

MEETING OF THE 9TH BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

4789

Minutes of August 1, 1966  
Stamford, Connecticut

A regular monthly meeting of the 9th Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Monday, August 1, 1966 in the Board's meeting room, Municipal Office Building, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the President, George E. Russell, at 8:30 P.M.

INVOCATION - Given by Rev. Charles J. Sargent, Jr., Union Baptist Church

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE - In memory of CHARLES A GILBERT, former member of Fourth Board and also a former Selectman.

The members observed a moment of silence in respect to the memory of Charles A. Gilbert, a member of the Fourth Board of Representatives and former Selectman.

ROLL CALL:

The roll call was taken by the Clerk. There were 29 present and 11 absent at the calling of the roll. However, Mr. Vincent Caporizzo arrived shortly after, changing the roll call to 30 present and 10 absent.

The absent members were:

Edward Dombroski (D) 3rd District  
William G. Hearing (R) 7th District  
Theodore J. Hoccuzzi (D) 9th District  
Jonathan M. Bennett (R) 11th District  
H. Alton LeBeau, Jr. (R) 13th District  
Leon Zebroski (R) 13th District  
Thomas A. Morris (R) 15th District  
Edwin D. Iacovo, Sr. (R) 16th District  
Lynn H. Farnen (R) 18th District  
Booth Hemingway (R) 19th District

CHANGE OF MEETING DATE OF REGULAR BOARD MEETING FOR SEPTEMBER: TUESDAY, SEPT. 6, 1966

In accordance with Section 21 of the Charter concerning "meetings" the date of the next regular meeting of the Board was changed to Tuesday, September 6, 1966, inasmuch as the first Monday of September is a legal holiday. (On motion, duly seconded and CARRIED by a vote of 19 in favor and 10 opposed.)

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES - Meeting of June 30, 1966 (Special meeting on Collective Bargaining agreements)

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

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

The Steering Committee report was read and entered in the Minutes, as follows:

STEERING COMMITTEE REPORT  
Meeting held Monday, July 18, 1966

A meeting of the Steering Committee was held on Monday, July 18, 1966 in the Board of Representatives' meeting rooms, Municipal Office Building, 429 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Connecticut.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, George Russell, at 8:15 P.M. All members were present, with the exception of Thomas Morris, Edwin Lindstrom, William Murphy and Robert Durso.

The following matters were discussed and acted upon:

- (1) Additional appropriations (7) on agenda for Board of Finance meeting scheduled for 7/28/66 were ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA under FISCAL COMMITTEE, subject to prior approval of Board of Finance. Items in excess of \$2,000, except pensions, were referred to a secondary Committee, in accordance with Rule #10 on page 5 of Rules of Order.
- (2) Proposed Ordinance, being amendments to Article 11 of SEWER CODE, by adding Section 57 thereto - CONCERNING ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS IN CASES WHERE IT WILL OVERTAX AVAILABLE SEWER FACILITIES - (Reactivated in letter of 3/21/66 from Thomas Morris, 15th District Representative. Originally adopted for publication by 8th Board; published 1/11/65; open hearing held 1/27/65; deferred 2/1/65; 3/1/65 and 4/5/65 - See Minutes of 5/3/66, pages 4318-19) (Adopted for publication again on 5/2/66 in revised form; published 5/7/66 - Deferred 6/6/66 and referred back to Committee on 7/11/66)

The above matter, having been in the LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE since the 8th Board and having been revised twice before, was ORDERED PLACED ON THE AGENDA again, in its third revised form, for publication only.

