

SPECIAL ADJOURNED MEETING OF  
BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES, CON-  
CERNING CHARTER REVISIONS, AS  
REJECTED BY 7TH CHARTER REVISION  
COMMISSION - JANUARY 15, 1964

3879

A Special Adjourned meeting of the 8th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held Wednesday, January 15, 1964 at 8:20 P.M. in the Auditorium of Dolan Jr. High School, in response to a "Call" issued by the President, Ronald M. Schwartz.

The President called the meeting to order at 8:20 P.M. (Note: This meeting was not broadcast)

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 28 present and 12 absent. The absent members were: Chester Walajtys, Anthony Truglia, Vincent Caporizzo, John Maffucci, Vito Biscaglio, John Morris, Allen Shanen, William Murphy, Stanley Kulowiec, Edward Dombroski, Carmine Longo and Jennie Esposito.

The President read the following "Call" of the meeting:

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ROOM #23, CITY HALL  
STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

January 6, 1964

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUBJECT: SPECIAL MEETING

I, RONALD M. SCHWARTZ, President of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, do hereby call a SPECIAL MEETING of said Board, in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 202 of the Charter and Sec. 7-191 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, to be held in the Auditorium of Dolan Jr. High School, at 8:00 P.M., on MONDAY, JANUARY 13, 1964, for the following purposes:

- (1) To hold a PUBLIC HEARING to consider the report of the 7th Charter Revision Commission;
- (2) To hear speakers for and against the recommendations of said Commission;
- (3) To take final action on the same;
- (4) To revise Committee appointments.

Special Meeting held Wednesday, January 15, 1964

(Signed) RONALD M. SCHWARTZ, PRESIDENT  
BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

RMS:vf

The President said that on Monday, January 13, 1964, due to the inclement weather, the meeting was called to order by the President, at 8:00 P.M. and on motion by Mr. Nathanson, Representative from the 7th District, seconded by Mr. Morris, Representative from the 16th District, the meeting was adjourned to January 15, 1964. He said the following notice of an adjourned special meeting was given to each member of the Board of Representatives on January 14, 1964, delivered by the Police Department:

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ROOM #23, CITY HALL  
STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT

January 14, 1964

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
SUBJECT: ADJOURNED SPECIAL MEETING OF BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
-----

N O T I C E

The Special Meeting of the Board of Representatives was  
duly called for January 13, 1964, and because of the inclement weather,  
was ADJOURNED at 8:00 P.M., to be held on

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1964

at 8:00 P.M.

in the AUDITORIUM OF DOLAN JR. HIGH  
SCHOOL, TOMS ROAD

(Signed) Ronald M. Schwartz,  
President  
Board of Representatives

RMS:vf

• • • • •  
Mr. Schwartz said: "I might add that the Majority Leader, Mr. Ketcham and the  
Minority Leader, Mr. Truglia concurred in the action taken by the President,  
as did the Corporation Counsel."

Mr. Schwartz: "Public notices were published in the Stamford Advocate on January 9,  
1964 and on January 10, 1964."

Concerning Corporation Counsel's Opinion on 7th Charter Revision Commission's Report to the Board of Representatives

THE PRESIDENT read the following opinion from the Corporation Counsel on the above matter:

December 30, 1963

Ronald M. Schwartz, Esq., President  
Board of Representatives of the  
City of Stamford  
City Hall  
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Schwartz:

I am pleased to respond to your recent inquiry concerning the question of the procedure of the Seventh Charter Revision Commission report to the Board of Representatives and its hearing thereon.

A fair reading of the Home Rule Act, particularly Sec. 7-187 of the General Statutes (Rev. 1958) and Public Act 184 (1963 Session) requires the interpretation that when the Act uses the words "appointing authority" it refers to the Board of Representatives and not a committee of such board. This, too, is the substantial import of the recent case, Sloane v. Waterbury, 150 Conn. 24 (1962)

It follows, necessarily, that under the Act, the Board itself shall hold the public meeting on the Charter Revision Commission's Report.

Nothing contained in the Act requires every member be present and a quorum of the Board (a majority of the members, Charter Sec. 202.2) is sufficient to transact this business.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Sydney C. Kueskin  
Corporation Counsel

SCK:A

\* \* \* \* \*

THE PRESIDENT explained the general procedure of the meeting about to be conducted. He said: "Just so that everyone will have an understanding of the procedure to be followed tonight - tonight's meeting of the Board of Representatives will be in two parts. The first part will be the PUBLIC HEARING, which we are about to commence. After the public hearing, there will be recess and caucuses by the political parties represented on the Board. Following the caucuses - I can't give you the hour at the present time, as it depends on when we complete our business of the public hearing portion - we will re-convene and then will take action on the recommendations and any motions which may be forthcoming."



