

Minutes of April 6, 1964  
Meeting of the Board of Representatives  
Stamford, Connecticut

3950

The regular monthly meeting of the 8th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Monday, April 6, 1964 in the Cafeteria of the Walter Dolan Jr. High School, Toms Road, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, Ronald M. Schwartz, at 8:15 P.M.

The INVOCATION was given by Rev. James A. Miller, Calvary Baptist Church

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 38 members present and 2 absent. The absent members were: Dominick Vivona and Stephen Kelly.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of March 2, 1964.

The Minutes of the above meeting were accepted, there being no corrections.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The President read the report of the Steering Committee, which follows:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT  
Meeting held Monday, March 23, 1964

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Monday, March 23, 1964 in the Board of Representatives' meeting room, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 8:15 P.M. All members were present, with the exception of the following: Michael Zexima and Stephen Kelly. Joseph Bitetto attended in Mr. Kelly's absence.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Mayor's letter of 3/2/64 concerning appointments to Patriotic and Special Events Commission, Park Commission, Sewer Commission, Health Commission, Alternate to Zoning Board, Hubbard Heights Golf Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals and Alternate to Zoning Board of Appeals - REFERRED TO APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE
- (2) Additional Appropriations (approved by Board of Finance on 3/12/64) REFERRED TO FISCAL COMMITTEE and other committees concerned
- (3) Regarding increase in Standing Committee memberships (As per letter from Board President to all members, dated 2/11/64) - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (4) Resolution concerning appointment of a Special Charter Revision Commission to consider the establishment of new boundary lines for Stamford's 20 Voting Districts - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 6, 1964

- (5) Concerning increased benefits for pensioners now on pension under the CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES Pension Plan. (Brought up by Mr. Ketcham under "New Business" at the March 2, 1964 meeting, followed up by letter submitted to the Steering Committee 3/23/64. Also brought up by Mr. Martin and Mr. Philpot at the 3/2/64 meeting.) - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE
- (6) Concerning adoption of a SEWER CODE, as per Section 4 of Ordinance #80. (Being balance of Building Code adopted July 1, 1959) (Requested in letter of 1/21/64 from Mr. Nathanson, 7th District Representative) - REFERRED TO PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
- (7) Parking Authority request for approval of acquisition of property on Bell Street from the Jemex Co., formerly leased - Purchase price to be \$29,800. REFERRED TO HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE
- (8) Concerning possibility of installation of a traffic light at the corner of SELLECK STREET AND FAIRFIELD AVENUE (Brought up by Mr. Truglia under "Old Business" at the March 2, 1964 meeting) - REFERRED TO HEALTH AND PROTECTION COMMITTEE
- (9) Abandonment of strip of land at dead end of DORSET LANE - REFERRED TO PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
- (10) Fees - 1964 Season, for Tennis, Park-Beach parking permit stickers and lawn bowling (Requested in letter of 2/4/64 from Mr. Connell, Supt. Parks and Trees, per provisions outlined in Ordinance No. 64) - REFERRED TO PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE
- (11) Stamford Fire Fighters Local 786 (Letter dated 2/1/64) requesting Board adopt provisions of Public Act 495 of 1963 Legislature, extending right of collective bargaining to municipal employees. (Not ordered on agenda)
- (12) Letter from State, County and Municipal Employees' Local, Union #1083, Board of Education Custodians (dated 2/8/64) requesting the Board to adopt the provisions of Public Act 495 of 1963 Legislature, extending right to collective bargaining to municipal employees. (Not ordered on agenda)
- (13) Concerning group insurance and inequities in conjunction with Retirement Plan for present ineligible pensioners. (Brought up by Mr. Ketcham, Mr. Philpot and Mr. Martin under "New Business" at the 3/2/64 meeting.) - REFERRED TO PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
- (14) Regarding May meeting of Board - A vote was taken to leave it to the discretion of the President as to the date the meeting will be held.
- (15) Letter to be sent to the Mayor, notifying him that Mr. George Russell and Mr. Allen Shanen were appointed by the President to act as liaison between the Board and his Committee in regard to drop-out of industry from the Stamford area.
- (16) Concerning request from HUBBARD HEIGHTS GOLF COMMISSION for a Charter amendment to change name to "City of Stamford Golf Commission" - REFERRED TO CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE

- (17) Letter from CITY AND TOWN CLERK (dated 3/20/64) requesting authorization for BOARD OF ELECTORS to hold 5 additional sessions, as provided under Sec. 9-19 of Conn. General Statutes (1958 revision) - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE AND EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.
- (18) Letter from CITY AND TOWN CLERK (dated 3/2/64) requesting authority to change FEES charged in Town Clerk's Office under Sec. 471, Chapter 47 of Charter - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE AND RULES COMMITTEE.
- (19) Request to WAIVE BUILDING PERMIT FEE on construction to expand facilities of Sacred Heart Academy on Strawberry Hill Avenue (letter dated 2/12/64 from Paul D. Shapero, Attorney) - REFERRED TO LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE
- (20) Letter from 13 owners of PACKAGE LIQUOR STORES (dated 3/18/64) located in Southeast Quadrant area, who will be forced out of their present locations because of the advent of Urban Renewal - REFERRED TO URBAN REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
- (21) Copies of BOARD OF EDUCATION OPERATING BUDGET for 1964-1965 were given to President and Chairman of the Fiscal Committee
- (22) Financial statement from Controller, given to Chairman of Fiscal Committee.

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

RONALD M. SCHWARTZ,  
Chairman, Steering Committee

BYMC

#### APPOINTMENTS COMMITTEE:

MR. NATHANSON, Chairman, presented his committee report. He said the committee met March 24, 1964 in the Mayor's conference room, City Hall. Present were: Benjamin Nathanson, Chairman, Edwin O. Lindstrom, Jr., Paul J. Kucso, at which time six appointees were interviewed.