- (3) Letter dated 6/27/66 from Donald F. Zezima, Board of Public Safety, requesting the adoption of an Ordinance to RAISE THE MAXIMUM FINE FOR OVERTIME PARKING FROM \$1.00 TO \$5.00 - Also requesting an Ordinance re ILLEGAL PARKING IN FRONT OF FIRE HYDRANTS, DRIVEWAYS AND RESTRICTED ZONES

Referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Not ordered on agenda

- (4) Request in letter of 7/15/66 from Commissioner of Public Works, George Ferrara, that the Board initiate under Chapter 64 of Charter a resolution enabling them to proceed with the LAYOUT OF INTERVALE ROAD STREET LINE, FROM TURN-OF-RIVER ROAD EASTERLY TO NEWFIELD DRIVE (Description attached)

Referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE, PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE and PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

- (5) REGARDING DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY - Recommended by Planning Board at their meeting of 6/30/66, pursuant to request of Commissioner of Finance under date of 6/2/66 and requirements of Section 2-24 of Code of General Ordinances - (List mailed to all Board members)

- (6) MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS TO CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES PENSION PLAN - (See letter of 5/25/66 from Saul Kwartin, their Attorney) (See Chapter 73 A of Charter - May be amended by resolution of Board of Representatives by a two-thirds vote, being Special Act #463 adopted by 1951 General Assembly) (Previously deferred, pending more information, now presented - See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4726, item #9)

The above matter, having been held in Committee, pending further information, was REFERRED TO THE LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE, FISCAL COMMITTEE and PERSONNEL COMMITTEE - Ordered on Agenda

- (7) LEON N. LAPINE APPEAL from Planning Board's denial of application disapproved on 6/8/66 (Filed with Board of Representatives 7/8/66)

Referred to LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE as to proper form, and to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE for action - Ordered on agenda

- (8) Request from Peter Chirimbes, 12th District Representative, undated (received 7/11/66) for A SURVEY OF RECREATION AREAS AND PLAYING FIELDS TO PROVIDE DRINKING FOUNTAINS

Referred to PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE - Ordered on agenda

- (9) Mayor's letter (dated 7/18/66) concerning proposed RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF REVISED WORK PROGRAM AND EXPANDED BUDGET FOR THE COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM - (Providing for a one-year extension, terminating September 1967)

Referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE and EDUCATION, WELFARE AND GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Ordered on agenda

- (10) Concerning appropriation to purchase voting machine attachment to electronic loudspeaker and recording system in Board's meeting room - (Appropriation in the 1966-1967 Budget)

Referred to MUNICIPAL OFFICE BUILDING "HOUSE COMMITTEE" - Ordered on agenda

- (11) Letter (dated 7/7/66) from Paul A. Plotkin, requesting that LIBERTY PLACE BE BROUGHT UP TO ACCEPTABLE STANDARDS FOR ACCEPTANCE BY CITY, under the provisions of Chapter 64 of Charter

Referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE - Not on agenda

- (12) Letter (dated 6/15/66) from PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, acknowledging receipt of Resolution No. 496 adopted by Board of Representatives at July 11, 1966 meeting

It was MOVED, seconded and CARRIED that the above letter be placed on the agenda and read by the President at the August 1, 1966 Board meeting.

- (13) Letter (dated 7/15/66) from Mrs. Marvin Rakoff, REQUESTING BUS TRANSPORTATION FOR CHILDREN FROM STRAWBERRY HILL AVENUE APARTMENTS, TO BELLTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Referred to EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE - Not on agenda

- (14) COMPLAINT FROM RESIDENT RE NOISE AT POLYCAST (Letter of 7/8/66) - Presented by John Boccuzzi, 2nd District Representative, at July 11, 1966 Board meeting.

Referred to HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE - Not on agenda

- (15) CONCERNING WESTOVER SCHOOL AND BAD DRAINAGE PROBLEM - Letter from William E. Strada, Jr., President of West Stamford Democratic Club - (Copies sent to all Board Officers and all members of Fiscal Committee)

Referred to FISCAL COMMITTEE - Ordered on agenda

- (16) CONCERNING NEED FOR EXPANSION OF FACILITIES AT SMITH HOUSE - (Letter dated 7/1/66 from Miss Patricia Conway, School teacher)

Noted and filed - For information only

- (17) April 1966 REPORT FROM DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE - Noted and filed, with copy sent to Chairman of Education, Welfare & Government Committee.

