

Minutes of September 9, 1963
Meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives
Stamford, Connecticut

3765

A regular monthly meeting of the 7th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Monday, September 9, 1963, in the Cafeteria of the Dolan Junior High School, Toms Road, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Paul D. Shapero, at 8:05 P.M.

In the Absence of Rev. Claude Peters, of Stamford Baptist Church, a moment of silent prayer was observed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO FLAG: The President led the members in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 33 members present and 7 absent at the calling of the roll. However, two new members were sworn in and two other members arrived shortly thereafter, changing the roll call to 37 present and 3 absent.

The absent members were: Chester Walajtys, Richard O'Neill and George Russell.

RESIGNATION - DR. MELVIN N. GROVE, Democrat, 8th District Representative and election of replacement to fill out unexpired term of office, ending November 30, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT read the letter of resignation of Dr. Grove, resigning for the reason that he had moved from the 8th District.

MRS. AUSTIN presented the name of PETER J. SOMMA, JR., Democrat, 8th District, 91 Strawberry Hill Avenue, as replacement to fill out the unexpired term of Dr. Grove. The nomination was seconded by several members.

There being no further nominations, the President directed the Clerk of the Board to cast one vote, thus making it unanimous.

THE PRESIDENT administered the oath of office to Mr. Somma, who thereupon assumed a seat as a member of the Board. (applause)

RESIGNATION - JOHN R. NOLAN, Democrat, 9th District Representative and election of replacement to fill out unexpired term of office, ending November 30, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT read a letter of resignation from Mr. Nolan, who resigned for the reason that he had moved from the 9th District.

MR. SHANEN offered the name of JOHN J. MORRIS, JR., Democrat, 9th District, residing at 169 Hope Street, as replacement to fill out the unexpired term of Mr. Nolan. The nomination was seconded by several members.

There being no further nominations, the President directed the Clerk of the Board to cast one vote, thus making it unanimous.

THE PRESIDENT administered the oath of office to Mr. Morris, who then assumed a seat as a member of the Board. (applause)

MR. SCHWARTZ rose on a point of personal privilege. He said: "I think it would

be remiss on our part and the record should not be barren of the remarks that I would like to make at this time.

"I would like the record to note the departure from our ranks of a man who delegated many hours and, I believe sincerely, although I may not have agreed with him, as Minority Leader, from time to time, as you all well know.

"It is my belief that any man who has devoted so much of his time to public service of the community should be remembered in the annals of our records."

MR. SCHWARTZ MOVED that an appropriate letter or resolution be addressed to John Nolan from the entire membership of the Board of Representatives; seconded by several members and CARRIED unanimously.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of August 5, 1963.

The minutes of the above meeting were accepted with the following correction, proposed by MR. KETCHAM, who referred the members to page 3763, second paragraph. He quoted the paragraph in question as it appears in the Minutes of August 5th:

"THE PRESIDENT informed Mr. Philpot that it was decided at a Steering Committee meeting held some months ago to adopt a policy of the Board that rather than reading all petitions sent to the Board during a Board meeting, to expedite matters by having them referred to the Steering Committee for referral to the proper Committee."

MR. KETCHAM said if his recollection is correct, at that particular meeting of the Steering Committee when there was some discussion as to cutting down on the time involved in presenting new business to the Board - that at that time the suggestion was made that no debate be held on new business presented by any member, and it was also further brought up for consideration by the Steering Committee that at any time new business was brought up that it must be brought up in writing and that a member in bringing this matter to the attention of the Board, be restricted in his debate.

MR. KETCHAM said at that time he categorically stated that such a procedure would be entirely unacceptable to both himself and to the Republican members of the Board. He said it was his recollection that no decision was made at the Steering Committee meeting in question as to the presentation by any member of this Board when he wishes to present new business to the attention of the members.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

MR. SHAPERO presented the following report of the Steering Committee:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT
Meeting held Monday, August 26, 1963

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Monday, August 26, 1963 in the Conference Room, City Hall.

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. Mrs. Eleanor Austin, Chairman, pro tempore, presided in the absence of the Chairman, Paul Shapero.

Present were the following members: Eleanor Austin, Daniel Baker, William Murphy, Allen Shanen, George Russell, Alan Ketcham, Fred Blois, Hilda Clarke, Ronald Schwartz, Anthony Truglia and James Mulreed. Mr. Oppenheimer was also present as Chairman of the Urban Redevelopment Committee, a special Committee.

The following members were absent: Paul Shapero, John Nolan and John Kane.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Mayor's Appointments - The three appointments not acted upon at the August 5th Board meeting were ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA.
 - (2) Additional Appropriations - The following matters were ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA and referred to the FISCAL COMMITTEE, with matters over \$2,000 (except pensions) referred to a secondary committee:
 - (a) Resolution authorizing \$850,000 bond issue to finance HELCO BUILDING (TABLED at the August Board meeting) (Mayor's letter 7/29/63)
 - (b) Salary Increase for Mayor to \$17,000; per Sec. 402 of Charter (Approved by Board of Finance on 8/15/63)
 - (c) \$1,170.00 for Assessor's Office, Code 144.0101, Salaries (Requested in Mayor's letter of 7/29/63)
 - (d) \$2,781.60 for Pension for Fireman Arthur A. Dixon (Mayor's letter of 7/29/63)
 - (3) GUILDWAY HOMES, ET AL - Petition from Zoning Board denial to change land use described in Application #63-014 from R-2 to R-1 One-Family Residence District - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Legislative & Rules and Planning & Zoning Committees.
 - (4) Concerning a proposed Ordinance to establish a Commission on Human Rights (Mayor's letter of 8/2/63)
- MR. BAKER MOVED this be placed on the Agenda. The Secretary was instructed to send a copy of the proposed Ordinance to each member of the Board. There being no copy available, one was obtained from the Mayor's office. REFERRED TO THE LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE and ordered PLACED ON AGENDA, (with two no votes.)
- (5) Petition from Residents of GLENDALE CIRCLE and GREENFIELD ROAD, Glenbrook, concerning bad road conditions (Brought up under "New Business" 6/3/63 - See page 3709 of Minutes) - REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.
 - (6) Petition from residents of COURTLAND HILL STREET, Glenbrook, requesting immediate action in regard to the repavement and completion of work being done by DeLeo Bros. (Signed by 43 property owners on street) (Brought up by Mr. Philpot at the 8/5/63 meeting - See page 3763 of Minutes) - REFERRED TO THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.
 - (7) Petition from residents of FINE HILL AVENUE, complaining of flash flooding washing away top soil and ruining yards, equipment and gardens with oil and debris, resulting in an unsanitary condition. (Brought up by Mr. Philpot at the 8/5/63 meeting - See page 3763 of Minutes) REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE.
 - (8) Letter, dated 7/31/63, from George Connors and Paul Kuczo, 10th District Representatives, concerning correction of bad road conditions on GIVENS AVENUE, NEPONSIT AND ISLAND HEIGHTS ROAD and sidewalk on COVE ROAD; also the USE OF SALT IN SNOW REMOVAL OPERATIONS - REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COM-