The Tellers distributed the ballots on the following appointments. The resulting vote on each appointment is recorded below:

- (1) HEALTH COMMISSION: - DR. FRANK H. D'ANDREA (R)  
West Lane, Revonah Woods  
(Reappointment)

Term Expiring:  
Dec. 1, 1968  
(5 yr. term)

VOTE: 36 yes  
2 no

- (2) HEALTH COMMISSION - DONALD J. CARDELLI (R)  
127 West Broad Street  
(Filling out unexpired term  
of Robert Durso)

Dec. 1, 1964  
(3 yr. term after  
original app't.)

VOTE 33 yes  
3 no

- (3) HUBBARD HEIGHTS GOLF COMMISSION - GEORGE COHEN (R)  
293 Club Road  
(Replaces Michael Beluk)

Dec. 1, 1968

VOTE: 34 yes  
7 no

- (4) PARK COMMISSION - FRANK COWLIN (R)  
51 Ralsey Road  
(Filling out unexpired term of  
Robert Nolan)

Dec. 1, 1964  
(5 yr. term)

VOTE: 31 yes  
7 no

- (5) SEWER COMMISSION - JOSEPH J. RINALDI (R)  
171 Dannel Drive  
(Replaces Lucian V. Scalfani)

Dec. 1, 1968  
(5 yr. term)

VOTE: 37 yes  
1 no

- (6) ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - JACK FINSKY (R)  
128 Woodside Village  
(Presently an Alternate)  
(Replacing Roland Trudel,  
whose term expired 12/1/63)

Dec. 1, 1968

VOTE: 28 yes  
9 no  
1 Abstention

MR. KANE rose on a point of information. He said there were three other appointments on the agenda for this evening. He asked the reason why they were not reported out of committee.

MR. RATHANSON replied that Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Brown were unable to attend the meeting and the committee is getting further information on Mr. Santoro.

#### FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. ROGERS said a meeting of his committee was held on April 1, 1964, with the following present: Mr. Hemingway, Mrs. Lilliendahl, Mr. Russell and the Chairman. In addition, informal conferences were held with other members of the committee prior to tonight's Board meeting.

- (1) \$25,000.00 - Resolution No. 436 amending 1963-1964 Capital Projects Budget, Board of Education, by adding item in amount of \$25,000.00 for purpose of making necessary surveys in connection with proposed STAMFORD HIGH SCHOOL SITE EXPANSION AND ADDITION PROGRAM, and appropriation of \$25,000.00 for said Project (See recommendations of Board of Finance that this be subject to competitive bid) (Mayor's letter of 2/7/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Kuczo, who said the Education, Welfare and Government Committee concurred in approving this appropriation. CARRIED:



RESOLUTION NO. 436AMENDING THE 1963-1964 CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET,  
BOARD OF EDUCATION, FOR SURVEYS IN CONNECTION  
WITH STAMFORD HIGH SCHOOL SITE EXPANSION AND  
ADDITION, IN AMOUNT OF \$25,000.00

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, to amend the 1963-1964 Capital Projects Budget in accordance with the provisions of Section 611.5 of the Stamford Charter, by adding an item in the amount of \$25,000.00 for the purpose of making the necessary surveys in connection with the proposed STAMFORD HIGH SCHOOL, SITE EXPANSION AND ADDITION PROGRAM, and the appropriation of that amount therefor.

\*\*\*\*\*

- (2) \$514.80 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Salaries (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

Code 626.0101 - Bureau of Engineering, Salaries-----	\$427.44
Code 624.0101 - Division of Collection, Salaries-----	87.36
(Concerning reclassification of above)	\$514.80

The above matter was DEFERRED for further information.

- (3) \$1,130.45 - PENSION for Joseph T. Kearns, Custodian - Code 154.0000, effective Feb. 1, 1964, based on 52% of his average salary for past five years, being annual pension in amount of \$2,713.13 (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Mogul and CARRIED.

- (4) \$150.00 - HUBBARD HEIGHTS GOLF COMMISSION - Code 730.0501, Telephone (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mrs. Lilliendahl and CARRIED.

- (5) \$1,500.00 - HUBBARD HEIGHTS GOLF COMMISSION - Code 730.0601, General Supplies (REDUCED by Board of Finance from \$1,720.00) (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Rand and CARRIED.

- (6) \$175.00 - PLANNING BOARD - Code 134.0101, Salaries (Reclassification of position of Associate Planner from Grade S-20 to Grade S-22) (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

The above matter was DEFERRED for further information.

- (7) \$450.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH - Code 510.2201, New Equipment (Refrigerator) (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Ketcham and CARRIED.

Minutes of April 6, 1964

- (8) \$400.00 - ASSESSOR'S OFFICE - Code 144.0901, Professional Services (To hire a draftsman to bring aerial maps up-to-date) (Mayor's letter of 2/7/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Katcham and CARRIED.

- (9) \$12,220.00 - OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE - Code 132.0000, Employees' Medical and Hospital Account (Disbursement made on warrant of Corporation Counsel) (Mayor's letter of 2/7/64)

MR. ROGERS moved for approval of the above request. Mr. Connors seconded the motion.

MR. KUCZO said his committee (Education, Welfare & Government Committee) to whom it had also been referred, concurred in approving this request. CARRIED.

- (10) \$250.00 - BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES - Code 106.0301, Stationery, Postage and Office Supplies (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Katcham and the President. CARRIED.

- (11) \$5,440.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 550.1209, Hydrants, Rural (REDUCED by Board of Finance from \$14,960.00) (Mayor's letter of 2/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Ramling and Mr. Morris, who said the Public Works Committee also concurred in approving this request. CARRIED.

- (12) \$27,947.56 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Code 606.0609, Snow Removal and Flood Emergency (Mayor's letter of 3/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Bitatto and Mr. Rand.

MR. MORRIS reported that the Public Works Committee concurred in the approval of this request. CARRIED.

- (13) \$348.00 - OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF FINANCE, BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS & RECORDS - Code 116.0101, Salaries (Reclassification of Data Processing Supervisor from \$7,267.00, Step "C" to \$7,585.00, step "D" ----- From 8-20 to 8-22 (\$8,465.00) (Mayor's letter of 3/6/64 and attached letter of 2/24/64 from Personnel Director)

The above matter was DEFERRED for further information.