Special Meeting held Wednesday, January 15, 1964

"When you come forward to speak, I would appreciate it very much if you would give your name and address, and any organization that you may be representing. Each speaker will be allowed FIVE MINUTES. No speaker will be allowed more than five minutes in the first 'go-round'. We will not allow any yielding of time from one person to another.

"When everyone has completed the first 'go-around' you will be given a second opportunity for anyone who wants to speak further. Everyone will be given ample opportunity to be heard."

FIRST PORTION OF MEETING - PUBLIC HEARING - To hear speakers for and against the following report to the Board of Representatives from the 7th Charter Revision Commission: (Received December 16, 1963)

THE SEVENTH CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

December 10, 1963

Mr. Ronald Schwartz  
President  
Board of Representatives  
Room 23, City Hall  
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Mr. Schwartz:

The Seventh Charter Revision Commission, appointed under the provisions of Chapter 99 of the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut, by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford on September 9, 1963, after a lengthy public hearing and due deliberation, rejects the request to amend the Charter of the City of Stamford, presented to said Board of Representatives on July 26, 1963, by the Town and City Clerk.

The proposed amendment, rejected by The Seventh Charter Revision Commission, was submitted as follows:

"Urban Renewal and/or Urban Redevelopment: referendum

No funds obtained by taxation or by borrowing shall be expended by the City of Stamford in furtherance of existing or future Urban Renewal or Urban Redevelopment Projects, including, but not limited to, the appraisal and acquisition or rental of real property within a Renewal or Redevelopment area, whether by eminent domain, purchase, gift, lease or otherwise, unless and until such Renewal or Redevelopment Project shall have been submitted to the electors of the City of Stamford for approval or rejection in a regular election or at a special election warned and held for that purpose and unless such Project shall have been approved at such election by the affirmative vote of at least a simple majority of the electors voting in said election. The words "City of Stamford" as used herein shall be deemed to include and bind any municipal agency, authority, commission, department, board or other body. This section shall be retroactive in effect and shall apply to

any Urban Renewal or Redevelopment Project approved by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford prior to the date of the referendum at which this section was adopted and approved. This section shall supersede any contrary provision of this Charter, the General Statutes and/or the Special Acts of the State Legislature."

Respectfully submitted,

cc: Jack Baer  
Rev. Edward H. Coleman  
Raymond G. Cushing  
Thomas A. Morris  
James E. Mulreed  
John R. Nolan  
Rev. Rafe M. Taylor

(Signed) Milton Ellerin, Chairman  
Anthony Amico, Secretary  
For the Commission

THE PRESIDENT requested the first speaker to come forward.

FIRST SPEAKER: David Oppenheimer, 32 Arrowhead Drive

MR. OPPENHEIMER spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

SECOND SPEAKER: Robert Wise, Attorney, 74 West Park Place

MR. WISE spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

THIRD SPEAKER: Nicholas T. Condos, 18 Winthrop Place

MR. CONDOS spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

FOURTH SPEAKER: Mrs. David Dean, Jr., 48 Bellair Drive, Vice President, League of Women Voters (300 members)

MRS. DEAN said she was speaking as the official representative from the League of Women Voters, with a membership of 300. She spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

FIFTH SPEAKER: Harold Sandak, 105 Pine Road, North Stamford Democratic Club

MR. SANDAK said he was speaking on behalf of the North Stamford Democratic Club. He spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

SIXTH SPEAKER: Rev. Rafe M. Taylor, Pastor, Faith Tabernacle Baptist Church, and a member of the 7th Charter Revision Commission (16 Greyrock Place)

REV. TAYLOR spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

SEVENTH SPEAKER: Frederick W. Cunningham, 56 Hubbard Avenue

MR. CUNNINGHAM spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

EIGHTH SPEAKER: Edward Seward, 413 Glenbrook Road

MR. SEWARD said he could not understand why a referendum is not being held, since



there were some 6,300 signatures on the petition requesting a referendum be held. He spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