MITTEE.

- (9) Complaint, dated 6/17/63, from 46 nearby residents of 5th, 6th and 8th Districts, concerning dangerous traffic hazard on SUMMER STREET, at location of RIDGEWAY SHOPPING CENTER - REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE.
- (10) Concerning two letters regarding alleged CONTAMINATION OF STAMFORD WATERS (1) From Mrs. Marie Ritch, dated 5/13/63; and (2) From Edward R. Jobson, Jr., dated 5/7/63 - (See Minutes of 6/3/63, page 3690, item #7) - REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE at a previous meeting - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA.
- MR. BAKER MOVED that the Chairman of the Health & Protection Committee be asked to contact the Health Department regarding the above complaint. He (Mr. Truglia) said that he would do so.
- (11) Concerning petition complaining about bad road conditions on WEBB AVENUE and HOUSTON TERRACE (See Minutes of 5/6/63, page 3647; Minutes of 8/5/63, page 3756) - ORDERED PLACED ON AGENDA under Planning & Zoning Committee, to which Committee it had previously been referred.
- (12) Letter and attached resolution from Ronald M. Schwartz, 16th District Representative, dated 8/24/63, proposing the establishment of a SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE under provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter, to Investigate Civil Service and Personnel Department procedures and to recommend whatever changes may be necessary to correct inequities or weaknesses in the present system.

It was MOVED and seconded that the above matter be referred to the PERSONNEL COMMITTEE and placed on the agenda.

MR. MURPHY MOVED that this matter be TABLED for the next Board to take office in December to consider.

MR. SHANEN questioned the advisability of appointing a Special Committee.

MR. BAKER inquired as to the effect of the motion -- would it keep the Committee from holding it in Committee for further study.

MR. SCHWARTZ said he thought this was a matter for the entire Board to consider and that by referring it to Committee would be usurping the powers of the Board itself.

MR. KETCHAM objected to treating this matter lightly and informed the members that when the Board had appointed a Special Committee to investigate problems connected with the Police Department that it had been handled by the Board itself, acting as a Committee of the Whole. He said he considered this matter to be just as important and that it should be acted upon by the entire Board.

MR. SHANEN MOVED THE QUESTION. REFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE and ordered PLACED ON AGENDA, with one "no" vote (Mr. Murphy).

- (13) Letter, dated 8/14/63, from Mr. Philpot, 15th District Representative, concerning resolution presented by him at the June 3, 1963 Board meeting in regard to CIVIL SERVICE PROCEDURES. (See page 3710 of 6/3/63 Minutes and page 3764 of 8/5/63 Minutes) - ORDERED FILED.
- (14) Welfare Department - Monthly Report for June 1963 - NOTED AND ORDERED FILED,

with copy sent to Education, Welfare & Government Committee.

(15) Parking Authority Statement and Balance Sheet as of June 30, 1963

Inasmuch as there was only one copy of the above and several members expressed a desire to have a copy, Mrs. Austin directed the Secretary to have copies made of this report and mailed to all Board members.

(16) Petition under provisions of Section 7-188 of Connecticut Statutes, requesting amendment of the Stamford Charter to incorporate provisions for a referendum on URBAN RENEWAL AND/OR URBAN REDEVELOPMENT (Attached to letter from the City and Town Clerk, dated 7/26/63, and TABLED at the August 5, 1963 Board meeting) (Note: See Minutes of 8/5/63, pages 3757 through 3762)

The above matter was ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA under "Old Business".

(17) Concerning USE OF SALT ON CITY STREETS and Mr. Kuczo's request for an opinion from the Corporation Counsel as to the legality of its use. (See Minutes of 2/4/63, page 3579; Minutes of 3/4/63, pages 3595-3598; Minutes of 4/1/63, page 3630)

Mr. BLOIS said the above matter has been under discussion for some time and said he has been requested to ask the President to inquire of the Corporation Counsel when an opinion can be expected.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned.

Eleanor R. Austin,
Chairman pro tempore
Steering Committee

vf

The PRESIDENT announced that there are now 37 members present, Mr. Caporizzo and Mr. Connors having arrived shortly after the meeting started, and the two replacements having been made for the resigned members in the 8th and 9th Districts.

APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE:

MRS. AUSTIN presented her Committee report. She reported that all the appointees had been interviewed by the Committee and approved, with the exception of one abstention on the two appointments for the URC.

The Tellers distributed and collected the ballots as each appointment was presented, and the President announced the vote as the ballots were counted by the Tellers.

HEATING & AIR CONDITIONING BOARD:

Term Ending

RAYMOND V. ARNOW (Republican) (Master Heater)
Cedar Heights Road
(Replacing James E. Purcell (R))

January 1, 1964

VOTE: 34 Yes
3 No

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

MRS. DWIGHT N. MARSHALL (Republican)
Brookdale Road (Reappointment)

August 7, 1968

MRS. AUSTIN presented the above named person for reappointment.

MR. KUCZO spoke in opposition to the appointment.

MR. OPPENHEIMER spoke in favor of the appointment.

MR. PHILPOT said he did not believe that any member of a City Board or a Commission should be "gagged" when they try to express an opinion. He spoke in favor of the appointment.

MR. BAKER said he believed the qualifications of the appointee were the best and spoke in favor of the appointment.