- (18) Letter (dated 6/20/66) from George V. Connors, 8th District Representative, requesting acceptance of BIRCH STREET for a distance of approximately 300 ft. to Waterbury Avenue

Referred to PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE and to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE - Not on agenda

- (19) Concerning Creation of a new Special Committee to look into enforcement of Sec. 708 of Charter RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST - To consist of 7 members - Four Republicans and 3 Democrats, to be named by the President of the Board of Representatives - Authorized at the July 11, 1966 Board meeting. (To report back to Board in 6 months, at the January 1967 meeting)

There was some discussion of the membership of the above Special Committee, the members to be as follows:

J. ROBERT BROMLEY (R) Chairman  
THOMAS A. MORRIS (R)  
WILLIAM P. CAPOORIZZO (R)  
LYNN H. FARMEN (R)  
JOHN G. FUSARO (D)  
PAUL J. KUCZO (D)  
CARMINE V. LONGO (D)

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

VF

George E. Russell, Chairman  
Steering Committee



FISCAL COMMITTEE:

MR. RICH, Vice Chairman, presented the Committee report in the absence of its Chairman, Booth Hemingway. He said the Committee met in joint session with the Personnel Committee and the Board of Finance on Thursday, July 28th. He explained that the Committee at time of voting did not know the final figures approved by the Board of Finance, the total monies approved may have to be reduced or eliminated, depending upon the action taken by the Board of Finance.

- (1) \$38,435.12 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - For Project School Library Resources, under terms of Public Law 89-10, Title II and Resolution No. 489 adopted by Board of Representatives 4/6/66 (See pages 4639-40 of Minutes and letter of 6/16/66 from Supt. of Schools) - (Copies sent to all Board members)

MR. RICH MOVED for approval of the above request. Seconded by Mr. Murphy, who said his Committee - the Education, Welfare & Government Committee - concurs in approval. CARRIED unanimously.

- (2) \$225,000.00 - BOARD OF EDUCATION - Resolution, amendment 1966-1967 Capital Projects Budget for construction and addition to WESTOVER SCHOOL (Mayor's letter of 6/30/66)

MR. RICH presented a proposed resolution at this time and MOVED its adoption.

MR. MURPHY, Chairman of the EDUCATION, WELFARE & GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE said his Committee DISAPPROVED this resolution by a vote of four to nothing.

MR. HYBNICK seconded Mr. Rich's motion.

MR. WATHANSON spoke against the resolution. He said he does not feel that there has been any major change since this was before the Board at the time the Budget was adopted May 9, 1966 and this was DELETED from the Budget. He said if every item that is turned down by the Board at the time the Budget is adopted, keeps coming back to the Board, ad infinitum, we will always have these coming back again and again.

MR. CHIRIMBES presented a written statement on this matter, in which he stated that he feels that the Westover School addition or ANY other school addition should not be acted upon until the LOW COST HOUSING AREAS have been clearly defined as to where they will be located. He asked if we intend to build houses in one neighborhood and schools in another and then spend a fortune in bussing the children from one neighborhood to another. He said he is opposed to this appropriation until we settle the housing situation.

MR. KUCZO said he also is opposed and thinks the Board is cognizant of the blunders that were pulled on the Cloonan School. He said let them come up with a replacement for Rice School or some other area that will provide schooling for the children in this particular area.

MR. BITETTO said his Committee (Public Works) discussed this problem at their last meeting because they knew there was a very major drainage problem in this area. He said they were told there is money in the Budget to take care of the drainage problem up to the point of West Main Street, but from that point on it becomes the responsibility of the State and they are not doing anything about alleviating the drainage problem, so therefore he is against this resolution.

MR. WALDEN spoke in favor of the resolution, for the reason that he represents an area of people that need classroom space badly and he is tired of hearing "wait for the housing problem to be solved" and "wait for drainage problems to be solved" and in the meantime, year after year goes by while the children continue to go to school under very unfavorable conditions.