- (14) \$20,000.00 - FIRE DEPARTMENT - Code 540.2201, New Equipment (Ladder Truck Repairs) (REDUCED by Board of Finance from \$27,000.00) (Mayor's letter of 3/5/64)

MR. ROGERS said the Fiscal Committee at this time defers to the Health and Protection Committee, in order to hear from Mr. Morris.

THE PRESIDENT said he would first like to hear the report from the Health and Protection Committee Chairman, Mr. Hearing. Mr. Hearing replied that he wished to delegate this report to Mr. Morris as the Committee concurs.

MR. MORRIS said they had examined the truck in question, which had been involved in an accident - that the \$20,000.00 had been a verbal agreement to repair the truck which they had previously had in writing for \$27,000.00. He said the Committee felt that inasmuch as the truck is around ten years old and has about half of the life use gone out of it, that possibly they would like to go back to the Board of Finance and re-consider the purchase of a new ladder truck, and this old one can be used as a trade in. He said he felt that if they went back to the other boards and explained the reasons why this is a better idea, that they might see the point and want to buy a new truck, using the old one to trade in.

Above item DENIED for reasons given as stated by Mr. Morris.

(15) \$500.00 - DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL DEFENSE - Code 560.1701, Auto Operation and Maintenance (Mayor's letter of 3/5/64)

MR. ROGERS MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Mogul and CARRIED.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. SELSBERG, Chairman, said a meeting of his committee was held Thursday, April 2, 1964 in the Municipal Office Building, with the following members present: Mr. Selsberg, Mr. Maffucci, Mr. Rich and Mr. Kane.

- (1) Regarding increase in Standing Committee memberships (See letter from President to all Board members, dated 2/11/64) - (Deferred 3/2/64 because notice of meeting did not contain text of proposed amendment to Rules of Board) Following is text of amendment:

"To increase all Standing Committees to eight (8) members of the Board, with exception of Steering Committee, which would remain at fifteen (15)".

MR. SELSBERG said this would amend the Rules of Order of the Board, as set forth on page 4, paragraph 1. He said Mr. Kane voted against raising the membership of the committees and Mr. Rich voted to raise the committee membership to 7, exclusive of the Fiscal and Steering Committees. Mr. Maffucci and Mr. Selsberg voted in favor of raising said committees to 8 inclusive of Fiscal, which shall remain at 8 and the Steering Committee at 15.

MR. SELSBERG MOVED that said committee memberships be raised as aforesaid. Seconded by Mr. Rogers.

MR. CONNORS said he wanted to know what the object was in raising the membership to an arbitrary figure of 8.

MR. RUSSELL said the main reason for raising it was the fact that members on both sides of the table felt that some people were not getting a fair opportunity to serve on the committees of their choice. He said some years back committee memberships were increased for this very reason. He said it only seemed fair to allow members to choose the committees on which they wished to serve and for these reasons he had brought the matter up.

MR. CONNORS said he wanted to know why the figure of 8 was picked, because it will only end up in a 5 to 3 division. He said he favors either 9 which would then be 5 to 4 or 7 which would then be 4 to 3. He said with an arbitrary figure of 8 whichever party is in power will have a balance.



MR. RUSSELL said in fairness to the committee system, it is very seldom that every member shows up at a meeting and with a smaller committee, it is quite likely that only one or two would show up, which throws most of the work on one or two people.

MR. CONNORS said he still objects and thinks the better way to do it would be a 7 member committee, giving a better balanced committee.

MR. KANE spoke in opposition to enlarging the committee membership. He said he believes there is inequity on the committee assignments and has felt this all along, but does not feel by enlarging the committees that it will solve the problem.

MR. KETCHAM reminded Mr. Connors that he is presently serving on an 8 member committee - the Fiscal Committee, and as a member of a previous Board must have voted for the establishment of an 8 member Fiscal Committee. He spoke in favor of the motion.

MR. DURSO spoke against the motion and said he wants the committees to remain as they are - that he feels the lack of attendance is due to the fact that some people were given committee assignments that they did not want and the assignments they had preferred were denied to them.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Russell to take the Chair for a moment, as he wished to address the members.

MR. RUSSELL took the Chair.

MR. SCHWARTZ said he had checked into the real facts involved in all this talk about disproportionate committee assignments. He said in looking at the rules, they require that substantial proportionate allocation of committee assignments be made by the President. He said this has without doubt been achieved on the Fiscal Committee, Legislative and Rules, Public Works, Parks and Recreation, Education, Welfare and Government Committee; with one additional Democrat on the Appointments Committee, The Personnel Committee, the Planning and Zoning Committee and the Health and Protection Committee would make the Committees exactly proportionate and the rules do not require an exact proportion, but do require "substantial proportion". He said the Steering Committee would require three more Democrats to make it exactly proportionate.

Mr. Schwartz called attention to the fact that he had appointed two Democrats to two committees and further gave the Democrats control of one committee. He said he thought this was unprecedented when one party has the balance of power and did not occur in 1959 or 1961 when the Republicans were relegated to a small portion, being the minority party at that time. He said with five committees being exactly proportionate and four committees one away from being exactly proportionate, he believed that the rule was satisfied.

Mr. Schwartz spoke in great detail on the question before the Board, and said the records in 1959 and again in 1961 speak for themselves. He suggested that some thought be given to spelling out in the rules just what the minority representation should be so that controversies such as are now occurring be averted in future Boards.

He said he believes that the Democrats should not expect a different set of rules to exist - one when they are in power and another when the Republicans are in the majority - that the Board has a job to do and should try to do the job as a



united body when it comes to the mechanics of this Board of Representatives. He suggested that in fairness to the job this Board was elected to accomplish that this "imbroglio" be discontinued.

THE PRESIDENT now resumed the Chair.

