

PUBLIC HEARING AND SPECIAL MEETING  
OF BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERN-  
ING REPORT OF THE EIGHTH CHARTER  
REVISION COMMISSION - FEBRUARY 25, 1965

4222

A Special Meeting and Public Hearing, of the 8th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held Thursday, February 25, 1965 at 8:20 P.M. in the Auditorium of Dolan Jr. High School, in response to a "Call" issued by the President, Alan H. Ketcham, mailed to all Board members on February 18, 1965.

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

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 22 present and 18 absent at the calling of the roll. However, Mr. Band arrived later in the meeting, changing the roll call to <sup>24</sup>23 present and <sup>16</sup>17 absent.

The absent members were: Edwin Lindstrom, Chester Walajtys, Robert Durso, Vincent Caporizzo, Dominick Vivona, Michael Zezima, ~~William Caporizzo~~, Daniel Remling, John Morris, William Murphy, Stanley Kulowiec, Edward Dombroski, Carmine Longo, Jennie Esposito, William Hearing, Judith Sutherland and J. Keggi.

The President declared a quorum to be present. He then read the following "Call" of the meeting:

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Municipal Office Building  
429 Atlantic Street  
Stamford, Connecticut

February 18, 1965

TO: ALL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
FROM: ALAN H. KETCHAM, PRESIDENT  
SUBJECT: SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING ON REPORT OF 8TH CHARTER  
REVISION COMMISSION TO BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

-----  
I, ALAN H. KETCHAM, President of the 8th 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 o'clock P.M., on THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1965, for the following purpose:

- (1) To hold a PUBLIC HEARING to consider the report of the 8th Charter Revision Commission;
- (2) To hear speakers for and against the recommendations of said Commission;

**Special Meeting & Public Hearing held Thursday,  
February 25, 1965**

(3) To consider action on the same.

vf

**ALAN H. KETCHAM, President  
BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES**

\*\*\*\*\*

THE PRESIDENT announced a notice of this public hearing was published in the Stamford Advocate on February 18, 1965 and again on February 19, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT said the "ground rules" of this hearing, which is also a special meeting of the Board, have been established and they are that five minutes will be allowed each speaker, who is requested to identify himself by giving his name, and the organization which he represents, if any, to Mrs. Farrell, the Administrative Assistant of the Board.

THE PRESIDENT turned the portion of the meeting concerned with the public hearing over to the Chairman of the Charter Revision Committee, Mr. George Connors, 10th District Representative.

FIRST PORTION OF MEETING - PUBLIC HEARING - to hear speakers for and against

the recommendations presented by the 8th Charter Revision Commission to the

Board of Representatives on February 1, 1965

MR. CONNORS asked the speakers to please present their remarks in writing, if they have copies. He said in order to allow everyone a chance to be heard, he would allow the speakers five minutes and after all speakers have been heard, they can return to finish their remarks if unable to do so during their allotted time.

MR. CONNORS requested the first speaker to come forward.

FIRST SPEAKER: Attorney Louis J. Iacovo, 13 Rachelle Avenue

Concerning Chapter 11, Section 111, to add the following:

**"The Mayor shall be ex officio a voting member of the Board of Finance."**

MR. IACOVO spoke in opposition to the above proposal. He said there could be a violation of the Charter as it presently exists, or a violation of the State Statutes. He called the members' attention to the wording which means that the Mayor by reason of his office shall be a voting member of the Board of Finance. He called attention to the General Statutes of the State of Connecticut (1958 rev.) Sec. 9-167A where it states that "the maximum number of members any board, commission, committee or similar body of the state or any political subdivision thereof, whether elective or appointive, except any such board, commission, committee or body whose members are elected on the basis of a geographical division of the state or such political subdivision may be members of the same political party as specified in the following table:

Special Meeting and Public Hearing held  
Thursday, February 25, 1965

4224

Total membership:

6

The Maximum from one body shall be:

4

Mr. Iacovo said the Board of Finance is composed of six members, and if the Mayor becomes a voting member of the Board of Finance, it will ostensibly violate that because he is not a member of the Board, because it is a six-member Board and you will then have five people from the same party voting on the budget, provisions of the Charter, etc. He said in his opinion this would therefore be in violation of Sec. 9-167A of the General Statutes.

MR. IACOVO said there is another section of the Charter which states that no person shall hold two positions in the City government and the only exception to that provision is members of the Board of Selectmen, who can hold two positions. He said if the Mayor becomes a voting member of the Board of Finance, even though he is not a member of the Board of Finance, he will then be holding two positions.

Also, under Sec. 619. Additional Appropriations, he pointed out that approval of these requests shall require "the affirmative vote of five members of the Board of Finance..." and if the setup is as it now is, this would result, perhaps in five Republicans against two Democrats voting on emergency appropriations and if the Mayor had four captive members of the Board of Finance, they could railroad through the Board of Finance any emergency appropriation they wanted without the minority party having a word to say about it. He said this provision of the Charter was set up so that the minority party would have a say in any emergency appropriation.

Concerning Tie Votes

Mr. Iacovo called attention to Sec. 613. Budget approval by the Board of Finance, where it states: "...Any item not rejected or revised by the Board of Finance shall be deemed approved by it..." and if there is a tie vote on the Board of Finance, it is deemed approved and then goes to the Board of Representatives, so there is nothing to worry about in there being a tie vote.

