

This office has been informed that a hearing will be held on the matter by the Connecticut Flood Control and Water Policy Commission at 2:00 P.M., on Friday 26 October 1956. Arrangements are being made to have a representative of this office in attendance.

FOR THE DIVISION ENGINEER:
Sincerely yours,

/s/ Miles L. Wachendorf

MILES L. WACHENDORF
Lt. Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Assistant Division Engineer for Civil Works

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS

(1) Letter from Corporation Counsel, answering request made at Oct. 1, 1956 Board meeting for a written report on procedure for bond release. (See page 1386, 4th paragraph from top)

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONN.

October 18, 1956

Board of Representatives
City Hall
Stamford, Connecticut

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith are copies of the present form of performance bonds used by the Planning Board of the City of Stamford.

You will note that the obligation is based on performance in accordance with the "specifications and rules of the City Engineer and the terms and provisions of the ordinances of the City of Stamford and the statutes of the State governing the construction of highways and their acceptance."

I trust that this information answers your inquiry of October 16th.

Very truly yours,

John M. Hanrahan
Corporation Counsel

JMH:A
Encls.

First enclosure:

DRAFT OF PERFORMANCE BOND

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That_____ of the City of Stamford, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, as PRINCIPAL, and_____of said Stamford, as SURETY, are holden and stand firmly bound, jointly and severally, unto the City of Stamford, a municipal corporation of the State of Connecticut, located in Fairfield County in said State, in the penal sum of_____ Dollars, to be paid to said City of Stamford, to the which payment well and truly to be made, we, the said obligators, do bind ourselves and our respective heirs, executors and administrators and each and every of them, for an in the whole sum aforesaid, firmly by these presents.

Signed with our hands and sealed with our seals this_____day of_____19____.

THE CONDITION OF THIS OBLIGATION IS SUCH, That whereas (Principal) has entered into an agreement with the City of Stamford for the grading and construction of higbways, installing of storm sewers and setting of street line monuments at locations indicated by the City Engineer of said City of Stamford and all in accordance with the specifications and rules of said City Engineer, and the terms and provisions of the ordinances of the City of Stamford and the statutes of the State governing the construction of highways and their acceptance, on a project known as_____and shown on a certain map entitled "_____", which map is to be filed in the office of the Town Clerk of said City of Stamford.

The estimate of the required drainage is based on the information submitted by the applicant to date. If, in the course of development of this tract for building purposes, a physical inspection of the premises indicates the presence of additional drainage and water conditions which effect the subdivision, then in that event such conditions must be remedied to the full satisfaction of the City Engineer of Stamford.

This Bond submitted in connection with this original application is to be regarded as covering such additional drainage work.

NOW THEREFORE, if said (Principal) shall satisfactorily complete the making and grading of the above described_____and the installation of the storm sewers aforesaid, within (Maximum time - two years) years from the date hereof, subject to the approval of the City of Stamford, then this obligation to be void and of no effect, otherwise to remain in full force, power and virtue.

(SIGN, WITNESS AND NOTARIZE)

Second Enclosure:

WHEREAS

A Connecticut corporation located in the County of Fairfield, State of Connecticut, has applied to the Planning Board of the City of Stamford, a municipal corporation of the State of Connecticut, for approval of a subdivision of land in the manner set forth on a certain map entitled:_____

_____

WHEREAS the Planning Board of the City of Stamford has approved said subdivision of land upon condition that the highways as shown on said map will be graded and constructed and storm sewers installed and street line monuments located in accordance with the specifications of the City of Stamford's Engineer, as set out in his estimate dated_____ and the profile and construction plans approved by the City Engineer.

WHEREAS the estimate of the required drainage is based on the information submitted by the applicant to date, so that if in the course of development of this tract for building purposes, a physical inspection of the premises indicates the presence of additional drainage and water conditions which effect the subdivision, then, in that event such conditions must be remedied to the full satisfaction of the City of Stamford, and the bond submitted in connection with this original application is to be regarded as covering such additional drainage work.