MR. BLOIS read a statement at this time. He said, as a member of this Board who had voted in favor of urban renewal, he was opposed to the power of eminent domain which the URC possesses and was very much concerned with the setting of standards for members of the Urban Redevelopment Commission. He said it would not be remiss to ask that members of this Commission possess certain skills, such as the possession of knowledge of construction and city planning. He said it was his belief that a \$90,000,000 project should not be entrusted to unskilled amateurs; that no corporation would operate this way and neither should the City of Stamford.

MR. SCARELLA said this Board is being asked to confirm an appointment of a member of a City Commission who has helped formulate a plan for redevelopment which is not acceptable to many citizens. He said in view of the coming election that he did not think it sensible to saddle an incoming new administration with appointments made by a previous one. In view of this, HE MOVED that this appointment be TABLED until after the November election so that an incoming Mayor would be able to make his own appointment.

MR. KUCZO seconded Mr. Scarella's motion.

MR. KANE MOVED for a roll call vote. Seconded.

There being enough members in favor of a roll call vote, the President requested the Clerk to call the roll.

MR. SCARELLA'S motion was LOST by the following vote of 9 in favor and 28 opposed:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

Fred C. Blois
George V. Connors
Samuel D. Cushing
Stephen E. Kelly
Paul Kuczo, Jr.
Carmine V. Longo
R. A. Mead, Jr.
Gerald J. Rybnick
Patrick Scarella

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION

Patsy Arruzza
Eleanor R. Austin
Jack Baer
Daniel Baker
Vincent Caporizzo
Hilda S. Clarke
Edward Dombroski
Anthony Esposito
Peter J. Somma, Jr.
Armando Gurliacci
William Hearing
John V. Kane, Jr.
Alan H. Ketcham
Stanley Kulowiec
Frances Lilliendahl
Charles A. Rodin

Thomas A. Morris
James E. Mulreed
William D. Murphy
John J. Morris, Jr.
David Oppenheimer
Romaine Philpot
Randolph Rogers
Ronald M. Schwartz
Allen J. Shanen
Paul D. Shapero
Michael S. Sherman
Anthony D. Truglia

The Tellers distributed the ballots on the appointment of MRS. DWIGHT N. MARSHALL to the Urban Redevelopment Commission, to term ending August 7, 1968.

MRS. MARSHALL was reappointed by a VOTE of 25 yes and 12 no.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Term Ending

DR. EDWARD B. ALLEN (Independent)
69 Gary Road (Reappointment)

August 7, 1967

MRS. AUSTIN presented the above name for reappointment. The Tellers distributed the ballots. DR. ALLEN was reappointed by a VOTE of 26 yes and 11 no.

FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. KANE, Chairman, presented his committee report.

- (1) Resolution authorizing the issuance of \$850,000 General Obligation Bonds of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, to finance the acquisition of the HELCO BUILDING, in the Capital Budget for the fiscal year 1962-1963, as amended.
(Note: TABLED at August 5, 1963 Board meeting - See pages 3752-54 of Minutes)
(Requested in letter of 7/29/63 from Mayor Kennedy and approved by Board of Finance on 8/15/63)

MR. KANE MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mrs. Clarke, who said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in approval.
CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 424

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF EIGHT HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$850,000.00) GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT, TO FINANCE THE ACQUISITION OF THE HELCO BUILDING IN THE CAPITAL BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1962-1963, AS AMENDED.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 630 of the Charter of the City of Stamford, as amended, the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford has received a letter from the Mayor, dated July 29, 1963, requesting it to authorize the issuance of bonds to finance the acquisition of the HELCO BUILDING, a Capital Project, contained in The Capital Budget for the fiscal year 1962-1963, as amended:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT:

- (1) That there be and there hereby is authorized, under and pursuant to the Charter of the City of Stamford and any other General or Special Statutes thereby enabling, the issuance of general obligation serial bonds of the City of Stamford, Connecticut, in the aggregate principal amount of Eight Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$850,000.00) for the purpose of financing the acquisition of the HELCO BUILDING, which Capital Project is included in the Capital Budget for the fiscal year 1962-1963, as amended, duly adopted, and reference is hereby made to the said Capital Budget, as amended;
- (2) That 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 one bond issue, and subject to the Charter of the City of Stamford and other applicable provisions of law, in the manner and in the principal amounts that the Board of Finance may determine, from time to time, including, but without limitation, the determination of the form, date, dates of payment of principal and all other particulars;
- (3) That the Capital Project hereinabove described and contained in The Capital Budget for the fiscal year 1962-1963, as amended, is hereby confirmed as a duly authorized Capital Project;
- (4) That this resolution shall take effect upon approval by the Board of Finance, and all resolutions or parts of resolutions in conflict herewith be and the same are hereby repealed.

- (2) Concerning increase in salary for Mayor, effective 12/1/63, to \$17,000.00 per Sec. 402 of Charter (Approved by Board of Finance 8/15/63) (See Minutes of 6/3/63, page 3690, item #11 and Minutes of 7/1/63, pages 3725-26)

MR. KANE MOVED for approval of the above item. Seconded by Mrs. Clarke, who said the Education, Welfare & Government Committee concurred in approval.

MR. MULREED said, as the author of this, he would like to speak in favor and urge everyone to vote for the increase.

MR. OPPENHEIMER spoke in favor of the motion and said his only regret is that it was not for the original \$20,000.00 as originally suggested by this Board.

MR. KELLY said he was in favor of the motion, but wondered what happened to the salary raises for the department heads.

VOTE taken on item #2 above and CARRIED unanimously.

- (3) \$1,170.00 - Assessor's Office, Code 144.0101, Salaries - Salary Upgrade for Assessment Inspector from \$5,156.00 to \$6,326.00 effective 7/1/63 (Mayor's letter of 7/29/63)

MR. KANE MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Rodin and CARRIED unanimously.

- (4) \$2,781.60 - Fire Department - Pension for Fireman Arthur A. Dixon, effective August 14, 1963 for balance of fiscal year, representing pension of 56% of annual salary of \$5,623.10 (Mayor's letter of 7/29/63)

MR. KANE MOVED for approval of the above. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and CARRIED Unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. BAKER said his Committee has two matters to report.