MR. FUSARO introduced pictures of the site of the proposed addition to Westover School, showing areas under water and said it should be better named "Westover Pond". He said it is so bad that a safety program was set up where the children would travel along a pathway from the William T. Ward Home and from Stillwater Avenue and if we every do have any rain, these pathways cannot be used and the open highways will have to be used instead. He said these are highways that are heavily congested with trucks and cars and is not a safe way for children to travel on foot to school. He said the Architects noted in their report that it would not be feasible to put an addition there with the present flooding conditions.

MR. ARRUZZA said he is against the resolution.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know if this is supposed to be such a good proposition, then why are the residents in opposition to this proposed addition to the Westover School. He said there has been a severe drainage problem there since 1955. He said Architects have said it would cost a great deal of money to try and correct the drainage problem with no assurance that flooding will not continue to occur.

MR. KELLY spoke in opposition to the resolution.

MR. RICH said he can see he is in the minority, but the facts should be known and he hopes the vote will be based on the facts and not on emotional arguments. He said someone has asked what changes have been made since the Board deleted this item from the Capital Budget. He said the reason given at the time this was deleted from the Capital Budget was that the Supt. of Schools had expressed some reservations about this item. However, now the Supt. of Schools voted in favor of this when the Board of Education had the matter before it and the record should clearly show that. Another matter that was considered was that the racial balance must be maintained. He said the Board of Education has firmly committed itself to maintaining that racial balance. Another concern is the drainage problem, which has not been solved as yet, but for which a great deal of money has been appropriated but not yet spent. He said this sum is very close to a million dollars and is now in the process of being spent. He said there is no guarantee that this will correct the drainage problem, but the best estimate that has been given by engineers is that "this is the answer". He said he will grant that it moves the water further down the line to West Main Street and the answer to that is that the State must dig a culvert underneath West Main Street to hook up with a line that will ultimately run underneath the Turnpike. He said it is true that the State has not committed itself to doing this, but it is obvious that the State will have to do it and will do it when it is fully presented as having been completed by the City of Stamford. He urged approval of the resolution.

MR. CASALE MOVED THE QUESTION. Seconded by Mrs. Lilliendahl.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the question.

MR. RICH said a motion to move the question is a motion to close debate.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on moving the question. CARRIED.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the resolution as presented by Mr. Rich. LOST, with several votes in favor. (voice vote) The President said item #2 on the agenda has been defeated.

(3) \$5,203.20 - PENSION for Fire Captain Harold J. Gillespie, effective July 1, 1966  
(Being at rate of 64% of his annual salary of \$8,130.00, or \$5,203.20 annually, and in accordance with Special Act No. 345) - (Mayor's letter of 6/22/66)

MR. RICH MOVED for approval of the above appropriation. Seconded by Mr. Kelly and others. CARRIED.

(4) \$2,700.00 - POLICE DEPARTMENT - Resolution amending 1966/1967 Capital Projects Budget for SIGNAL LIGHT AT OLD NORTH STAMFORD ROAD AND BEDFORD STREET  
(Mayor's letter of 7/8/66)

MR. RICH said the Fiscal Committee DENIED this request.

THE PRESIDENT said this has also been referred to the Health & Protection Committee.

MR. KAPLAN, Chairman of the Health & Protection Committee, said at their meeting they did not have a quorum present, so therefore will not report this out of Committee.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Rich if he is going to present a motion. Mr. Rich replied that he cannot for the reason that the Committee denied the appropriation.

MR. NATHANSON MOVED that the appropriation be granted.

MR. RICH rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said the proper procedure is to remove the matter from Committee, as there is nothing before the Board and it will have to be removed from Committee to bring it on the floor.

MR. NATHANSON said, as he understands it, Mr. Rich has reported it out of Committee and is therefore on the floor for discussion. He asked for a RULING OF THE CHAIR.