NINTH SPEAKER: Benjamin D. Gilbert, Greenway Island, representing "Citizens for Fairer Urban Renewal"

MR. GILBERT spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TENTH SPEAKER: Salvatore Marciano, 72 Pacific Street

MR. MARCIANO spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

ELEVENTH SPEAKER : Frank Daley, 27 Webb Avenue, representing the East Stamford Taxpayers Association

MR. DALEY spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWELFTH SPEAKER: Joseph V. Toner, 1022 Shippan Avenue, representing "Citizens for Fairer Urban Renewal" and former Town and City Clerk

MR. TONER spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment. He said not only is he here representing the Citizens for Fairer Urban Renewal, but also the 6,300 people who signed the petition requesting a referendum be held.

THIRTEENTH SPEAKER: Mrs. Eleanor Austin, 31 Coolidge Avenue

MRS. AUSTIN spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

FOURTEENTH SPEAKER: I.S. Mattingly, 127 Cloverhill Drive.

MR. MATTINGLY spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

FIFTEENTH SPEAKER: Dominic DelGuidice, 312 Soundview Avenue, Executive Director of Citizens Action Council

MR. DELGUIDICE said he is speaking to register the Executive Committee's unanimous opposition taken on January 7, 1964 by vote to register their opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

SIXTEENTH SPEAKER: Mrs. William Rosenfield, 71 Ooolittle Road

MRS. ROSENFELD spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

SEVENTEENTH SPEAKER: Paul Shapero, Attorney, 34 Hubbard Avenue

MR. SHAPERO spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

EIGHTEENTH SPEAKER: Paul Desik, 93 Haig Avenue

MR. DESIK spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

NINETEENTH SPEAKER: Joseph D'Acunto 98 Dean Street, President, East Side Democratic Club

MR. D'ACUNTO spoke as representative of the above Club. He spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTIETH SPEAKER: Herbert Kohn, 6 Kenilworth Drive, owner of Komar Furniture Store located in the Southeast Quadrant

MR. KOHN spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY FIRST SPEAKER: Mrs. Arthur Conti, 74 Tremont Avenue, Glenbrook

MRS. CONTI spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY SECOND SPEAKER: Joseph DeBroski, 28 Holbrook Drive, former member of URC

MR. DeBROSKI spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY THIRD SPEAKER: Warren Corbin, 6 Washington Court (Contractor)

MR. CORBIN spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY FOURTH SPEAKER: Walter Betz, 35 Arnold Drive

MR. BETZ spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY FIFTH SPEAKER: George Ravallesse, 61 Lincoln Avenue

MR. RAVELLESE spoke in favor of the proposed Charter amendment.

TWENTY SIXTH SPEAKER: Edward K. Scofield, 111 Bridge Street

MR. SCOFIELD spoke in opposition to the proposed Charter amendment.

-----  
THE PRESIDENT said: "If any of the previous speakers wish an additional five minutes to speak, they may do so at this time."

The following people requested and were given additional time to speak for the second time:

David Oppenheimer  
Joseph V. Toner  
Walter Betz  
Frank Daley  
Salvatore Marciano  
Warren Corbin

Herbert Kohn  
Robert Wise  
\*Mary Vanko (favor of referendum)  
Paul Shapero  
\*Frank Juliani  
Edward K. Scofield (See above)  
(spoke for first time)

\*Spoke from rear of auditorium.

THE PRESIDENT announced that the hearing would conclude in time for the members of the Board to hold their meeting so that they may finish before midnight.

THE PRESIDENT said it was now 8 minutes before 11 O'Clock.

THE PRESIDENT: "Seeing no other speakers, I would like to explain to those who are present. There has been a request from the Majority and Minority Leaders of the



Board of Representatives for a recess, which I will declare in just a few moments. I cannot give you the exact time that we will re-convene, but if you wish to remain, you are invited to do so and you will then be able to listen to the remainder of the meeting, which will take place shortly after the recess."

THE RECESS WAS DECLARED AT THIS TIME, and the members of the Board went into caucus.

The Board re-convened for the second part of the meeting, at 11:40 P.M. the public hearing now being over.