- (1) GUILDWAY HOMES, ET AL - Petition from denial of Zoning Board to Change Application #63-014 from R-2 to R-1 One Family Residence District.

MR. BAKER reported that this matter is properly before the Board, but as to the merits of the appeal, that will be taken up under the report of the Planning and Zoning Committee. He called attention to the fact that Mr. Sherman has disqualified himself from any participation in this matter because of his association with it.

- (2) Concerning a Proposed Ordinance to Establish a Commission on Human Rights (Mayor's Letter to President of 8/2/63)

MR. BAKER said this matter cannot be reported upon for action tonight, for the reason that there was no copy of the proposed Ordinance available the night of the Steering Committee meeting and they had to await duplication for distribution to the members and they were therefore unable, for lack of a copy of the Ordinance to consider, to proceed on the matter.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

MR. BLOIS presented his Committee report. He said a meeting was held September 6, 1963 with the following members present: Messrs. Arruzza, Longo, Morris and Blois. He said absent were: Messrs. Esposito, Mead and Dombroski.

- (1) Petition from Residents of Glendale Circle and Greenfield Road, Glenbrook, Concerning Bad Road Conditions (See page 3709, Minutes of 6/3/63)
- (2) Petition from residents of Courtland Hill Street, Glenbrook, requesting immediate action in regard to the repavement and completion of work being done by DeLeo Bros. - Signed by 43 property owners on street (Brought up by Mr. Philpot, 15th District Representative on 8/5/63 - See page 3763 of Minutes)
- (3) Petition from Residents of Pine Hill Avenue, complaining of flash flooding washing away top soil and ruining yards, equipment and gardens with oil and debris, resulting in an unsanitary condition (Brought up by Mr. Philpot at meeting of 8/5/63 - See page 3763 of Minutes)

MR. BLOIS said the members of his Committee made an on the site inspection of the above areas in question. As to the first item above, he said it was his Committee's opinion that some of the complaints had been removed, as the roads had recently been blacktopped. As to the complaint regarding Pine Hill, he said they found many justifiable complaints, but the Committee cannot make any recommendations as the situation requires more study and can only report progress at this time.

- (4) Letter dated 7/31/63 from George Connors and Paul Kuczo, 10th District Representatives, concerning correction of bad road conditions on GIVENS AVENUE, NEPONSIT and ISLAND HEIGHTS ROAD and sidewalk on COVE ROAD; also the USE OF SALT IN SNOW REMOVAL OPERATIONS.

MR. KUCZO said he wished to ask a question of the Chairman. He asked if the Public

Works Committee has received any correspondence on the above matter?

MR. BLOIS said the only thing he can say is that they would like to keep this letter in Committee for another month, because this has also been submitted to the Planning and Zoning Committee and he is awaiting a report from that Committee and the Chairman, George Russell, is out of town on vacation at the present time.

Concerning the USE OF SALT ON CITY STREETS IN SNOW REMOVAL OPERATIONS

MR. BLOIS asked the President if he has received an answer from the Corporation Counsel on the above matter. He said nothing has been received since the letter from Mr. Mackler, printed in the June 3, 1963 Minutes (See page 3705) in which he acknowledged receipt of the request for an opinion but was unable to complete his research "at this time."

THE PRESIDENT said he has not been able to follow this up as he has been on vacation for most of this month. He said he would give his word that he would soon have a letter on this.

HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

- (1) Complaint from 46 nearby residents of 5th, 6th and 8th Districts, concerning dangerous traffic hazard on Summer Street at location of Ridgeway Shopping Center (dated 6/17/63)

MR. TRUGLIA said he had sent a letter to the Police Department (Mr. Qefinger, Sup't. of Communications) with a request that this complaint be investigated.

- (2) Concerning two letters regarding alleged contamination of Stamford Waters (One, from Mrs. Marie Ritch (letter of 5/13/63); and another from Edward R. Jobson, Jr. (Letter of 5/7/63 - See Minutes of 6/3/63, page 3690, item #7)

MR. TRUGLIA said the Health Department is working "with us on this, and we will have a report shortly."

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. MULREED, Vice Chairman, presented the Committee report in the absence of the Chairman, George Russell. He said a meeting was held August 27 and present were members Armando Gurliacci, Allen Shanen, George Russell and James Mulreed.

- (1) GUILDWAY HOMES, ET AL - Petition from denial by Zoning Board to change Application #63-014 from R-2 to R-1 One Family Residence District

MR. MULREED said the Committee held an open meeting after inviting all parties who showed interest at the original Zoning Board's public hearing and after several hours of open discussion and presentations for and against the application, the Committee adjourned the open meeting and then met in executive session.

He said the Committee discussed in length the facts presented, as well as the transcript of the public hearing held by the Zoning Board on May 22, 1963. He said a motion was made to vote on the referral application and the Committee voted unanimously by a vote of 4 to 0 to DENY THE APPLICATION to amend the Zoning Map and thus sustained the decision of the Zoning Board and recommends their action to the Board of Representatives.

MR. MULREED said he is not offering a motion by the Committee. However, if any

member of the Board desires to present a motion to amend the Zoning Map by granting the application and thus reverse the decision of the Zoning Board, he may do so.

MR. MULREED explained that an affirmative vote of 21 will be required to carry the motion under the requirements of the Charter.

THE PRESIDENT said for the benefit of some of the newer members of the Board, Mr. Mulreed has outlined the procedure properly. He said: "As of now, the position taken by the Planning & Zoning Committee is to sustain the position of the Zoning Board - that is to say they make no recommendations to grant the application of the Appellant. If a member of this Board wishes to reverse the Zoning Board, the procedure for him to follow is to now make a motion to sustain the position of the Applicant." He asked if any member wishes to make a motion.

As no member offered a motion, it resulted in the action previously taken by the Zoning Board in this matter being sustained.

(2) Petitions for acceptance of roads as city streets

MR. MULREED said at the time of their meeting the Committee had not received any recommendations for acceptance of roads.

He said the remaining items on the agenda will not be reported out until the October Board meeting.