NOW THEREFORE the parties hereto agree as follows:

Said_____agrees to satisfactorily complete the highways, storm sewers and street line monuments in accordance with the aforesaid specifications of the City Engineer and in accordance with the terms of the ordinances of the City and the Statutes of the State governing the construction and acceptance of highways, within a period of two years from the date of the bond: and further agrees to execute and deliver a bond in the amount of_____ with a surety authorized to transact surety business in the State of Connecticut conditioned upon the performance of said work; and in consideration thereof the City of Stamford, acting herein by its Planning Board, hereby agrees that if said work shall be satisfactorily completed within a period of two years and approved by the Engineer of the City of Stamford, that the obligation of said bond shall be discharged.

In witness hereby the parties have hereunto set their hands and seal this_____day of_____19__.

WITNESS_____ BY:_____

CITY OF STAMFORD, by its Planning Board, acting herein

WITNESS:_____ By_____

---

(2) American Machine & Foundry Company reply to our letter inviting them to move into Stamford. (See page 1395 of Oct. 1, 1956 Minutes)

AMERICAN MACHINE & FOUNDRY COMPANY
261 Madison Avenue
New York 16, N. Y.

November 1, 1956

Mr. George V. Connors, President
Board of Representatives
City of Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Connors:

Your expression and that of the Board of Representatives of October 5th is most gratifying to me. With some of American Machine & Foundry Company's chemical and engineering activities occupying over 77,000 s. ft. in Stamford, I feel that our consideration to move our research and development work to High Ridge Road is the best endorsement an American industry could make of your fine community.

The atmosphere of cooperation that pervades Stamford is most conducive to our building a campus-type laboratory of such uniqueness that it will be a landmark of which we may all be proud. I look forward with great anticipation to opening this new modern Research Center.

Sincerely yours,

Morehead Patterson,
Chairman

(3) Commissioner of Finance - Answer to comments made by Auditors Hadfield, Rothwell, Soule & Coates in their report for fiscal year ending June 30, 1956

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE

November 2, 1956

To:

The Honorable Thomas F. J. Quigley
The Honorable Members of the Board of Finance
The Honorable Members of the Board of Representatives

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am enclosing a copy of a press release which reflects my sentiments of the city audit recently filed by Hadfield, Rothwell, Soule & Coates.

I intend to make a detailed study not only of the comments but also of the exhibits and schedules, at the conclusion of which I shall make a further statement.

Very truly yours,

Thomas Morrissey, Jr.
Commissioner of Finance

TMJr/g
Encl.

November 2, 1956

I received the report of the city auditors yesterday and in the short period that I have had to analyze it, I am appalled by the amount of space and attention they devoted to criticizing minor items in the city's records.

At the outset I want to state that there is nothing in the audit that in any way reflects upon the honesty of any member or employee of the Department of Finance or any of the other city departments or upon their ability to perform their duties. In fact, if anything, it would seem to indicate that the city's employees were overzealous in being more interested in the substance of the city's business affairs than in the form.

It must be remembered that the Finance Department in particular, and most of the other departments concerned in this audit, are operating the increased affairs of the city with a very limited personnel. Despite the rapid growth of the city over the last several years, it will be found that departments are functioning with the same number of employees handling a much greater volume of business. This is particularly true of the Finance Department.

In my department there are only two executive employees, myself and the Controller. The remainder of the personnel consist of bookkeeping machine operators and clerks. The position of accountant, which was established at my request to safeguard against some of the very criticisms that are being made, became vacant at the beginning of the fiscal year under review. The duties of the accountant are to inspect the various departments and render an internal audit. The Personnel Department has been trying to fill the vacancy in the office of accountant for almost a year and to date no one has been certified to me by the Personnel Department as qualified. One difficulty in filling the position appears to be the problem of securing a person of competence and experience within the salary range. This situation has finally been clarified by the Personnel Commission and an examination is

to be held in the immediate future. It would appear from information available to me that qualified individuals have applied for the position.

The Commissioner of Finance and the Controller alone cannot perform all of the detailed duties and discharge all the responsibilities of the Finance Department as outlined by the Charter without such an employee.

The suggestion in the audit that the conditions criticized would not have existed if I had been present every single minute of a working day failed to take into account the vacancy in the position of accountant. When one stops to think of the number of departments, boards and agencies in the City of Stamford, it is readily apparent that the Commissioner of Finance can merely supervise their activities rather than operate each one of them. It must be remembered that since I took office the original departments and agencies in the city have been expanded by the addition of new boards, such as the addition of a Sewer Commission, Parking Authority and Urban Redevelopment Commission.