MR. ROGERS said he thinks enough time has been spent on this question of committee assignments and thinks that an 8 man committee would be the best solution to the dilemma. He said he had served for a brief time on the previous Board, and although the Minority Leader (Mr. Schwartz) at that time had requested he be placed on a committee, this was never done.

MR. SHANEN said he agrees in part with what the President has just said and asked why this question was not raised at the organizational meeting of the Board. He also spoke at some length and said he does not think the reasons given for changing the committee assignments are valid. HE MOVED that there be no changes in the committee assignments.

THE PRESIDENT declared this motion out of order for the reason that a motion is now before the Board.

MR. SHANEN MOVED for a five minute recess. However, no action was taken on this motion and the debate continued for some time, for the reason that several members wished to speak on the motion before the Board.

After considerable further debate, MR. TRUGLIA requested a five minute recess at 9:50 P.M. The request was granted.

The recess was declared over at 10:00 P.M. and the members resumed their seats.

MR. ROGERS MOVED the question and called for a roll call vote on the motion to increase the Standing Committees to 8 members (see Mr. Selsberg's motion under item #1 under Legislative and Rules Committee). CARRIED.

LOST by the following roll call vote of 21 in favor and 17 opposed (it requiring a two-thirds vote to amend the Rules of the Board):

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

(R) Vito Biscaglio  
(R) Joseph Bitetto  
(R) Booth Hemingway  
(R) Alan Ketcham  
(R) Frances Lilliendahl  
(R) Edwin Lindstrom  
(R) John Maffucci  
(R) Peter Martin  
(R) Lee Mogul  
(R) Thomas Morris  
(R) Benjamin Nathan son  
(R) Romaine Philpot  
(R) Paul Rand  
(R) Daniel Remling  
(R) John Rich  
(R) Randolph Rogers  
(R) George Russell  
(R) Ronald Schwartz

THOSE OPPOSED

(D) Patsy Arruzza  
(D) Vincent Caporizzo  
(D) George Connors  
(D) Edward Dombroski  
(D) Robert Durso  
(D) Jennie Esposito  
(R) William Hearing  
(D) John Kane  
(D) Paul Kuczo  
(D) Stanley Kulowiec  
(D) Carmine Longo  
(D) John Morris  
(D) William Murphy  
(D) Gerald Rybnick  
(D) Allen Shanen  
(D) Anthony Truglia  
(D) Chester Walajtys

Minutes of April 6, 1964

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR

- (R) William Selsberg
- (R) Michael Sherman
- (R) Michael Zenina

- (2) Proposed resolution (No. 437) concerning appointment of a Special Committee to consider establishment of new boundary lines for Stamford's 20 Voting Districts (Deferred on 3/2/64 awaiting opinion from Corporation Counsel - See item #13 of Steering Committee Report, Minutes of 3/2/64, page 3925) (Also see item #5, page 3943)

MR. SELSBERG said they had been awaiting the Corporation Counsel's opinion which they have now received. He thereupon read the opinion which follows:

Concerning Proper Procedure for the  
establishment of new boundary lines  
for Stamford's 20 Voting Districts

March 24, 1964

William Selsberg, Esq.  
Chairman, Legislative & Rules Committee  
Board of Representatives  
City Hall  
Stamford, Connecticut

Dear Bill:

I hand you herewith our opinion concerning your inquiry of March 10th with reference to the resolution proposed by Alan Katcham for the establishment of new boundary lines of the voting districts of the City of Stamford.

The question posed is - What is the proper procedure to be taken for the establishment of such new boundary lines?

Our Charter, Sec. 101 provides that:

"For the purpose of voting, Stamford shall remain divided into the twenty voting districts defined by the commission established by a special act of 1941 entitled, 'An Act establishing a Commission to define voting districts in the Town of Stamford' and further defined by subsequent legislative enactment."

There has been subsequent legislative enactment concerning these districts which does not affect the present problem.

The General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as amended to date, provide that the legislative body of any city may change the boundaries of voting districts. Any such change, however, made within 90 days prior to any election or primary shall not apply with respect to such election or primary. (Conn. General Statutes, Rev. 1958, Sec. 9-169, as amended)

The same section of the statutes provide that the legislative body may divide and re-divide such municipality into voting districts, providing that voting

district lines shall not be drawn so as to conflict with the lines of senate districts as established by the general assembly.

The provision concerning the senatorial districts obviously doesn't affect our problem and needs no further comment.

Section 9.1 of the general statutes defines voting district as "any municipality \*\*\* having not more than one polling place in a regular election,". The districts forming the Board of Representatives are in harmony with this definition.

However, the Supreme Court of the State of Connecticut passed upon this problem in 1953 in the case of Lacava v Carfi, 1940 Conn. 517. This was a New Britain case seeking a declaratory judgment and the question was whether the legislative body of the City of New Britain could increase its number of wards. The established wards had become unequal by reason of shifts of its voting population. It was argued that the legislative body could increase the number of voting districts in the city because the charter referred to wards as voting districts and support was elicited under the statute which for the question therein discussed was substantially the same as the present statute.

At first blush from a casual reading of the New Britain charter and the statute, one might assume that the Common Council (similar to our own Board of Representatives) would have the power to divide and re-divide the voting districts, but the Supreme Court pointed out that although the charter provided that the wards shall be voting districts, it did not follow that the two terms are synonymous. The Supreme Court, speaking through Justice Wynne stated -

"The intent is that there shall not be more than one polling place in each ward, but so far as each ward is entitled to elect one representative to the common council it is something above and beyond a voting district. For this reason a 'ward' as the word is used in the charter is not a 'voting district' as those words are used in Sec. 1052. The section does not authorize the common council of New Britain to change the number or the boundaries of the wards as fixed by the charter."

In Stamford, the Board of Representatives is similar in character to the New Britain ward. In addition to being a voting district for election purposes, each of our districts is "entitled to elect one (in our case, two) representatives" to the Board of Representatives and for this reason, it is something above and beyond a voting district". We must, therefore, conclude that our voting district is not the "voting district" as these words are used in Section 9-169 of the General Statutes.