SECOND SPEAKER: Thomas Kernan, Vice President, 16th District Democratic Club

Chapter 10, Section 102, concerning increasing term of office  
of the Mayor from two to four years

MR. KERNAN spoke in favor of a four year term of office for the Mayor. He said after election the Mayor has only one year to learn his job and then he must spend the last year running for reelection which hardly creates an efficient system of government. Also, he pointed out that a newly elected Mayor inherits the budget of his predecessor and if he should be defeated in running for reelection he, in turn, leaves his budget for his successor, thus leaving the electorate trying to evaluate the administration of a budget by a man who did not originate it. Third, he said there is little possibility for intelligent evaluation of the ability of a man who has to administer a budget which he may not be responsible for. He said his organization believes it would make for a much more intelligent campaign if a man had three years in which to carry out his own program, because he finds himself dealing with Boards and Commissions who have a considerably longer term of office, which hardly enhances the prestige of the office of Mayor and very often encourages a Board to wait out the election of a Mayor and see whether or not he will be reelected. Also, despite the past ruling of the Corporation Counsel on the legality of Sec. 2 of the 10th Article of the Constitution,

is the fact that there never has been a test of this particular area of the Constitution by the Courts, and it also is a fact that the Town of Wallingford---(the City of Wallingford) has elected a Mayor to a four year term, without this Court test. He said they feel the City of Stamford can follow the example set by Wallingford and elect a Mayor for a term of four years and they feel certain that if and when a Court test should come that the said Article shall not be found to apply.

THIRD SPEAKER: Rev. Paul DuBois, 18 Janes Lane

Concerning Chapter 10, Section 102, to increase term of office of Mayor from two to four years

REV. DUBOIS said he favored keeping the present two year term for the Mayor and that the better way to provide for a four year term is that a Mayor should be reelected after two years, during which time he has proved to the people that he has served them well enough to deserve a second term of two years.

Secondly, he said he favors a referendum to which the provisions of the new Charter will be submitted to the voters of Stamford.

Thirdly, he said he believes the Charter should include a penalty for a violation of the Charter. The purpose of the Charter, he said, is to give the rules and regulations for the conduct of orderly government and without any provisions for penalties in the case of violations, the process of orderly government is in jeopardy.

He said it is a sound principle in politics that "one good term deserves another."

FOURTH SPEAKER: Attorney Donald F. Zezima, Haviland Road

Concerning deletion of Sec. 434 - Police Work Week (Passed by referendum held April 2, 1951) Also Sec. 444 - Firemen's Work Week (11/5/57 referendum)

MR. ZEZIMA said he intends to confine his remarks to both of the above sections of the Charter. He said he is speaking both as a private citizen and as Vice Chairman of the Board of Public Safety. He said they had a meeting last evening of the Board of Public Safety and he was delegated to come before this Board to inform the members that the Board of Public Safety thinks that the present hours of work for the Police and Firemen as set forth in the present Charter should remain as it is. He said they feel that this is a protection for the man on the job as well as for new men coming in. He said at the time these referendum became effective, the Board of Public Safety assured new men that their hours of duty are guaranteed to them by the Charter. He said to now turn around and take this out of the Charter will mean that conditions might change in the future and it is not fair to promise something that you cannot be certain will not later on be changed. He urged the retention of these provisions in the Charter and that they not be removed.

Concerning Chapter 10, Section 102, to increase term of Office of Mayor from two to four years

MR. ZEZIMA spoke in favor of the above proposal and urged its approval.

FIFTH SPEAKER: Anthony Zannino, 42 Merrell Avenue - President, Stamford Fire Fighters Local 786



Concerning deletion of Sec. 444 - Firemen's Work Week

MR. ZANNINO said the previous speaker has already mentioned some of the things he had intended to talk about. He said there are members of the Board who must remember when they brought this before the Board of Representatives in 1957 and when the Home Rule Act first came into being. He reminded those members that at that time the Fire Fighters went out and got over 6,000 signatures to a petition which was approved by the Board of Representatives at that time so that it could go to referendum. He said that naturally when they hear that this is going to be taken out of the Charter and made into an Ordinance, it scares them a bit, considering all the time and trouble that it took not only to get the signatures, but to go through the long involved process of having it placed in the Charter only to discover that it might be wasted effort and they would find themselves back where they were in 1957 before it was placed in the Charter. He urged that this provision not be removed from the Charter.

SIXTH SPEAKER: John J. Hogan, 39 Scofield Avenue, Glenbrook - Secretary, Stamford Fire Fighters Local 706

Concerning deletion of Sec. 444 - Firemen's Work Week

MR. HOGAN spoke in opposition to removing this section from the Charter. He said at a recent meeting of his organization it was unanimously voted to oppose any attempt to delete the above section from the Charter. Prior to the passage of the Home Rule Act by the 1957 session of the General Assembly, he said the Fire Fighters had petitioned various administrations for reduction in their work hours. At that time they were working a 56 hour a week work schedule and their pleas fell on deaf ears and they were ignored in their requests, so when the Home Rule Act gave them the opportunity to go directly to the voters, they made the most of it. He said not only was this shorter work week approved by the Board of Representatives when it went before them, but also by a petition filed with the Town Clerk of Stamford, containing over 7,000 names of Stamford voters in sympathy with their cause. He said after many meetings with the Charter Revision Committee and the Charter Revision Commission and the required public hearings, the issue was finally placed before the voters of the City of Stamford and the people supported their request by passing their proposal by a vote of approximately 15,000 in favor and 5,000 against and at that time it was the largest number of votes ever cast in a referendum in the City of Stamford. He said this took many hours, days and weeks and months of hard work and meant putting on a campaign to show the public that what they were asking for was right and just and that they needed their support. He said by placing this in the Charter they felt it was being put where it could never be used as a wedge against them if the opportunity presented itself. He said this kind of protection could never be given them under an Ordinance for the simple reason that it is much easier to change an Ordinance than it is to change the Charter. He said the arguments presented to remove this from the Charter is that it just does not belong in the Charter and they would like to know why it is felt now that it should not be in the Charter when only a few years ago nearly 7,000 voters felt that it did. He asked the Board of Representatives not to strip them of this small amount of protection that they presently enjoy, but to defeat this proposal now, once and for all.