(3) Concerning Bad Road Conditions on WEBB AVENUE and HOUSTON TERRACE (See Minutes of 5/6/63, page 3647 and Minutes of 8/5/63, page 3756)

MR. CONNORS asked why the above matter was not reported out of Committee. He said this has been in the Planning & Zoning Committee since May. He said: "Do you mean to tell me that this Committee couldn't get together since May 6th and rectify this condition and explain why they haven't rectified it? Why is it when we ask for something we cannot get any action? While we wait and wait, other matters are taken care of - \$89,000 for flood control - drainage problems are taken care of and we can't even get \$10,000 - it doesn't make sense. These people are taxpayers also and they can't be blamed for complaining. They're getting water in their cellars with every rainstorm - they don't have to have a flood. And, here they sit and wait and wait and wait. Don't you think it's about time something was done for them? If they are not city streets, why did the city place a drain there?"

MR. KETCHAM said he would like to take issue with Mr. Connors on his remarks regarding the fact that all improvements are channeled into the country districts and none are in the city. He said recently in the 20th District some very small public improvements have been made.

MR. CONNORS said he did not mention any minor problems that were taken care of in the country - he said he stated that it was easier to obtain \$89,000 for a new school, but on a drainage problem, that was created by the City of Stamford, they can get nothing.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:

MR. MULREED presented his Committee report. He said they held two meetings - one on August 29, 1963, with all members present, to consider the resolutions of Mr. Philpot and Mr. Schwartz. The second meeting was held September 3, 1963. He said the first meeting was held jointly with the Personnel Commission to review the functions of and procedures used by the Commission.

- (1) Concerning resolution on Civil Service Procedures (Introduced by Mr. Philpot, 15th District Representative - See Minutes of 7/1/63, page 3719)
- (2) Concerning letter and attached resolution proposing the establishment of a Special Investigating Committee under provisions of Section 204.2 of the Charter, to Investigate Civil Service and Personnel Department procedures and to recommend whatever changes may be necessary to correct inequities or weaknesses in the present system. (Letter from Ronald M. Schwartz, 16th District Representative dated 8/24/63)

MR. MULREED presented the following report on the above two matters which had been referred to his committee:

"As a result of the meeting with the Personnel Commission and contacts made with other Civil Service Commissions the Committee submits the following conclusions:

1. The procedures and practices used by the Personnel Commission are substantially the same as those used by other Civil Service Commissions contacted.
2. The Civil Service regulations in other cities contacted do not prohibit a non-Civil Service employee appointed by an incumbent administration to establish job specifications, (subject to approval of the Commission) of a new Civil Service position to which he might apply and subsequently be appointed, during the remaining term of the same administration.

"After consideration of the proposed resolutions and the information obtained from the Personnel Commission at our meeting and other Civil Service Commissions, the Committee by a vote of 3 to 1 recommends to the Board that no action be taken on the aforementioned resolutions."

MR. PHILPOT said he believes that somewhere in the meeting of the Committee, the original purpose of his resolution was lost. He said it makes no sense to have money appropriated in the budget before the job specification has been filled. He said perhaps the present Civil Service regulations do permit such a thing, but if that is the case, he strongly recommends that those procedures be changed. He said you first find out the nature of the job you want to fill and then you proceed to appropriate the money when you know the confines of the job.

MR. SCHWARTZ said he has a motion he would like to make at this time and is addressing himself specifically to the second item under the Personnel Committee concerning the investigation. He read the following excerpt from the Charter:

SEC. 204.2 POWER TO INVESTIGATE ADMINISTRATION.

The Board of Representatives shall have power, by a two-thirds vote of its entire membership, to investigate any officer, department or agency, and shall have access to all data kept by any officer, department or agency, and shall have power to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of data at any meeting of the Board of Representatives or any committee thereof, and for that purpose may issue subpoenas which shall be signed by the President of the Board. The investigation may be conducted by a committee appointed by the Board for the purpose, provided that not more than half of the members of such com-

mittee shall be members of the same political party.

MR. SCHWARTZ said the Charter clearly spells out the rules by which the legislative body (this Board) may conduct an investigation - the Charter spells out the rules, not the Board of Representatives.

He said there is nothing in the Charter stating that matter of this sort must be referred to a Committee, or that a Committee has the power to cut off an investigation. He said there have been many precedents for this - such as the Police Department investigation (authorized Sept. 8, 1958) and there have been other investigations which the President is familiar with, all of which have been convened by this Board, without any attempt to channel it into any committee of the Board.

MR. SCHWARTZ said "I submit to you that we do not have a committee to investigate whether or not we should have an investigation, which the Personnel Committee, under Mr. Mulreed as its Chairman has attempted to do - they have attempted to pre-judge whether or not there is a problem. If there is a problem the citizens of Stamford have a right to know what the answers are and if there is no problem, the people involved should be given the opportunity to clear their names. An investigation that is conducted properly with due process of law, sworn testimony, witnesses under oath, that there would be no chance of a white-wash, there would be no chance for people to be hurt. I think that the Personnel Committee is denying the citizens of Stamford of their right to know what is going on in the City Administration. I think the rules are clear and I don't think there is anything in the Charter to my knowledge giving one committee the power to choke off an investigation, as Mr. Mulreed's committee is attempting to do here. I think it is wrong and is contrary to law and violates the Charter. I would MOVE at this time FOR SUSPENSION OF THE RULES to take this out of Committee and let us act upon it as responsible citizens and give the people of Stamford their opportunity to know what is going on in their City administration".

MR. KETCHAM seconded the above motion.

MR. SHANEN said he wishes to speak against the motion. He said there are several points made by Mr. Schwartz upon which he would like to comment in regard to what the democratic process has been on this Board. He said after reviewing the resolution presented by Mr. Schwartz, he can only conclude that it is full of legal, professional ambiguities, and in the resolution he makes the statement: "WHEREAS, it appears that some procedures presently followed in the hiring and firing of personnel by some of the governmental agencies of the City of Stamford, appear not to be in the public interest....." He said he doesn't know what that is supposed to mean and he does not think Mr. Schwartz knows what it means.