We determine, therefore, that under the general statutes, the City of Stamford may not change from the 20 voting districts as referred to in Sec. 101 of the Charter. The boundaries of such districts, however, having been created by Ordinance, such boundaries may be changed by the Board of Representatives through subsequent Ordinance.

Any changes in the number of the voting districts may be made by Special Act of the State of Connecticut, or under the Home Rule legislation.

The policy of changing boundaries to accommodate shifts in voting population when they become unequal and the determination of how much of a shift is necessary



to accommodate such change is a matter within the discretion of the Board of Representatives.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Sydney C. Kwaskin,  
Corporation Counsel

SCK:A

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. SELSBERG said that based upon the opinion of the Corporation Counsel it was the opinion of the committee that the following resolution be recommended to the Board.

MR. SELSBERG MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Rogers:

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that a Special Committee be appointed by the President of the Board of Representatives, with the concurrence of the Majority and Minority Leaders, to study and propose changes in the present boundary lines of the 20 districts of the City of Stamford, based upon the population in said districts.

MR. KETCHAM spoke in favor of the motion. He said it is of the utmost importance that qualified people be members of this committee and offered the following amendment to Mr. Selsberg's motion: (seconded)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Special Committee shall consist of the following: (1) Town and City Clerk; (2) Republican Deputy Registrar of Voters; (3) Democratic Deputy Registrar of Voters; (4) Republican Town Chairman or his designate; (5) Democratic Town Chairman or his designate; (6) Republican Majority Leader or his designate; (7) Democratic Minority Leader or his designate; (8) one Democrat (at large); and (9) one Republican (at large).

MR. KANE asked whether the Town Clerk would have a vote in this committee.

MR. KETCHAM said he would be entitled to vote as a member of the committee.

MR. KANE asked what vote would be needed to carry an amendment.

THE PRESIDENT informed him that it would require a simple majority vote.

MR. SHERMAN MOVED to further amend as follows: (seconded)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Special Committee, as established, be directed to make its report to this Board, or a committee of it, no later than May 1, 1965.

MR. KETCHAM accepted Mr. Sherman's amendment to his amendment.

THE PRESIDENT explained the above motions. He said the action of the committee will not be binding upon anything done here - that it is a sort of supernumerary committee - that it will go out and investigate the facts and report back to this



Board and then this Board will by Ordinance either amend or not amend the boundary lines of the City of Stamford - that the recommendations of the committee will not be binding upon this Board as the legislative body of the city.

MR. MURPHY MOVED to further amend that the Town Clerk be a non-voting member of the committee.

MR. SHERMAN refused to accept the amendment.

THE PRESIDENT advised Mr. Murphy to hold his proposed amendment for later - that for the sake of parliamentary clarity, that the Board first consider the amendments now before it.

THE PRESIDENT informed the members that the debate is now confined to the last amendment as proposed by Mr. Sherman. Then, after a vote is taken on this amendment, the next item for consideration will be Mr. Ketcham's motion and then the vote will be on whether or not there will be a committee.

MR. MURPHY requested clarification, saying he was "lost" in amendments.

THE PRESIDENT said he would attempt to clarify the status of the amendments and the procedure in order to avoid confusion. He said that as it now stands Mr. Murphy's motion is out of order as a result of Mr. Sherman refusing to accept it.

MR. MURPHY asked when he would be able to present his amendment.

THE PRESIDENT said if he wished, he could present it at the time the main motion is ready to be voted on.

MR. DURSO MOVED TO TABLE the resolution, as amended. Seconded by Mr. Kane, who asked for a roll call vote.

THE PRESIDENT explained the present status. He said there is a motion on the floor, made by Mr. Selsberg to which motion Mr. Ketcham has made an amendment, to which amendment Mr. Sherman has now offered an amendment, to which Mr. Durso has now made the motion to TABLE. He said the vote will now be on the last one, which is Mr. Durso's motion to table.

The Clerk called the roll on Mr. Durso's motion to TABLE. DEFEATED by the following vote of 22 opposed and 15 in favor:

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR OF TABLING

(D) Patsy Arruzza  
(D) Vincent Caporizzo  
(D) George Connors  
(D) Edward Dombroski  
(D) Robert Durso  
(D) Jennie Esposito  
(D) John Kane  
(D) Paul Kuczo  
(D) Stanley Kulowiec  
(D) Carmine Longo  
(D) John Morris  
(D) William Murphy

THOSE OPPOSED TO TABLING

(R) Vito Biscaglio  
(R) Joseph Bitetto  
(R) William Hearing  
(R) Booth Hemingway  
(R) Alan Ketcham  
(R) Frances Lilliendahl  
(R) Edwin Lindstrom  
(R) John Maffucci  
(R) Peter Martin  
(R) Lee Mogul  
(R) Thomas Morris  
(R) Benjamin Nathanson

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR OF TABLING

(D) Gerald Rybnick  
(D) Anthony Truglia  
(D) Chester Walajtys

THOSE OPPOSED TO TABLING

(R) Romaine Philpot  
(R) Paul Rand  
(R) Daniel Remling  
(R) John Rich  
(R) Randolph Rogers  
(R) George Russell  
(R) Ronald Schwartz  
(R) William Selsberg  
(R) Michael Sherman  
(R) Michael Zezima

(Note: Mr. Shanen left the meeting at this time.)

MR. MORRIS MOVED that the Board now vote on Mr. Sherman's amendment. Seconded and CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Sherman's amendment to add the limitation of May 1, 1965 to the resolution as proposed by Mr. Selsberg. CARRIED with a few no votes.

MR. MORRIS MOVED that the Board now vote on Mr. Ketcham's amendment to the resolution as proposed by Mr. Selsberg. Seconded and CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on Mr. Ketcham's amendment, which names the people who will serve on the committee. CARRIED with a few no votes.

MR. MORRIS MOVED that the Board now vote on Mr. Selsberg's motion. Seconded by Mr. Ketcham.