SEVENTH SPEAKER - John J. Heanue, Business Agent for Teamster's Local

Concerning Chapter 73, increasing size of Personnel Commission from 3 to 5

MR. HEANUE spoke in opposition to this proposal and said it had been defeated in referendum once before. He said as it now stands the member of the Personnel Commission who is a city employee has one vote out of three, but if it is increased to five members, he will have very little say as the employees' representative. He asked that these sections (731 d, 731 e) remain as is and sees no reason to increase the terms to a five year term - that a three year term is long enough.

EIGHTH SPEAKER: Mrs. Euphemia Cushing, Vice Chairman, Republican Town Committee

MRS. CUSHING presented the following recommendations as approved at a special meeting held February 23, 1965:

CHAPTER 10, Sec. 102.

APPROVED, with one change. The group wished to include the Town Clerk's term with that of the Mayor for a FOUR year duration.

CHAPTER 11, Sec. 111.

OPPOSED. A substitute recommendation was offered which was approved unanimously:

"That membership of the Board of Finance should be made an odd number, such as 7 or 9 so that there would be no need for a Mayor's vote to break a tie."

CHAPTER 12, Sec. 120.

APPROVED

CHAPTER 42, Sec. 120.

APPROVED, if "approval of Health Commission" is deleted from last sentence.

CHAPTER 42, Sec. 422.

APPROVED the following substitute:

"That an Assistant Commissioner of Environmental Health may be appointed by the Commissioner of Health, with the approval of the Commission. He shall perform the duties delegated to him by the Commissioner, and shall be a graduate Sanitary Engineer, or Industrial Hygienist, with Public Health experience."

CHAPTER 43, Sec. 433, and Sec. 434.

OPPOSED.

CHAPTER 50, Sec. 503.2

APPROVED.

CHAPTER 52, Sec. 523 (new)

APPROVED.

CHAPTER 55, Sec. 552 (new)

APPROVED.

CHAPTER 57, (as described by report)

APPROVED.

CHAPTER 65, Sec. 650 and Sec. 652

OPPOSED.

CHAPTER 73, (as described in report)

APPROVED.

MRS. CUSHING said there were two others that the Town Committee would like to include as part of their recommendations, as follows:

CHAPTER 43, Sec. 434.

To remain as it now is in the Charter.

CHAPTER 44, Sec. 444.

To remain as it now is in the Charter.

NINTH SPEAKER: Mrs. Dorothy W. Lorenzen, Chairman, Board of Recreation

MRS. LORENZEN said, on behalf of the Board of Recreation, she had hoped that she could come here tonight and say that we agreed entirely with the recommendations made by the 8th Charter Revision Commission. She presented the following recommendations of the Board of Recreation:

CHAPTER 54, Sec. 540.

"The Board of Recreation shall RECOMMEND public recreation policies."

We object to the word "recommend" and understand it should be the word DETERMINE. Otherwise, we agree with everything but the end of the No. (1) item under Sec. 540. The Board of Recreation shall provide and supervise organized public recreational programs in public parks and beaches, public schools, public golf course, and public Housing Authority Projects, and when approved by the Corporation Counsel, in public buildings or properties when such programs are determined to be in the public interest and to meet public recreational needs, except that the scheduling of programs in non-public buildings or areas shall be subject to the normal use and maintenance regulations (and the approval of the City Boards or Commissions having primary jurisdictional responsibility for such areas); we DISAPPROVE of the section in parenthesis.

We feel that this would take responsibility away from the Board of Recreation, so that it could not do a good job for the children of Stamford. This particular phrase tends to subjugate the Board of Recreation to the whims of other Boards. It is then subject to the approval of other Boards. If our activities

Special Meeting and Public Hearing held Thursday  
February 25, 1965

are subject to the approval of other Boards, what powers or responsibilities does the Board of Recreation have? We feel that we should have control over our OWN activities.

TENTH SPEAKER: Lt. Kevin Tobin, President, Stamford Police Association

Concerning deletion of Sec. 434. - Police Work Week (Passed by referendum held April 2, 1951)

LT. TOBIN said he is prompted to say: "Well, here we go again," for the reason that this matter comes up periodically. He said the Stamford Police Association are OPPOSED to having this deleted from the Charter, for the reason that a great deal of time and effort went into bringing this about. He said the reason this was first put into the Charter was because that was the way the people up in Hartford insisted it be done. He said his organization would like to know what merit there is in taking this out of the Charter. He said this proposal of putting it into the form of an Ordinance, as everyone very well knows, it is a very simple matter to adopt an Ordinance, and leaves them with very little security, while the matter of amending the Charter requires that it go to referendum with the city-wide vote to change it.