THE PRESIDENT informed Mr. Rich that he believes he has reported this out of Committee, but has reported it out unfavorably. He said Mr. Nathanson is in order by offering a motion.

MR. RYBNICK said it is true that there is nothing before the Board.

MR. NATHANSON said it has been reported out of Committee and therefore is on the floor for discussion.

THE PRESIDENT said it is now up to the Board as to whether or not they will accept the decision of the Committee. He said Mr. Nathanson is in order to offer a motion.

MR. NATHANSON said he has already made a motion. Seconded by Mr. Grant, that the appropriation be approved.

MR. RICH rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said if this is properly before the Board, he would present a resolution to Mr. Nathanson which he must offer for adoption.



MR. LINDSTROM rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said if the Committee has reported this out unfavorably, doesn't this mean that the appropriation will be approved.

MR. NATHANSON said a motion must be presented to be accepted.

MR. CONNORS said he believes this must be removed from Committee before a vote can be taken on the motion to approve the appropriation resolution.

There ensued considerable discussion as to the proper way in which this can be handled.

THE PRESIDENT explained that it is not necessary for a Committee to bring in a favorable report, and in this case, they have reported it out unfavorably, which is their right. He said he would advise Mr. Rich to make a motion that this be denied.

MR. RICH said he will report that the Fiscal Committee reacted unfavorably to this request for an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget and does not favor its adoption and MOVES the appropriation be DENIED. Seconded.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the DENIAL of item No. 4. He explained that a vote of "no" will leave it open to hear Mr. Nathanson's counter proposal and a vote of "yes" is a vote accepting Mr. Rich's committee action to deny the appropriation. A voice vote was taken and the President said the "nos" have it. He thereupon called for a show of hands to clarify the vote, as it appeared to be close. He said Mr. Rich's motion to DENY the appropriation was CARRIED, by a vote of 16 in favor and 6 opposed.

MR. NATHANSON said now that this matter has been reported out of Committee, he would like to offer his motion.

MR. RICH objected and said Mr. Nathanson's motion is out of order. The President said he agrees.

MR. RICH said the vote has supported the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee that this item be denied and objected to another vote being taken.

MR. NATHANSON asked to be heard. He said he did not speak on the motion as he felt he would have a chance to speak on his own motion, as he understood and was told that we are simply trying to remove the matter from Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said the time for discussion is past - that when the Committee brings this on the floor for discussion is at the time they make their report.

MR. NATHANSON asked the President if he is ruling that a resolution cannot be introduced at this time. He said he would like the record to show this.

THE PRESIDENT said he is not saying it isn't in order, but does not think it is practical, as the vote has already been taken.

MR. NATHANSON asked if he could speak on this appropriation.

THE PRESIDENT asked if he wished to bring this up under suspension of the rules, or how.



MR. NATHANSON said he is asking the President for a ruling, as this is important and he has not had a chance to speak on the motion, perhaps due to a misunderstanding as to the President's interpretation as to what was or was not before the Board. He asked if he can bring a resolution on the floor for a vote.

There was considerable discussion at this point as to what the parliamentary procedure can be.

MR. NATHANSON said he would then offer a MOTION TO RECONSIDER the matter. Seconded.

MR. CONNORS objected to this procedure. He said if we allow this on the floor for reconsideration, every time someone does not like the way the Board voted on a matter, they will bring it up on the floor again. He said he thinks this should be forgotten and brought up before the Steering Committee next month.

THE PRESIDENT said he agrees with Mr. Connors.

MR. NATHANSON asked the President if he is ruling that his motion to reconsider is out of order.

THE PRESIDENT said he is not ruling the motion is out of order, but thinks it is not proper.

MR. NATHANSON said he thinks this should be reconsidered and if someone got killed at that intersection tomorrow, it will be the Board's fault for failing to act. He explained that he gave up his opportunity to speak on the motion as he thought the Board was simply voting on bringing the matter out of Committee.