The Clerk called the roll for the special board meeting at this time. There were 30 present and 10 absent. The absent members were: Vincent Caporizzo, John Maffucci, Vito Biscaglio, John Morris, Allen Shanen, William Murphy, Stanley Kulowiec, Edward Dombroski and Jennie Esposito. (Note: Mr. Arruzza asked to be excused earlier in the meeting and Messrs. Walajtys, Truglia and Longo arrived in the interim)

THE PRESIDENT said: "The matter before us is the question of the recommendations back to the Seventh Charter Revision Commission. There is no discussion until there is a motion on the floor. Is there a motion?"

THE PRESIDENT said he wished to make this very clear. He said: "In order to get the report of the Seventh Charter Revision Commission, which has been accepted by the Board of Representatives at our last meeting, on a motion made by Mr. Mogul, which accepted the Commission's report dated December 16, 1963. In order for this to be placed in the hands of the Seventh Charter Revision Commission, it is necessary for a motion to be made, indicating, specifying, what recommendations we wish as a Board if any to make to the Commission. Do I make myself clear?"

MR. KUCZO said: "Mr. President, do we have any time lapse in between the time we have to send it back to the Commission?"

THE PRESIDENT said: "The requirement of the State Statute, Mr. Kuczo, provides that within thirty days after the time we have received the report, we must hold a public hearing. This we have done tonight. The Statutes also provide that within fifteen days after the public hearing we must make a decision as to whether to make recommendations back to the Commission or not. In the 'Call' of tonight's meeting it was specified, (1) that we would hold a public hearing; (2) that we would act pursuant to that hearing. It is now before us, according to the 'Call' of the meeting."

MR. KUCZO said he does not see how we can possibly arrive at any decision tonight. HE MOVED to TABLE this matter until either the next Board meeting.....

THE PRESIDENT said: "Are you making a motion to table?"

MR. KUCZO: "Yes"

THE PRESIDENT: "It is not debatable, as you know, Mr. Kuczo - make your motion."

MR. KUCZO MOVED to table. Seconded by Mr. Connors.

VOTE taken by a show of hands. There were four votes in favor of tabling. LOST.



THE PRESIDENT asked if there were any further motions.

MR. MORRIS (16th District) MOVED that this meeting send back to the Charter Revision Commission a request that they reconsider the matter. Seconded by Mr. Kuczo.

MR. CONNORS said he thinks this Board should give the people of Stamford a chance to vote on this issue. He said he does not believe he should, as a member of the Board of Representatives, have the right to vote on this issue alone. He said he felt the way so many of his constituents feel - that they should have the right to vote whether or not we should have a referendum or not. He said it was his belief that never in the history of Stamford has this Board been called upon to vote for so much money - that he has been on many Boards since 1949 and to the best of his knowledge he does not remember any item that came within a third of this money item. He said he does not feel that this Board has the right to say whether or not the people should or shouldn't vote on large appropriations of this magnitude. He said he believes we should give it back to the people and let them decide in a referendum whether they want Urban Redevelopment or they don't want it. He said: "I feel the people should decide for the simple reason that it is their tax money that we are spending and the easiest thing in the world to do is to spend somebody else's money."

MR. KANE asked whether or not, if this is referred back to the Charter Revision Commission - should the charges also be referred back to the Commission.

THE PRESIDENT asked him to repeat his question.

MR. KANE: "Is it not so, that when referring something back to the Commission, that you must have specific charges to that Commission? Or, do we just refer it back to it without any recommendations for further study?"

MR. RICH spoke against sending this back to the Charter Revision Commission.

MR. KUCZO: "Mr. President, he's out of order."

THE PRESIDENT: "Mr. Kuczo, YOU are out of order."

MR. RICH continued speaking in opposition to sending this back to the Commission, and urged the members to act on this tonight. He said: "This issue has been very thoroughly explored and those who say they have just had the last month to do it, ignore the previous time we've had. The current Charter Revision Commission turned this matter down, seven to one. A previous Charter Revision Commission, just a year ago, turned the same matter down. It seems to me that the issue is not do we want this matter to go to a vote of the people, but do we want the Urban Renewal Project to go forward? Because, if it's delayed ten days, somebody might propose what harm could ten days do? Then, it will be delayed another ten days, ten months, and the people who are speaking out for a more thorough review of this are not saying what it is that they really want - and that is, defeat of the Urban Renewal Project. So, I urge this body to vote against sending this matter back to the Commission."

MR. MORRIS said: "Where do they get the figure 7 to one vote?"

THE PRESIDENT asked him if he wished to have the report from the Charter Revision Commission read at this time.