ELEVENTH SPEAKER: Louis Gasper, President, Municipal Employees Association

Concerning CHAPTER 42, Sec. 422. Assistant Commissioners of Health.

MR. GASPER said his organization opposes this proposal for the reason that this work is now being performed satisfactorily under the present personnel and employees.

Concerning CHAPTER 50, Sec. 501. to increase the Personnel Commission from 3 to 5 members.

MR. GASPER said the last time this was presented, his organization opposed it very strongly and they felt that by adding two more members it would only serve to lessen the employees strength on the Commission, where the employees' member would have very little say. He said there is a very harmonious relationship now with the present three member Commission and they would like to keep it that way. He urged the Board to REJECT both of the above proposals.

TWELFTH SPEAKER: Edward J. Hunt, Superintendent of Recreation

Concerning CHAPTER 54., Sec. 540. and Sec. 541.

MR. HUNT spoke in OPPOSITION to taking away the powers of the Board of Recreation. He presented the following report to the Board:

If these recommended changes are carried out, it will be impossible for the Superintendent of Recreation and the Board of Recreation to carry out its responsibilities to the community. It would limit their jurisdiction of recreation areas and would demote the Board of Recreation to a Bureau. Recreation services would be seriously subordinated to park ideology.

From an operating standpoint, this plan has a serious defect, because the recreation service would depend entirely upon the good will of another department. The Park Commission could, if it wished, by withholding cooperation, strangle the recreation service, or render its work ineffective.



The basic function of the Board of Recreation is the provision of recreation services the year around to all citizens of the community, utilizing both indoor and outdoor facilities and activities. The proper performance of the function involves the organization of the community and its resources. The real nature of the recreation function can be made clear by drawing a comparison between the work of the Board of Recreation and the Board of Education. The primary function of the Board of Education is NOT to build schools and to maintain grounds and buildings, but to provide children with activities which will contribute to their growth and development, in accordance with ideals and good citizenship. Similarly, the effectiveness of a recreation service is to be judged not so much from the standpoint of the material facilities as provided by the Park Commission (playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds) and the manner in which they are maintained, but from the standpoint of activities that the Board of Recreation carries on and their contribution to individual satisfaction, personal growth, and social objectives.

MR. HUNT said he is in favor of a very strong Park Commission, but we also need a strong Board of Recreation. He said it looks as if we have forgotten the children and their needs and thinks we had better start thinking about them.

He said the Board of Recreation in the past ten years has lost their jurisdiction, bit by bit. He said they are considered throughout New England as having one of the best recreation departments, but he is not so sure this will be true ten years from now.

He recalled when the Parks Department was a Bureau under the Department of Public Works. At that time the Board of Recreation was under the Town. He said he saw what happened to the parks - they deteriorated and became a disgrace. He said he does not want to be a part of that kind of a system, when it happens to the Board of Recreation - when they become a Bureau - and this is what it would do.

He said he believes we have got to have an interpretation and clarification of the Charter, which the Board of Recreation has been trying to get for ten years and why can't we get it? Because, he said, the gimmick is that the Park Commission has ASSUMED authority that they shouldn't have and if this interpretation came out you would find that out - there would be no conflict, between the Board of Recreation and the Park Commission, IF we had an interpretation.

THIRTEENTH SPEAKER: Dominick DelGuidice, 312 Soundview Avenue

Concerning increase in term from two to four years of Board of Representatives  
Also, eleven technical suggestions

MR. DELGUIDICE presented the following:

Speaking as a private citizen, I wish to make one substantive recommendation and eleven technical suggestions regarding the report of the Eighth Charter Revision Commission now before the appointing authority for consideration.

My one substantive recommendation is that the Board of Representatives, as the appointing authority under the Home Rule Law, resist any temptation

**Special Meeting and Public Hearing held Thursday  
February 25, 1965**

to seek an amendment to increase its term from two to four years. In addition to seriously endangering prospects for passage of the needed amendment increasing the Mayor's term to four years, such a parallel increase in the Board's term could result in government by the non-elected.

To illustrate what I mean, let us look at the actual record of the last two Boards of Representatives. Of the 40 members elected to the Board in 1961, 12 members did not service a full two-year term. It is logical to assume that resignations in the third and fourth years of a four-year term would at least equal the rate in the first two years. Thus, if the 1961-1963 Board had been elected for a four-year term, at this rate of replacement, 24 of its 40 members --- more than a majority of the total Board membership - - - would have been selected by the Board itself.

In the first 14 months of the current Board's term, five of the popularly elected members were replaced. If this rate of replacement is projected for a four-year term, it would amount to 17 of the 40 members.

It is thus clear, based upon actual recent experience, that under a four-year term, our laws would be made by a majority of legislators who were elected not by the voters, but by the Board itself. This is what I mean by "government by the non-elected".

**Technical Suggestions**

Turning to the technical suggestions, I take no position on the substantive content of the amendments with which they deal. My aims are: (1) to identify internal inconsistencies and errors of omission in the Commission's report; and (2) to point out how parts of the report should be corrected to reflect certain amendments adopted by referendum in 1962. These suggestions are:

**(1) Sec. 102. Terms of Office of Elective Officers.**

The proposed amendment should be extended to provide for subsequent election dates. Otherwise, the Charter would be silent on this vital subject.