It must be further borne out that when I took this office, I pointed out to the responsible city boards that I could not be expected to devote all of my time in view of the salary and the absence of job tenure and that I agreed to devote substantially all of my time, which I have done, to the operations of the Finance Department. This representation was reiterated to the appointments committee of the Board of Representatives in connection with my last appointment a year ago when the subject of devoting full time to the office was raised.

I should like to assure the people of Stamford that the auditor's comments that the books and records are in a poor condition is a statement inconsistent with the facts. The records of the City are being conducted in much the same manner as they have been in the past five years, during which time other audits have been made by reputable auditing firms, none of which contained the comments or recommendations comparable to those contained in the current report.

It would appear to me that the emphasis upon the time I spend on city business is attributable in part to differences of opinion that arose during the course of this audit between Mr. Charles Coates, a partner in the auditing firm, and members of his staff and myself and other city department heads. This audit, you will remember, was begun late because the auditing firm was not engaged by the Board of Finance until after the period prescribed by statutes, consequently the auditors did not arrive until practically the beginning of the new fiscal year, a time when the city's various departments were engaged in closing out the records of the fiscal year 1955-56 and opening their accounts for the fiscal year 1956-57. You can appreciate that the Finance Department and the other city departments, with their limited personnel, were receptive to harassment by the auditors. It has been reported to me that in spite of provocation, all of the department heads and their employees endeavored to their utmost to give full cooperation to the examination as they have in past years.

However, because I interceded for these over-burdened department heads and employees, it would appear that the auditors are taking out their annoyance on me by a thinly disguised personal attack upon the performance of my duties under the guise of comments in connection with an audit. This seems evident when one examines the time they devote to the fact that taxpayers received their tax bills several days prior to July 1. What they did not take into account was the fact that our fiscal year begins on July 1 and that unless we have tax receipts available to meet current city expenses as of that date, we would be going back to the old system of pledging our tax money in the form of tax anticipation notes to pay current bills.

The comment concerning the Tax Collector having an overage of $3.00 which was

not promptly deposited, without bringing out the fact that tax collections of approximately ten million dollars made by the Collector during the course of the year, were promptly deposited, was obviously a gross exaggeration and misrepresentation of the actual facts concerning the conduct of office by the Tax Collector.

The problem concerning the collections on parking tickets is not solely within the control of the Finance Department. The Finance Department receives promptly any money collected on such tickets but if people fail to pay the tickets when issued or the City Court subsequent to the issuance of the tickets orders no payment should be made because of no violation of parking regulations was established, the Finance Department cannot take any action.

When one remembers that the establishment of a Parking Authority was requested by the City for the purpose of removing the necessity of appropriating tax revenues to the operations of that Authority, then one can appreciate that the criticism of the fact that no formal budget and request for funds for the operation of the Parking Authority was submitted was not merited. Financial reports of the operation of the Parking Authority showing its receipts and expenditures were annually submitted by me to the Mayor and Boards of Finance and Representatives but since no city funds were requested to operate this agency, such a report was not included in the budget itself. I submit that should it be done, it would amount to a mere bookkeeping operation.

In conclusion, I wish to assure the people of Stamford that no charge of corruption has been made against any city employee. Furthermore, I wish to state at this time that I have every confidence in the ability and devotion to duty of Mrs. Agnes S. Convery, the City Controller, and I think, in the light of the burdens of her office and the limited personnel available to her, she has performed excellently and I might add that this opinion is shared by every responsible official of the City.

NEW BUSINESS

Re: Report of Auditors Hadfield, Rothwell, Soule & Coates for City of Stamford for fiscal year ended June 30, 1956

MR. FREDERICKS: "There has been considerable alarm and concern in the City as a result of the audit report which appeared in the Stamford Advocate. The question as to how much time the Finance Commissioner should spend in the service of the city came up. The question of emergency appropriations are always before us. We, as the representatives of the citizens of Stamford, have the obligation to look into the report very carefully. A special committee of this Board should go over the auditor's report."

MR. FREDERICKS MOVED that a six man bi-partisan committee be appointed to review the auditor's report and report to this Board and make recommendations in connection with the audit report recently completed. Seconded by Mr. Waterbury and CARRIED by unanimous vote of the 27 members present.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Fredericks MOVED for adjournment at 10:30 P.M. Seconded by several voices and CARRIED unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

George V. Connors

George V. Connors, President
Board of Representatives

vf