MR. MORRIS said the statement had been made that the vote was 7 to one, but as he recalled, there was no mention made in the report as to what the vote was, but merely stated that it was rejected by the Commission.

MR. KELLY: "Mr. President, aren't we going to vote on whether the people will have a right to vote on the referendum or not - isn't that the subject before us?"

THE PRESIDENT: "No, it isn't. The only subject before us tonight is whether or not to make recommendations back to the Commission - the Commission then can take it from there."

MR. KELLY: "The meat of the whole thing is referendum, isn't it?"

THE PRESIDENT replied that the question is whether or not this Board is going to make a recommendation that they look further into the question of a referendum.

MR. KETCHAM: "Mr. President, I think in this matter that we on the Board of Representatives should bear in mind that we must support our oath of office, do our duty, in accordance with the Charter of the City of Stamford and that in circumstances clear cut, as they are before us now, the situation which has been long, loudly and often debated, that we cannot be derelict in our duty - it is our duty to vote on the issue of Urban Renewal and I think that it is not fair for us to attempt to toss this back into the laps of the people who, only last November voted for us. I might refresh Mr. Connors' mind on the matter of voting large sums of money by pointing out that in 1959 after about 35 minutes of debate, we voted the sum of four and one half million dollars for the Rippowam High School without turning a hair."

MR. CONNORS said he would like to answer this. He said he does not believe that there is anyone in this room who is opposed to urban redevelopment and he is not opposed to it, either. He said he was interested in the human element - in the people who live in the Project and said "Where are you going to put them? No one has yet told us where they are going to put them. I've heard lots of stories, but nobody to this day has told us where they are going to put these people." He spoke at some length.

MR. ROGERS MOVED the question. Seconded and CARRIED with one no vote (Mr. Kuczo)

THE PRESIDENT: "Now we will proceed to a vote on the motion. The motion is to make a recommendation back to the Charter Revision Commission to re-examine the question of a referendum."

MR. MOGUL MOVED for a roll call vote. Seconded and CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT asked if there were any questions as to what is now before the Board. He said: "A vote of yes means that it will go back to the Commission. A vote of no means that it will not." He asked if there were any questions.

A member asked: "Mr. President, the question is this. If it goes back----if we recommend that it goes back to Committee, then there will be some action taken. On the other hand if our vote is negative, it won't go back at all and that's the end of it?"

THE PRESIDENT: "That's correct. Is there any other question of order by any of the representatives?"



MR. CONNORS: "Assuming now that there are enough votes - does that mean that it stands as it is at the present time or does it mean that it changes the complexion of the whole thing?"

THE PRESIDENT: "The complexion would be changed in that it would be finished from this particular point of view at this time."

MR. CONNORS: "Does that mean that it stands as they brought it out?"

THE PRESIDENT: "That's right - it would be rejected. Now, are there any other points of order, any doubts in anyone's mind? A yes vote means that it will go back to the Commission. A no vote means that the matter is rejected. Is that clear? The clerk will now call the roll. Incidentally, there are 30 people here. Sixteen votes are necessary to refer it back to the Commission."

The Clerk called the roll and the motion FAILED to carry by the following roll call vote, with 22 voting no and 8 voting yes:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

(D) George Connors  
(D) Stephen Kelly  
(D) Paul Kuczo  
(R) Frances Lilliendahl  
(R) Edwin Lindstrom  
(R) Thomas Morris  
(R) Daniel Reamling  
(D) Gerald Rybnick

THOSE VOTING IN OPPOSITION

(R) Joseph Bitetto  
(D) Robert Durso  
(R) William Hearing  
(R) Booth Hemingway  
(D) John Kane  
(R) Alan Ketcham  
(D) Carmine Longo  
(R) Peter Martin  
(R) Lee Mogul  
(R) Benjamin Nathanson  
(R) Romaine Philpot  
(R) Paul Rand  
(R) John Rich  
(R) Randolph Rogers  
(R) George Russell  
(R) Ronald Schwartz  
(R) William Selsberg  
(R) Michael Sherman  
(D) Anthony Truglia  
(D) Dominick Vivona  
(D) Chester Walajtys  
(R) Michael Zezima

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, upon motion of Mr. Ketcham, seconded by Mr. Truglia, the meeting adjourned at 11:59 P.M.

vf

APPROVED

*Ronald M. Schwartz*

Ronald M. Schwartz, President Board of Representatives

*Velma Farrell*  
Velma Farrell, Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