**(2) Sec. 402. Salaries.**

"Commissioner of Health" should be revised to "Director of Health," to coincide with the change in title made by referendum on November 6, 1962, with respect to Sections 420 through 423. The term "Commissioner of Welfare" should be changed to "Director of Public Welfare" as this official is called in Sections 461 and 463. Also, the heading of Section 461 should be amended to read "Director of Public Welfare." As things now stand, this one official is referred to by three different titles in the Charter.

**(3) Sec. 421. Qualifications of the Commissioner of Health.**

Since this title was changed in 1962 to "Director of Health," the proposed amendment should be revised accordingly.

**(4) Sec. 422. Assistant Commissioners of Health.**

The proposed amendment might better describe the officials as "Assistant Directors" rather than "Assistant Commissioners" in view of the 1962 amendments.

(5) Sec. 425. Duties of the Health Commission.

References to the "Commissioner of Health" and the "Health Commissioner" in the proposed amendment should be changed to "Director of Health" and "Health Director" for the reasons referred to above.

(6) Sec. 500. Appointive Boards.

If this section is to be amended to include six appointive Commissions not now listed, consideration should be given to also including the Urban Redevelopment Commission and the Flood and Erosion Control Board. Subsequent changes in proposed amendments of Sections 503 and 503.2 would then be required.

(7) Sec. 502.3. Appointment of Patriotic and Special Events Commission.

Sec. 503.2. Boards Having Terms Concurrent With Mayor's Term.  
(New section inserted following 503.1)

As recommended by the Eighth Charter Revision Commission, there is an inconsistency between these two sections. In Section 502.3, the report recommends that each appointment to the Patriotic and Special Events Commission be for five years; while in Section 503.2 it recommends that the terms run concurrently with that of the Mayor.

(8) New Sec. 523. Vote Required by Board of Representatives.

The reference to "Section 523 hereof" in the current Section 529.1, which would become a new section 523 under the Commission's proposal, should be eliminated.

(9) Sec. 560. Powers and Duties of the Zoning Appeals Board.

If the second sentence of paragraph one of this section is to be retained under the proposed amendment, the reference to "Section 525" should be eliminated, since this section is recommended for deletion elsewhere in the Commission's report.

(10) Sec. 620.1. City Tax District.

The Commission's recommendation to delete the last sentence was accomplished by referendum in 1962, and is thus unnecessary.

(11) Sec. 731 (a). Organization of the Personnel Commission.

Whether or not this section is to be amended as proposed, the second sentence, dealing with appointment of the original members in 1949, should be eliminated.

The work of the Eighth Charter Revision Commission was thus complicated by one of the deficiencies which the Commission was to have corrected - - - the fact that the Charter edition from which it worked does not reflect several amendments already adopted. Since most of the above technical suggestions would clarify certain passages whether or not their substantive contents are to be amended, I urge the appointing authority to refer them back to the Eighth Charter Revision Commission.

Mr. DelGuidice said he wants to make it clear that in none of his suggestions is he making any comment as to their particular merit or demerit, excepting that if the Board intends to consider them, they should then make whatever corrections to the nomenclature that is necessary.

**FOURTEENTH SPEAKER:** Mrs. Robert Pearson, speaking for the League of Women Voters.

**MRS. PEARSON** presented the following:

The League is completing its third year of study of the Stamford Charter. We have been guided by several basic concepts of good government, particularly the need for clear and direct lines of responsibility, for government that is responsive to the will of the people, and for equal representation for all Stamford citizens.

We have testified at two public hearings held by the Eighth Charter Revision Commission whose recommendations you are now considering. It is quite gratifying, therefore, to find that two of their recommendations are the same as two proposals of the League of Women Voters - - - namely - - the Mayor should serve a 4 year term and have a vote on the Board of Finance. Both proposals, if adopted, will strengthen the office of the Mayor and help give him the authority he needs in order to govern effectively and responsibly. We would like to go on record supporting these two recommendations.

And, now a word about an omission. In his letter of transmittal, Mr. Cushing Chairman of the Commission, stated the Commission, in executive sessions, had considered changing the make-up of the Board of Representatives. The Commission did not make any specific or even general recommendations along this line in their report to you. We are most disappointed at the failure of the Commission to do so.

We respectfully suggest, therefore, that you direct the Commission to make a further study of the Board of Representatives and present to you some proposals for reducing the size of the Board of Representatives and enlarging the representational districts.

Stamford's Board of 40 Representatives from 20 Districts came into being as a compromise in the consolidation Charter of 1947. We question the need for continuing the use of 20 representational Districts in Stamford. In the interest of fair representation for the future, as well as the present, larger and fewer Districts, which could be expected to stay substantially equal in population over a longer period, should be considered.

The time to take a long and searching look at the Board of Representatives is NOW. The challenges of the present and the future are many. Stamford must meet them with modern municipal methods.



The League of Women Voters strongly urges the Board of Representatives to direct the Charter Revision Commission to make a further study on the Board of Representatives and present to you some proposals for enlarging the representational Districts and reducing the size of the Board. Thank you.

FIFTEENTH SPEAKER: Robert Bundock, 102 Woodside Village, Chairman of Park Commission.

Concerning CHAPTER 54, Section 540. and CHAPTER 59, Section 595., dealing with powers and duties of Board of Recreation, and powers and duties of the Park Commission

MR. BUNDOCK said he had hoped to appear here tonight with our mutual problems solved. This had been our joint, fond hope. You may have heard that the two Boards, or Commissions, have instituted a series of joint meetings whereby we have sat together and tried to iron out problems out which exist between the Board of Recreation and the Park Commission over the matter of jurisdiction. Unfortunately, we have not had enough time which has been too limited for us to appear before you in unanimous agreement tonight. We have gone aground principally on this one item - - the jurisdiction over parks.