MR. MURPHY objected at this point. He wanted to know what happened to his amendment.

THE PRESIDENT informed Mr. Murphy that he would entertain his amendment at this time.

MR. MURPHY said his motion to amend is that the Town Clerk remain a non-voting member of this committee. Seconded by Mr. Kane.

MR. KETCHAM spoke against the amendment. He said because a previous committee which was composed of equal representation failed in the past to arrive at any conclusion and for this reason he believed the Town Clerk should be allowed to vote as a member of the committee.

MR. KANE spoke in opposition to allowing the Town Clerk to have a vote on the committee - that he be a non voting member.

MR. MARTIN MOVED THE QUESTION. Seconded.

MR. MURPHY objected to shutting off debate.

THE PRESIDENT said he would allow Mr. Truglia to speak on the amendment.

MR. TRUGLIA said he objected to the Town Clerk having a vote as a member of the committee.

MR. SHERMAN spoke in opposition to Mr. Murphy's amendment. He said he believed

Mr. Ketcham's motion placed on the committee those people in the city who would have the best working knowledge required to come up with an equitable, intelligent solution to the present distribution problem.

MR. MORRIS MOVED THE QUESTION. Seconded and CARRIED by a show of hands, there being 22 in favor and 15 opposed.

THE PRESIDENT said the vote is now on Mr. Murphy's amendment to take away the voting power of the Town Clerk as a member of the committee. He said a yes vote will take away the voting power of the Town Clerk and a no vote would allow him to vote.

VOTE taken on Mr. Murphy's amendment by a show of hands. LOST by a vote of 15 in favor and 22 opposed.

THE PRESIDENT said the next thing before the Board is the vote on the main motion as made by Mr. Selsberg.

After some further debate, MR. MAFFUCCI MOVED THE QUESTION. Seconded and CARRIED with one no vote.

VOTE taken on Mr. Selsberg's motion for a resolution to create a special committee, as amended. CARRIED. The resolution, as amended follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 437

CONCERNING APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE  
TO CONSIDER ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW BOUNDARY LINES  
FOR STAMFORD'S 20 VOTING DISTRICTS.

BE AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that a Special Committee be appointed by the President of the Board of Representatives, with the concurrence of the Majority and Minority Leaders, to study and propose changes in the present boundary lines of the 20 Districts of the City of Stamford, based upon the population in said Districts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Special Committee shall consist of the following: (1) Town and City Clerk; (2) Republican Deputy Registrar of Voters; (3) Democratic Deputy Registrar of Voters; (4) Republican Town Chairman or his designate; (5) Democratic Town Chairman or his designate; (6) Republican Majority Leader or his designate; (7) Democratic Minority Leader or his designate; (8) one Democrat (at large); and (9) one Republican (at large); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Special Committee, as established, be directed to make its report to this Board, or a committee of it, no later than May 1, 1965.

\*\*\*\*\*

- (3) Concerning increased benefits for pensioners now on pension under CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES PENSION PLAN - (Brought up by Mr. Ketcham, Mr. Martin and Mr. Philpot under "New Business" at the 3/2/64 meeting, followed by letter from Mr. Ketcham at the 3/23/64 meeting of the Steering Committee (letter dated 3/16/64))

MR. SELSBERG said that although the above matter is not shown on the agenda, the above matter was also referred to the Personnel Committee, and it was the opinion of the Legislative and Rules Committee that since the Personnel Committee is much more familiar with and has made investigations into the Pension Plan, this matter should be taken up in toto by that committee.

The above matter was REFERRED TO THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE at this time.

- (4) Request for authorization for the BOARD OF ELECTORS to hold five additional sessions, as provided under Sec. 9-19 of Conn. General Statutes, 1958 Revision (Letter dated 3/20/64 from Town Clerk)

MR. SELSBERG MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Kuczo, who reported that the Education, Welfare and Government Committee to whom this had also been referred, concurred in approval. CARRIED.

- (5) Request from City and Town Clerk (letter of 3/2/64) for authority to change fees under Sec. 471, Chapter 47 of Charter.

MR. SELSBERG MOVED that the Town Clerk be given the discretion to increase the fees of his office up to the maximum rates as provided by the Connecticut General Statutes, Sec. 7-34. Seconded by Mr. Kane and CARRIED unanimously.

- (6) Request for Waiver of Building Permit Fee for construction to expand facilities of Sacred Heart Academy, Strawberry Hill Ave. (From Atty. Paul Shapiro, letter dated 3/12/64)

MR. SELSBERG MOVED for approval of the above request. He said it was the opinion that the intent behind amended Ordinance No. 80.1 (Article 100, Section 6, Sub-paragraph (13) of the Building Code) was to waive the fee for charitable and beneficial organizations and the committee feels the fee should be waived in this request as it was done at the February 3, 1964 meeting (see page 3916, Minutes 2/3/64, item #5) for the Stamford Hospital. Seconded and CARRIED.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

MR. MORRIS presented his committee report at this time. He said a meeting was held on 3/24/64 with the following present: Commissioner of Public Works Arthur Mitchell, Chairman Thomas Morris, Carmine Longo, Joseph Bitetto, and Daniel Remling. He said all matters before his committee were discussed and the fiscal matters (see Fiscal Committee report) approved.

Concerning adoption of a SEWER CODE, as per Sec. 4 of Ordinance No. 80 (Being balance of Building Code which was adopted on 7/1/59 leaving Sewer Code still to be adopted at a later time) (Deferred 3/2/64)

MR. MORRIS said the committee discussed the adoption of a Sewer Code and it was decided that a public hearing, in the near future, be held concerning this issue.

#### HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE

MR. HEARING, Chairman, presented his report.

Traffic Light at Main Street and Seaside Avenue

MR. HEARING said he was in receipt of a letter from Mr. Oefinger which he was sure



some of the members would be glad to hear about. He quoted from the letter:

"I have been in contact with the Highway Dept. of the State of Connecticut electrical division and I have been informed that the survey for a traffic light system at Main Street and Seaside Avenue has been completed and that department plans an installation at this intersection. Due to the long grade along Main Street, plans are being formulated for islands so that a minimum of interference will be received by traffic traveling west on Main Street. The completed plans should be in the Stamford Police Department sometime within a week for our inspection."