He said: "If Mr. Schwartz can stand up here tonight and tell this Board what charges he is referring to - who has to be called during an investigation - then I think he can shed some light into an investigation. Secondly, and most important, for the past six months we have heard from the other side of the fence that we should follow an orderly procedure in the Steering Committee - and in that Committee they voted to refer this item to the Personnel Committee - Mr. Schwartz endorsed that item completely - the Personnel Committee has come out with a report. The last time that Mr. Schwartz asked that a matter be taken out of Committee the Board got itself in a lot of trouble and that was over the Pension, so I urge you to uphold the decision and recommendation of the Personnel Committee in this matter."

MR. SCHWARTZ said he thinks that the Minutes of the Steering Committee will show that he was opposed to referring this matter to the Personnel Committee for the same reasons that he has mentioned here tonight, which is point #1, and also, point #2, the

motion was made to place this on the agenda as well as to refer it to the Personnel Committee. He said he thought this was made clear at the Steering Committee meeting.

He said it was not up to him to make charges and that an investigation is to learn and turn up the facts and if there are no facts the report would so indicate, and if there are, it will also indicate that. He said it is not proper for any member of this Board to make accusations, whether or not he has the information and is so happens that he does have information, but is not at liberty to disclose it, which would properly be the duty of those making the investigation. He said this is a matter of law.

MR. BAKER spoke against the motion. He said this is the "hue and cry time for political issues and you need issues to run a campaign.....and you need something to shout about". He said it has been his experience that whenever there is a contemplated investigation that someone makes charges that there is something wrong. He spoke at some length. He said some time ago certain charges were made on the floor of this Board and an investigating committee was appointed - he said: "I am referring to the great Ivler episode. We are now entering the 'silly season' when allegations are made that certain people have entered into certain improprieties. At the time of the episode I just referred to, we had an investigation - and lo and behold that eminent upstanding member of the Bar had to admit he did not know what he was talking about and had not investigated and cleared the procedures before he made his charges. After a thorough investigation was conducted by the Board - I know, because I sat as a member of the investigating committee - I can vouch for its thoroughness - we brought in our report that the charges were absolutely groundless and there was no action taken, because there was no basis for any action.

"It would seem to me that before we order an investigation that we must have some basis for thinking something is wrong and we ought not to indulge in wild goose chases for the sake of shooting at wild geese. It would seem to me that we have something better to do with our time and there are more serious things that require our attention.....particularly in the political silly season....."

MR. PHILPOT spoke about his letter of August 14, 1963, giving additional information with regard to the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works. He said in the Town of Greenwich, the qualifications for this position are that the person who fills this position must be a college graduate, but is also admitted to practice Civil Engineering in the State of Connecticut. He said not only is the Deputy Commissioner required to practice Civil Engineering in the State, but also his two Assistants must meet this requirement. He said he also has the minutes of a meeting of the Personnel Commission dated Tuesday, April 16, 1963, and one paragraph says: "No action was taken on new position of Deputy Commissioner of Public Works, as Commission is awaiting job specifications from Mr. Canavan." He said: "And, what job specifications do we have, gentlemen?"

MR. SCARELLA rose on a POINT OF ORDER at this time. He said the motion now before this Board is a motion to suspend the rules. He said he rules Mr. Philpot out of order.

THE PRESIDENT said that was within his province and asked the speaker to direct his remarks to the motion to suspend the rules.

MR. KETCHAM said he thought Mr. Baker was given ample opportunity to speak and perhaps his remarks on the "silly season" may or may not have been germane to the motion to suspend the rules, but tended to obscure the motion that is before the Board. He called attention to a meeting of this Board held September 8, 1958 when the Board acted as a Committee of the Whole and appointed a Committee to investigate the Police

Department. He said at that time there were no specific charges made - that Mr. Kelly, Mr. Connors and Mr. Rybnick were also members of this Board at that time and can substantiate what he is saying. He quoted Resolution No. 284 from the Minutes of September 8, 1958, at which time the investigating committee was authorized. He said, as a member of that investigating committee he can vouch for the fact that most of the recommendations of that committee have since been accomplished. He said it is perfectly proper for this Board to set up an investigating committee without specific charges and without allegations to any person. He spoke at some length.

MR. SCARELLA MOVED THE QUESTION.

THE PRESIDENT said the question before the Board now is the question of Mr. Schwartz' motion to SUSPEND THE RULES in order to bring this out of committee and will require 24 votes to suspend the rules.

MR. SCARELLA called for a roll call vote. Eight people signified their wish for a roll call vote. (See paragraph #2 under "Voting" in Rules of Board)

THE PRESIDENT explained that a vote of "yes" would be to suspend the rules to allow Mr. Schwartz to propose a resolution calling for an investigation and a vote of "no" would deny Mr. Schwartz the opportunity to make this motion.

MR. SCARELLA said if he understood the motion correctly, Mr. Schwartz moved to remove this from Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said he moved to suspend the rules.

MR. SCARELLA: "...to remove from Committee."

THE PRESIDENT said the motion was to suspend the rules so that he could introduce an appropriate resolution.

MR. SCARELLA: "Mr. Schwartz had the right at any time to propose a resolution for an investigation - it takes two-thirds of the membership of this Board, but he does not have to move to suspend the rules to propose a resolution. He moved to remove from committee. Now, Mr. Schwartz is present. Will he please re-state his motion?"

THE PRESIDENT said that Mr. Schwartz has asked that the rules be suspended in order that he can introduce a resolution not presently before this body - that he is not presenting it under new business, but is presenting it under the Personnel Committee report because it is appropriate to that report, and as it does not appear on the agenda, the rules have to be suspended. He asked the Clerk to call the roll on the motion to suspend the rules.

The Clerk called the roll. The motion was LOST by a vote of 13 in favor and 24 opposed. The ROLL CALL VOTE appears below:

THOSE IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION

Hilda Clarke
Samuel Cushing
William Hearing
Alan Ketcham
Paul Kuczo
Frances Lilliendahl
Richmond Mead
Thomas Morris

THOSE OPPOSED TO THE MOTION

Patsy Arruzza
Eleanor Austin
Jack Baer
Daniel Baker
Fred Blois
Vincent Caporizzo
George Connors
Edward Dombroski

THOSE IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION

David Oppenheimer
Romaine Philpot
Randolph Rogers
Ronald Schwartz
Michael Sherman

THOSE OPPOSED TO THE MOTION

Anthony Eposito
Peter Somma
Armando Gurliacci
John Kane
Stephen Kelly
Stanley Kulowiac
Carmin Longo
Charles Rodin
James Mulreed
William Murphy
John Morris
Gerald Rybnick
Patrick Scarella
Allen Shanen
Paul Shapero
Anthony Truglia

MR. PHILPOT asked through the Chair, if he could ask a question of Mr. Scarella. Permission was given.