"I think that anybody who has been a resident of Stamford for a year, and sometimes perhaps even less, is aware of the question of jurisdiction in the park system of the City. To the best of my knowledge, our research has shown that the Board of Recreation has made a good five appeals or so for clarification of the Charter to Corporation Counsels and the Park Commission has made three appeals for clarification, a total of eight appeals over a period of ten years. Now we see there can be no acceptable answer, because there is a Charter overlap.

"Here is a clarification in the Charter Revision Commission Report, which is based not on the opinion of one attorney, or Corporation Counsel, but on the objective thought of fifteen members of the Charter Revision Commission, based not on hearsay, but on documented fact.

"The jurisdictional dispute is, of course, the main issue. I would like to read to you something which you have not heard or seen, which is the actual Charter Revision Commission thought on this jurisdictional dispute. Here is a little bit of the history of this matter:

Recommendation for changes - Park Commission and Board of Recreation  
Concerning Section 540. and Section 595.

"Your Commission is determined to extend its conversation with past and present members of the Board of Recreation, the Park Commission, with various public officials and through personal knowledge of the conflict of interest that presently exists between the Board of Recreation and the Park Commission. It is their studied opinion, therefore, that this condition has existed since the establishment of the present Park Commission by Special Act No. 47 (session 1955), because this Act contained certain paragraphs designating authority to the Park Commission which overlapped powers already vested in the Board of Recreation.

"When the strong Mayor Charter became effective in 1933, the independent Park Department and the Park Commission was eliminated and the Parks came within the jurisdiction of the Department of Service, which is now called "Public Works". At the time of the 1933 change in the City Charter

there still existed a separate Town of Stamford and the Board of Recreation was a Town of Stamford agency. It continued as such with its own five member Board of Recreation, with an independent budget and major departmental status. With the advent of consolidation in Stamford in 1949, the Board of Recreation continued its independent major status, except that it became a department of the new consolidated government. From that date until 1956, despite the change in 1949 to the present consolidation, there was no administrative or jurisdictional equality between parks and recreation. They were on different levels of government and the root of communication was not recreation to parks, but recreation, major department, horizontally to Public Works, major department, and thence from Public Works to Parks, Bureau of a major department. During these years the salaries classifications of park personnel were considerably below that of the recreational personnel. There was no determination of a park operating budget by the official directly in charge of parks and the Commissioner of Public Works prepared the parks budget."

MR. CONNORS, Chairman, reminded the speaker that his time was up, but that he would be allowed to pick up and finish his remarks after others who had not yet been allowed to speak had their chance.

SIXTEENTH SPEAKER: William C. Kaminski, 21 Friar Tuck Lane

Concerning CHAPTER 54, Section 540.

MR. KAMINSKI said he had not intended to speak, but merely to be an observer this evening, but he did wish to make a few remarks on the above matter.

He said he would like to direct some of the older members of the Board's attention back to 1955 when the Park Department was a stepchild of the Public Works Department, and while the Public Works Department were very efficient in building roads, etc., certainly lacked the knowledge and the ability to develop physical park lands or areas. Since that time until now, he said, there has been persistent and insistent effort to diminish the control of the Board of Recreation over recreational programs.

"I would also like to remind some of the members of the Board that should we bring in any neighborhood in Stamford and choose any number of children and brought them before this Commission, without a doubt 90% of them would verify the need, dedication of the members of the present and past Recreation Department for developing programs which are very good for the City of Stamford.

"My interest in the Board of Recreation and their dedication took place when I was a child and was the recipient of some of the programs that they had instituted in the Waterside area and since then, after becoming a member of this Board, back in the early 50's and taking part in the original arguments pertaining to the splitting of the Park Commission away from the Public Works Department and the inevitable arguments over the jurisdictional lines, I am quite aware of what transpired then and what has transpired as a persistent effort since then.

"I had further knowledge of what the Board of Recreation was capable of doing with the limited amount of moneys that were at their disposal, as Chairman of the Fiscal Committee of this Board. Likewise, I am very familiar with some of the things that the Park Commission has done in developing recreational facilities. The argument seems to follow, and I would like to use analogy in the present argument that, at least the way I see it, in the attempt to subordinate the Board of Recreation, the

arguments all seem - - I'm not trying to blame the present Park Commission - - because I think this may be something that is external to the present Park Commission, however, I get the impression that there seems to be a feeling that the Board of Recreation isn't capable of handling the present recreational program. I am sure that many members of the Board, or members of their families, have been the recipients of the efforts of the recreational programs may feel differently. I have further been impressed with the efforts and the dedication of the recreational department when I was a member of the Personnel Commission. I had the exposure here, again to the administrative end of the Park Department. I had the exposure to the administrative end of the Recreation Department and I would simply end by saying that I think that each and every Board member should give serious attention to this particular section of our Charter - Section 540., before acting."

MR. CONNORS informed Mr. Kaminski if he wished to speak for a second time, he could do so after all speakers have been allowed to speak once. He asked if there was anybody in the audience who has not spoken. There being no further speakers for the first time, the Chairman allowed those who had already spoken to add to their remarks if they so wished.