Traffic light, corner SELLECK STREET & FAIRFIELD AVENUE (Brought up by Mr. Truglia on 3/2/64 under "Old Business" (page 3947)

MR. HEARING said he has been informed that "you'll get them when they get the money, then you'll get the lights."

PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

Concerning abandonment of strip of land at dead end of DORSET LANE.

The above matter was DEFERRED.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE:

MR. BITETTO, Vice Chairman, in the absence of Mr. Kelly on vacation, gave the committee report.

Fees - 1964 Season, for Tennis, Park-Beach parking permit stickers and lawn bowling (Deferred 3/2/64)

MR. BITETTO MOVED the fees for the 1964 season be approved, as printed on page 3945, Minutes of 3/2/64. Seconded and CARRIED.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:

Concerning possible use of Group Insurance and increased benefits in conjunction with Retirement Plan for present ineligible pensioners (Brought up under "New Business" 3/2/64 - page 3948)

MR. PHILPOT said he would not read his committee report, which was quite lengthy, but asked that it be made a part of the Minutes. The report is as follows:

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

Personnel Committee

4-6-64

To enable the Personnel Committee to pursue its studies relative to the Classified Employees Retirement Fund, the Pension Dept. has sent me census data as of 3/1/64, pertaining to the following groups of living or deceased members:

- 1) Those members who are presently employed;
- 2) Those members who are presently retired thru normal processes, and who receive income both from Social Security and from the Pension Plan;
- 3) Those members who are presently retired because of disability;
- 4) Those members who are presently retired but receive only Social Security payments;
- 5) Pensioners who died, after retirement, since the plan started in 1952;
- 6) A list of eligible employees who died prior to receiving benefits and of non-eligible employees who died after 15 years of service - after 7/1/62. This list shows the dates of birth of the widows of the deceased employees.

These lists - as well as all ordinances and amendments pertaining to the C.E.R.F. have been sent on to the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company in Boston.

However, two additional census lists are still being compiled. These are:

- 1) A list of the dependents of presently employed C.E.R.F. members;
- 2) A list of the employees who were eligible for retirement but died before receiving benefits after 7/1/62;
- 3) A list of the dependents of the deceased members referred to in 2) above.

No up-to-date records apparently exist of the now-living dependents of employees who died prior to retirement and prior to 7/1/62; and research to secure this information would be expensive in terms of time and money. The 7/1/62 date is the approximate date, however, as of which the Retirement Department first began to compile detailed information as to dependency. Alternative cut-off dates could be 6/3/63 (when the Board first took formal action toward amendment of the M.E.A. plan) or 2/3/64.

As of this moment, your committee has no information (legal or otherwise) as to what would be involved in extending benefits to dependents of employees who died during employment prior to 3/2/64. Consequently, no indication as to potential future action should be read into this phase of the enquiry. Only further facts and studies can determine the answers.

Data as to present pensioners breaks down as follows:

- |   |                |
|---|----------------|
| 1) Persons now pensioned because of Normal Retirement ) | 54             |
| 2) Persons now pensioned because of Disability )        | $\frac{9}{63}$ |

3) Persons now pensioned who receive only Social Security benefits	) 17
Total Pensioners . . . . .	80

It goes without say that the Personnel Committee and the Board of Representatives would like to extend the benefits of the new plan to these people. Yet, at the moment, the costs involved in such an extension are not known. In addition, policy and legal decisions as to scope and approach must be made, and further questions will probably crop up as the studies progress. It is the feeling of your committee that no decisions may finally be made until costs have been ascertained and technical advice secured on all points.

In the near future, policy decisions will have to be made in the following areas:

- 1) Of the retired persons presently receiving only Social Security benefits, 12 took a refund of their contributions (plus interest) in lieu of pension. The amounts of these refunds ranged from \$38.00 to \$1,154.97 and the retirement dates ranged from September 1953 thru December 1963.

Questions:

- a) If legal means to permit such action may be found, may these people repay their contributions (plus interest from date of withdrawal?) and become eligible for pensions under the new plan?
- b) If the answer to a) is 'yes' but the people don't have the funds to plow back in, should the City cover the deficit for them?
- c) If the answer to a) is 'yes', should survivorship benefits also be made available?
- d) If the City covers the deficit in b), should it also foot the potential bill for survivorship benefits?
- 2) The 5 other persons referred to in 1) above, who now receive only Social Security benefits, made no contributions to the Pension Plan. They retired between November 1952 and July 1954 and would have received City pensions ranging between \$471.08 and \$891.47 if Social Security had not exceeded these amounts.

Questions:

- a) If legal means to permit such action may be found, but since these people paid nothing into the Pension Plan, should they be made eligible for pensions under the new plan?
- b) If the answer to a) is 'yes', should survivorship benefits be made available?
- 3) Should all the benefits of the new plan be made retroactive to cover all the 62 persons who are now retired?

Although responsibility for further implementation of the C.E.R.F. plan lies solely in the hands of the Board of Representatives under the terms of the Charter, the Personnel Committee feels that both Administrative and Legislative inquiries must be initiated to determine the latitudes within which future action may be taken under the terms of our present laws. In addition, if present legal authorization is not sufficiently broad, the Committee feels that studies must be made to determine what steps may be necessary to enable the Board to adopt such changes (if any) as may eventually be decided upon.

For this reason, your Committee feels that a copy of this report should be sent both to Mayor Mayers and to the Legislative & Rules Committee for study.

Respectfully submitted,

---

R. A. Philpot

#### EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE:

MR. KUCZO, Chairman, said he had already reported out on the matters previously taken up under Fiscal Committee and under the Legislative and Rules Committee. He said a meeting was held on Friday, April 3, 1964 of his committee and again on April 5, 1964, with the first meeting attended by Mr. Hemingway and the Chairman and the second one attended by Mr. Philpot, Mr. Hemingway and the Chairman.