MR. PHILPOT: "When the Budget was voted upon at the meeting of May 13, 1963, there were five of us who voted against the position of Deputy Commissioner of Public Works - am I correct?" He called attention to page 3673 of the Minutes of 5/13/63.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know if the report of the Personnel Committee has been accepted by the Board?

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Mulreed did not recommend that any action be taken, so there was nothing to accept.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE:

MR. OPPENHEIMER presented his committee report at this time. He said a meeting was held on August 27, 1963 at the offices of the Urban Redevelopment Commission and present were the following: David Oppenheimer, Michael Sherman, Salem Shapiro, John Toth, Phil Holt, Mrs. Marshall, Louis Greenbaum, Miss Pinchot and Carter Dodd. (a guest)

He said Mr. Dodd, Executive Director of the Stamford-Darien Council of Churches addressed the group and explained about the proposed 120 unit apartment house that will be built under the sponsorship of the Council of Churches.

He explained that the sponsor of the Southeast Quadrant will build 150 units similar to this within the project and 60 to 120 units outside the project, if needed.

MR. TRUGLIA asked several questions of Mr. Oppenheimer at this time. He asked about the 12 story building proposed to be built in his District. He said he has been getting a lot of calls in regard to this building and that it is the opinion that there is not sufficient land on which to put such a large building and would it not cause an overcrowding of schools in the immediate area? He said anyone living in this area knows that the addition of high rise buildings in this area is bound to create a serious problem, in many respects and cause considerable strain on the facilities now available in the area. He said the fact that it will be near Hatch Field may also cause a strain on available recreation facilities. He expressed considerable alarm at the additional burden being placed on present facilities in his District.

MR. OPPENHEIMER said this is one of the things that "we are going to contend with if we are going to try to do something to relieve this downtown area." He said he wishes to express again that this is NOT public housing and that this is being done by the Council of Churches on a non-profit basis in order to help relieve the housing situation. He suggested that further questions be directed to them.

MR. TRUGLIA said his area is overcrowded now without adding to their problems, and can the area stand any more projects of this sort?

MR. CONNORS said we must take into consideration that nearly every school in the city is "bulging at the seams" and the more apartments that you build, the more children you will have to send to school. He said he was wondering if anyone ever thinks of consulting the Board of Education and he knows of one case where the Board of Education sent a letter to the Zoning Board telling them to please deny the application because they had no place to put the children and that there are certain areas in Stamford where you can't even build a school. He said: "Now, what are we going to do about this problem? Are we getting to the point where we will have 40 or 50 children in one classroom? Someone had better look into this phase of the problem because we are going to get ourselves in one big mess and I think we are heading for it fast."

THE PRESIDENT said he would like to clarify this matter. He said the housing that Mr. Oppenheimer is talking about is not any governmental function and does not come within the control of this Board or purview in any way. He said he is sure that there are many valid problems raised by both Mr. Truglia and Mr. Connors and most of the Board members are aware of it, but the appropriate Boards to consider this problem would be the Planning Board and the Zoning Board, both of which are concerned with land density and this Board is not concerned with that phase of the matter. He said anyone who is interested in this, should contact both the Planning & Zoning Boards to see what can be built in these areas and if changes are required and requested of these Boards, then it is within their purview and this Board has nothing to do with this problem.

MR. SCARELLA said he appreciates what the President has just stated. He said he thinks Mr. Oppenheimer should not be getting up time after time and expounding on these matters without knowing what repercussions can happen. He said he should be prepared to answer these questions and not just say it is a wonderful thing --- he said: "When he says this is a wonderful thing, is he just a salesman here?"

THE PRESIDENT called for order.

MR. TRUGLIA said he wanted to ask a question. He said he wanted to know what a private housing matter has to do with Mr. Oppenheimer's report.

THE PRESIDENT called for order.

MR. CUSHING said he objected to private ventures being discussed on the floor of this Board as it has nothing to do with the business before the Board.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE:

MR. MULREED asked that the matter that is presently listed under "Old Business" be taken up at this time. Permission was given.

Concerning Petition under Provision of Section 7-188 of Connecticut Statutes, requesting amendment of the Stamford Charter to incorporate Provisions for a referendum on URBAN RENEWAL AND/OR URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

(Attached to letter from the City and Town Clerk, dated 7/26/63 and
TABLED at the 8/5/63 Board meeting) (See Minutes of 8/5/63, pages
3757 through 3762)

There was some question as to the proper wording of the resolution.

It was MOVED, seconded and CARRIED that a recess be taken at this time in order to
word the proposed resolution properly.

The recess was declared over at 10:20 P.M., and the members resumed their seats.

MR. MULREED presented the following resolution and MOVED its adoption. Seconded
by Mr. Rodin and Mr. Kane. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 425

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF A 7TH CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION IN
THE CITY OF STAMFORD UNDER PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 99 OF THE GENERAL
STATUTES OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT. (To consider petition pre-
sented to Board of Representatives on July 26, 1963 by the Town
and City Clerk under provisions of Section 7-188 of the Connecticut
General Statutes, requesting an amendment of the Stamford Charter,
to incorporate provisions for a REFERENDUM ON URBAN RENEWAL AND/OR
URBAN REDEVELOPMENT.)

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of Stamford, Connecticut,
in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 99 of the General Statutes
of Connecticut, that action shall be initiated for the amendment of the
Charter of the City of Stamford, that there shall be appointed a Charter
Revision Commission in said City, to consider the petition presented by
the Town and City Clerk on July 26, 1963; that the Commission shall con-
sist of nine (9) members and shall serve until March 1, 1964 and shall
report to the Board of Representatives not later than its January 6, 1964
meeting on any proposed amendments or revisions which may be voted upon
at a regular or special election.