The following speakers addressed the Board for the second time, having spoken once:

Anthony Zannino (previous Fifth speaker, President, Stamford Fire Fighters Local 786)

Concerning CHAPTER 73, Sec. 731 (a), Sec. 731 (d) and Sec. 731 (e)  
Organization of the Personnel Commission

Also CHAPTER 50, Sec. 501., Increasing size of Personnel Commission

MR. ZANNINO said his organization recommends that the Committee amend the substitute Section and add to this "shall consist of THREE members" and not five members as recommended by the Charter Revision Commission.

He said enlarging the Personnel Commission would not serve any just purpose and as a matter of fact his organization thinks it would hinder their operation, because there are many instances where it is much more efficient to have a small Commission work than to overload it with more members, because then you have more differences of opinion and it becomes a lot harder for them to arrive at a fair judgment.

William C. Kaminski (previous 16th speaker) spoke for the second time

Concerning Personnel Commission

MR. KAMINSKI, said, having been Chairman of the Personnel Commission for four years and having achieved some experience in this field, he would like to make a few remarks on this subject.

"I am completely in favor of some of the remarks that have been expressed by both the Fire and Police Departments. However, I think that I should clarify some of the statements. Statement No. 1 - that a three member Board is much better because a five member Board is cumbersome and a three member Board can accomplish a lot more, because with a five member Board arguments prevail and nothing gets done.

"To that statement, I would make these remarks - that I have experienced in the few years I have been on the Board, that with three people that now constitutes the Board, with one being a member of the Employees' Association, that you have two other people, one of each of whom belong to two different parties. In the event, and it is highly possible, that the members of the two respective parties differ, and this could happen quite often, you then, in a sense, have a one-man Board, because then the so-called 'neutral' or employee representative, ends up making all the decisions on the Board and this could happen. I happened to be fortunate in that I served with some pretty good people, but I saw the possibility of this happening - that in the event that there were two people of different political parties and they were in total disagreement, then the Board becomes a one-man Board and that one man would be a representative of the employees' Association. I think you should give serious consideration to what I have said, as a speak from experience.

MR. CONNORS: "Thank you, Mr. Kaminski."

John J. Hogan (Sixth speaker, spoke for the second time)

MR. HOGAN: "Political overtones have now been brought out, as far as the Personnel Commission is concerned, and I think that this is a great injustice to the people who have served on the Commission in the past. You know, Civil Service is supposed to protect the employees, and when politics are injected into Civil Service, then it ceases to become Civil Service - it then becomes once again a political spoils system, under the guise of Civil Service. I see no reason for increasing the membership on the Personnel Commission. The only reason that could possibly be thought of would be to make the voice of the employee representative more effective on this Commission. I served four and one half years as employee representative on the Personnel Commission, and in that time I think that any judgement that I made, or that the men who served with me made, did not have any political inference whatsoever.

"As far as the makeup goes of the three man Commission, there were many times when we agreed unanimously on matters pertaining to the employees, or pertaining to the Civil Service Rules and Regulations. There were many times when I was out voted by a two to one vote and there were many times when one or the other gentleman was outvoted by a two to one vote.

"This is the way the Commission operates - an this is the way it should operate, without ANY political overtones, and without any outside influence. I think that to add two more members to this Commission, whether they be Democrats, Republicans - - it doesn't matter what you want to call them - - only, it would be doing a grave injustice to the City employees of the City of Stamford. Thank you very much."

MR. CONNORS: "Thank you very much, Mr. Hogan. Is there anybody else who would like to speak?"

ROBERT BUNDOCK: (Previous 15th speaker - spoke for the second time)

MR. BUNDOCK: "What's my limit this time, George?"

MR. CONNORS: "We'll have to see how many others want to speak first."

MR. BUNDOCK: "Thank you. Then I will take up where I previously left off, when I was talking about 1933 and 1959."



"The Parks Capital Budget as such, at this time did not specifically exist. The Capital construction of baseball fields and other game areas was suggested by the Board of Recreation to the Public Works, with the request that they be included in the over all Public Works Budget, and during this period the Bureau of Highways, the Police Department, the Board of Education, and the Board of Recreation, all had jurisdiction at parks and beaches without any central authority whatsoever. But, the overwhelming weakness was the complete lack of any planning responsibility for parks and beaches.

"It should be noted that during this period - from 1933 through 1956 - the former high standards of Stamford parks and beach maintenance was lost. Through the study of this history of fragmented authority, was referred to your Committee, (I am speaking now of Charter Revision) that with the advent of the new Park Commission, as established by Special Act No. 47 (1955 session), a number of changes should have been made in the Charter to eliminate the overlap of authority, but since they were not made, the conflict of interest mentioned previously, exists to this day. It is these changes that your Commission (the Charter Revision Commission) recommends at this time.

"I would go on to say this: It has been suggested here and before, that the Board of Recreation cannot do business without having jurisdiction over those particular areas which are involved with Recreation.

"But, I would like to point out at this time that the Board of Recreation does this with three other city agencies - the Board of Education, Housing Authority and Hubbard Heights Golf Commission. These recreational activities are carried out in ALL THREE of these agencies - in the school gyms, the housing development and in Hubbard Heights, and the Board of Recreation owns not one blade of grass or has jurisdiction over not one nail of these departmental facilities, yet they get along fine together, as they do with the Park Commission.