##### Concerning Oil Leaks in beds at Smith House

MR. KUCZO said the members became aware of this matter as a result of a recent news account regarding the cracked headboards and leaking hydraulic cylinders on the beds at the new Smith House. Upon investigation, it was found that although most of the hydraulic cylinders were replaced because of oil leaking from them, there is now about a dozen more that are leaking onto the floor. While this may be normal in a car garage, he said it becomes a hazard in an institution such as this and could result in the city paying sums of money for injuries received by help and patients because of the oil on the floors.

MR. KUCZO said this committee requests that the Mayor instruct all parties currently working on this matter to see to it that this present situation be brought to a favorable conclusion as soon as possible, with proper protection for the best interests of the Stamford taxpayers and the patients and help at the Smith House.

#### URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE:

MR. RICH, Chairman, presented his committee report on the following matter which had been referred to his committee by the Steering Committee: (See item #20 under Steering Committee Report)

Complaint in letter from 13 owners of PACKAGE LIQUOR STORES (dated 3/18/64) located in Southeast Quadrant area, who will be forced out of their present locations because of the advent of Urban Renewal



MR. RICH MOVED for adoption of the following resolution. Seconded and CARRIED unanimously:

RESOLUTION NO. 438

CONCERNING RELOCATION OF PACKAGE STORES  
IN URBAN RENEWAL AREA OF STAMFORD

WHEREAS, Stamford is embarking upon a project of urban redevelopment for a part of its downtown area, known as the Southeast Quadrant (Extended); and

WHEREAS, the demolition of buildings under this project will force the temporary or permanent relocation of many businesses now in the area; and

WHEREAS, there are thirteen package liquor permit owners who will be so affected by the project and who may have difficulty in relocating their businesses elsewhere in Stamford;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED:

That this Board request the State Liquor Control Commission to take full cognizance of this situation in its consideration of future applications for package liquor store permits in Stamford; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Board strongly urge said Commission not to grant any more such permits to other persons until the present thirteen project area permittees have been given adequate opportunity to relocate their permit, either within the area or elsewhere in Stamford.

\*\*\*\*\*

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE:

MR. LINDSTROM, Chairman, reported that a meeting was held at the new City Hall at 8:00 P.M. on March 19, 1964, with the following in attendance: Mr. Lindstrom, Mr. Ketcham, Mr. Rich, Mr. Philpot, Mr. Durso, John Morris, Mr. Shanen and Mr. Truglia. He said a discussion was held on procedure and that another meeting is planned for the near future.

CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE (special committee):

MR. SHERMAN, Chairman, reported on the following matter and said he would forward it on to the Charter Revision Commission:

Concerning request to initiate a Charter amendment for change of name from Hubbard Heights Golf Commission (letter dated 1/21/64 to Mr. Kelly, 12th District Representative)

COMMUNICATIONS FROM MAYOR:

Letter dated 4/2/64 concerning two appointments to be presented at next Board meeting - one for Personnel Commission and second to the Southwestern Fairfield County Regional Planning Agency

Minutes of April 6, 1964

The above communication was referred to the Steering Committee for proper referral to Committee at their next meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS:

THE PRESIDENT said he wished to report several things to the Board, as follows:

Letter from NAACP to Board members regarding possibility of an investigation into the Housing Authority of the City.

THE PRESIDENT said he had received a letter, as outlined above, which he believed was also sent to the other Board members. He said he consulted the Corporation Counsel for an opinion as to the jurisdiction and the powers of this Board to make such an investigation and is referring his opinion to the Steering Committee for action. The letter follows:

CITY OF STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT  
Department of Law

April 6, 1964

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

Dear Ron:

You ask "whether or not the Board of Representatives has the power and/or jurisdiction to conduct such an investigation". The investigation referred to is, of course, the suggestion of the NAACP concerning the administration of the Stamford Housing Authority.

The Stamford Housing Authority was created under Sec. 8-40 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, Revision of 1958, as a public body corporate and politic. As such, of course, it is not a municipal agency and it is not per se, subject to the investigative powers of the Board of Representatives.

Nevertheless, since the statutes in creating the authority specifically provide that each housing project of an authority is subject to "the planning, zoning, sanitary and building laws, ordinances and regulations" of the city to which it applies, the Board of Representatives may investigate to the extent necessary to ascertain whether the project complies in these directions.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Sydney C. Kweskin  
Corporation Counsel

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. SCHWARTZ said in view of the above letter that any investigation this Board would conduct therefore would have to be subject to the planning, zoning, sanitary and building laws, ordinances and regulations of the City in referring this to the Steering Committee.

Special Joint Meeting of Board of Finance and Board of Representatives  
on 1964-1965 Budget - To be held Wednesday, April 8, 1964 in Burdick Jr.  
High School

THE PRESIDENT informed the Board members of the above meeting and said it is not mandatory that all members attend, but is being held to enable the members to hear the sentiment of the public regarding the Budget for the coming fiscal year.

Special Board meeting to be held Tuesday, April 21, 1964 to copy figures  
as approved by Board of Finance in each member's copy of 1964-65 Budget

THE PRESIDENT informed the members that there will also be another meeting, as outlined above, to enable the members to copy the Budget items as approved by the Board of Finance in their individual copies of the Budget books.

When asked for the time and place of above meeting, the President said it would be held at 8:00 P.M. in the Cafeteria of Dolan Jr. High School. He also informed the members to bring their budget books, as they are in short supply and that directly after the meeting, the Steering Committee would also hold their meeting to prepare the agenda for the May 4th Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

Upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 P.M.

vf

APPROVED:

Ronald M. Schwartz  
Ronald M. Schwartz, President  
Board of Representatives

Velma Farrell  
Velma Farrell  
Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

Note: The above meeting was broadcast  
over Radio Station WSTC until  
11:00 P.M.  
V.F.