MR. CUSHING asked why this can't be presented before the December Board meeting.

THE PRESIDENT quoted from the Home Rule Act: "Sec. 4. Within thirty days after
such action has been initiated by vote of the appointing authority, or by petition,
such authority shall provide by resolution for the appointment of a Charter Re-
vision Commission-----" He said that means that within 30 days a Charter Re-
vision Commission has to be appointed - ".....that the Charter Revision Commission
shall hold at least one public hearing, and may hold such other public hearings
as it deems necessary.....and shall submit its report, including the proposed
.....amendment or amendments, to the appointing authority. Within thirty days
thereafter, the appointing authority shall hold at least one public hearing on
such report, and shall, within fifteen days after such hearing, make recommenda-
tions to the Commission for such changes in such report as it deems desirable;
provided, if no such recommendations are made within such fifteen days, the re-
port of the Commission shall be deemed final. The Commission shall confer with
the appointing authority concerning.....(he said: "That is to say, this body -
the Board of Representatives.") any recommendations so made and may amend any pro-
visions of the proposed Charter, amendment or amendments, in accordance therewith,
or the Commission may reject such recommendations; and in either case, the Com-
mission shall make its final report to the appointing authority (Board of Repre-
sentatives) within thirty days after receiving such recommendations. Within
fifteen days thereafter, the appointing authority, by a majority vote of its entire
membership, shall either approve the proposed Charter, amendment or amendments, or

reject the same or separate provisions thereof; etc.....Within thirty days after such approval, such proposed Charter, amendment or amendments, shall be published in full at least once in a newspaper having circulation in the city...."

THE PRESIDENT said this is a very slow process by Statute and cannot be hurried.

MR. SCARELLA said: "Mr. President, if I heard you correctly, this means that the Commission will have to be appointed WITHIN thirty days - is that correct?"

THE PRESIDENT said this is true.

MR. SCARELLA: "And that within thirty days they must make their report?"

THE PRESIDENT said this is true.

MR. SHERMAN said the Board went through this before when they appointed the previous Charter Revision Commission and felt it was incumbent upon this Board to set a deadline by which time the Charter Revision Commission must report back. He said: "The Charter Revision Commission MUST be appointed within thirty days from tonight, the Commission itself must hold its first public hearing within thirty days from that date."

THE PRESIDENT informed the members that it is not his intention to appoint the Commission tonight, because he had not yet conferred with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader, but assured the members that steps would be taken within the week.

After considerable further debate, the President said this Board cannot force the Commission to work faster than it is possible for them to work, no matter how pressing the issue may be.

MR. SCARELLA said this Board has a moral obligation to 6,370 people.

MR. MULREED said he thinks the resolution makes it very clear where it states: ".....not later than the January 1964 meeting....."

MR. KUCZO said he would like to make a motion at this time in connection with the matter under discussion.

THE PRESIDENT said this would be out of order and reminded Mr. Kuczo that there is now a motion on the floor under debate - namely the resolution presented by Mr. Mulreed.

MR. SCARELLA called for a roll call vote.

THE PRESIDENT stated the parliamentary situation. He said a vote of "yes" would be a vote in favor of the resolution creating a Charter Revision Commission to consider the petitions presented by the Town and City Clerk.....He was interrupted at this point.

MR. SHERMAN said: "Under the provisions of the Charter, there was some question raised at the last meeting as to whether or not a resolution was needed at all - was an opinion sought from the Corporation Counsel on this? It seems to me that the effect of the filing of this petition would make it MANDATORY upon this Board to NAME a Charter Revision Commission. Conceivably, this resolution could be defeated and nullify this provision of the Charter and it was my impression at our last meeting that a decision would be obtained from the Corporation Counsel on this question."

THE PRESIDENT replied that no such decision was obtained.

MR. SCARELLA MOVED the question.

THE PRESIDENT explained that a vote of "yes" was a vote in favor of the resolution.

THE CLERK called the roll. CARRIED by a vote of 30 in favor and 7 opposed, with one abstention, as follows:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

Patsy Arruzza
Eleanor Austin
Jack Baer
Fred Blois
Vincent Caporizzo
Hilda Clarke
George Connors
Samuel Cushing
Edward Dombroski
Anthony Esposito
Peter Somma
Armando Gurliacci
William Hearing
John Kane
Stephen Kelly
Paul Kuczo
Stanley Kulowiec
Frances Lilliendahl
Carmine Longo
Richmond Mead
Charles Rodin
Thomas Morris
James Mulreed
William Murphy
John Morris
Gerald Rybnick
Patrick Scarella
Allen Shanen
Paul Shapero
Anthony Truglia

ABSTAINED

Daniel Baker

THOSE VOING AGAINST

Alan Ketcham
David Oppenheimer
Romaine Philpot
Randolph Rogers
Ronald Schwartz
Michael Sherman

THE PRESIDENT said: "Within a week, as I previously stated, I will appoint a Commission."

OLD BUSINESS:

MR. SCHWARTZ asked the President when he was going to fill the vacancies on the Legislative and Rules Committee. He said it is his understanding that there are only three people now serving on this Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said this would be done prior to the next Steering Committee meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

Concerning appointment of members of the 7th Charter Revision Commission

MR. KUCZO MOVED that since both parties are running on a redevelopment platform,

there should be no members appointed on the Commission, or Committee, that are running for office, because this might prejudice their decision.

THE PRESIDENT said the Majority and Minority Leaders will suggest the appointments to the Commission.

Concerning procedure in calling special meetings of the Board

MR. SCARELLA said he wanted it to be known publicly that ten members of this Board can call a special meeting for the purpose of forming a special investigating committee.

THE PRESIDENT said: "Mr. Scarella, there are few members of this Board that know that better than I."

MR. SCARELLA said he wanted to clarify his position in voting no, and he didn't want anyone to get the impression that "we throttled or bottled anything".

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned.


Velma Farrell
Administrative Assistant

vf

APPROVED:


Paul D. Shapero, President
Board of Representatives

Note: The proceedings of the above meeting were broadcast over Radio Station WSTC.

VF