"Can anyone seriously suggest, that any City Board, such as the Park Commission, would for one moment, stop the use for the children of this City to any recreational facility? If you examine how many we have built for the children of this City in the last two or three years, I think you answer, obviously, is 'No'.

"The Park Commission wants NO PART of the work of the Board of Recreation - none whatsoever. We simply want equality with the other three Boards with which the Board of Recreation works. When they work with the schools, housing or with Hubbard Heights, their recreation is carried on with the facilities of those Boards under the Rules and Regulations of those Boards.

"When you ask the Park Commission to establish and maintain parks and keep them in good order - let's say take an acre out of the middle, where the Rules and Regulations will be established by someone else - you are asking two women to operate the same house - one is responsible for five rooms and the other is responsible for the sixth room. Has anybody here ever seen that work out? This is exactly why you have been having friction for the last ten or twelve years.

"Ask any businessman here or anywhere else: Can he run his business, say his fleet of trucks, service, painting and such, with jurisdiction of those trucks divided by giving someone else jurisdiction over the left front wheel? To say that this particular thing will be taken care of by someone else. It becomes an administrative nightmare. It is completely an administrative nightmare.

Special Meeting and Public Hearing held Thursday  
February 25, 1965

"I will assure you again that the Park Commission has NO desire to take over one single iota of the work done by the Board of Recreation - we have all the work that we can handle, as you people very well know. We don't want to take over basketball, volleyball, or softball, or any more than Hubbard Heights wants to take over golf administration from their junior tournaments, or the Board of Education wants to take volleyball away from them.

"We simply want a CLARIFICATION, the same clarification that both Boards have been seeking these many, many years. As I see it, your Committee tonight, and the Board of Representatives, has but two alternatives, as I say, as I see it - either to accept the judgment of this fifteen person Charter Revision Commission - a judgment which was made on investigations into all circumstances, both in this City and in others - and to adopt those changes, and thus to eliminate the long sought after clarification (which both Boards have looked for) - or you can reject the proposed changes, and in doing so, return the park and recreation situation back to the same two women in one kitchen thing that we have had for the last ten years.

"So, at long last, we have to have a clarification. If it isn't done now, by this Board, I don't know how on earth it will ever be done. Thank you."

MR. CONNORS: "Thank you, Mr. Bundock."

EDWARD J. HUNT: (Previous 12th speaker - spoke for the second time)

MR. HUNT: "I was very interested to learn that this Commission went very deeply into the history of this and investigated it so thoroughly. I think you people know that I've been Superintendent of Recreation for forty years. I've been on advisory boards of the National Recreation Association for New England. I've been called into other cities to help set up programs. I've taken part in national contests and chaired a lot of committees. I've got an honor from the National Recreation Association for outstanding work in New England. You people know what I've done with the Little League. You people know the leadership I've given the Babe Ruth League. You people know that I put Stamford on the map with the Girls' Softball League. You people know that I've led everything pertaining to recreation in this City.

"Now, why wasn't I consulted? We didn't even know that this was going to be announced until we read it in the paper. Now, gentlemen, where are they getting this expert information? I read in the paper of a meeting that the Community Council had and they wanted to have a Committee on conservation, and immediately the Park Commission says: 'What's the matter with the amateurs? Let the professionals do it.'

"I'm the recreational professional for Stamford and I question anybody in Stamford to state that I haven't done a good job for Stamford - and, if I haven't I'll resign. If this were to pass, it would be a vote of no confidence in me and the City of Stamford and I would get through. You people - - I don't have to tell you - - if you've been in Stamford over ten years - - for the past ten years I've been frustrated and handicapped by this bickering. But, up until then and even now -- give us a budget - let the Mayor give me a budget - the kind of a budget that I should have. Look what the parks have been getting. Sure, they are in a good position now, because for the past ten years they've been getting the money. And they say: 'Well - look what the parks are doing. Recreation isn't doing much.' And, we haven't been able to do much, because we didn't get a good budget. Give us a good budget and we'll do a good job for the children of Stamford."

MR. CONNORS: "Thank you, Eddie."

MR. CONNORS asked if there were any further speakers. There being no further speakers, the public hearing part of the meeting came to an end, and he turned the meeting over to the President of the Board of Representatives.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. KETCHAM: "The public hearing on the proposals from the 8th Charter Revision Commission have now been heard. You have heard speakers both for and against the proposals for Charter amendments. Our Agenda states in portion # (3) 'To consider action on the same.'"

RECESS:

MR. KETCHAM: "I will now ask for a five minute recess to hold a special meeting of the Board of Representatives, during which time I would like to talk with the Majority and Minority Leaders and the Chairman of the Charter Revision Committee of this Board."

The recess being over, the President requested the members to take their seats.

ADJOURNMENT:

THE PRESIDENT said that in view of the fact that the Charter Revision Committee would need time in which to study the matter more thoroughly, and after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders and the Chairman of the Charter Revision Committee, it would be unfair to the Charter Revision Committee or to the citizens of the City of Stamford to take any further action tonight. Therefore, he said he would entertain a motion to adjourn.

THE PRESIDENT announced that Mr. Connors, Chairman of the Charter Revision Committee, has informed him that the Charter Revision Committee will meet on Tuesday, 8: P.M. March 2, 1965 in the Caucus room of the Board's meeting rooms, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street.

Upon motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

vf

  
Velma Farrell, Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

APPROVED:

  
Alan H. Ketcham, President,  
Board of Representatives

Note: This meeting was not broadcast over the radio.  
VF