THE PRESIDENT said he believes the Board wants this to go to next month and it can be reconsidered at that time.

MR. NATHANSON said what has happened is that due to a misunderstanding the matter was denied and not kept open for reconsideration next month.

THE PRESIDENT said if every item is brought up again after it has been voted upon and denied, we will be setting a bad precedent.

MR. MURPHY asked if this will have to be done all over again in order to get it before the Board - another letter written by the Mayor and approved once more by the Board of Finance. He suggested that perhaps there was a question on the method of acting on this.

THE PRESIDENT said there was no question - that the vote was 16 to 6.

MR. NATHANSON said he is asking for a definite ruling from the Chair on whether or not at this time it is legal for him to present this matter to the Board for reconsideration.

MR. RICH rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said it is not proper for Mr. Nathanson to make such a motion and that a motion to reconsider can only be made by someone who voted on the prevailing side of the issue, which Mr. Nathanson did not do.

THE PRESIDENT said this is correct.

MR. NATHANSON said he wishes to present a resolution on item #4 on the agenda and wishes to withdraw his motion to reconsider.

THE PRESIDENT said he believes the resolution is out of order.

MR. NATHANSON asked the President if his ruling is that Mr. Nathanson's motion to introduce a resolution is out of order.

THE PRESIDENT said it is out of order, because the Board has already voted on the matter. He asked Mr. Rich to continue with his Committee report.

- (5) \$800,000.00 - DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS - Resolution amending 1966-1967 Capital Projects Budget, New Construction, Project No. 3, for a MULTI-PURPOSE INCINERATOR - (Mayor's letter of 7/5/66)

MR. RICH said although the above item is on our agenda, it is not before this Board for the reason that it has been DEFERRED by the Board of Finance at their meeting held July 28, 1966.

MR. BROMLEY said he hopes that the Board of Finance, by deferring action on this is simply doing it for technical reasons and will not allow the matter to drop.

MR. RICH said the reason why the Board of Finance deferred action on this is very simple and sensible. He said they had asked the Public Works Department to come up with the operating and maintenance costs of this \$800,000 Capital item and that is what the Public Works Department intends to do and will probably present it to the Board of Finance at their August meeting and will probably be before this Board at the September meeting.

- (6) \$321,405.00 - COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS negotiated under provisions of Public Act No. 159 (1965) and APPROPRIATION FOR EMPLOYEES' WAGE AND SALARY INCREASES (Those covered by contracts)  
(Mayor's letter of 7/8/66) - (Amounts to be allocated as set up in attachment to Mayor's letter - Does not affect tax rate; reserve provided in Budget - Collective Bargaining agreements approved by Board at Special Meeting held 6/30/66)

MR. RICH MOVED for approval of the above appropriation. Seconded by Mr. Chirimbes.

MR. RICH said he wished to remark that this is merely a formality for this Board to pass because the Board committed themselves to pass it at their Special Meeting held June 30, 1966 when they approved the City entering into the Collective Bargaining agreement.

MR. HYBNICK said the Personnel Committee also approves this appropriation. CARRIED unanimously.

- (7) \$188,252.00 - SALARY INCREMENTS to 16 Department heads, 3 appointed officials and Classified Employees (White collar workers) who were not included in Collective Bargaining Agreements - (Amounts to be allocated as set up in attachment to Mayor's letter of 7/8/66 - Does not affect tax rate; reserve provided in Budget)

MR. RICH MOVED for approval of the above appropriation. Seconded by Mr. Connors.

MR. RICH said this represents those employees who are not covered by Collective Bargaining Agreements and is to bring their salaries in conformity with the other employees who are covered and that it makes good sense for the unrepresented people to be treated the same as those who are represented by Unions and organizations who bargained on their behalf. He said a small part of this is for appointed officers as opposed to Civil Service employees.

MR. KELLY said he is greatly in favor of these raises, but would like to ask one question - that they say this is for those who were not represented. He asked if any consideration was given to the part-time employees, whose bread and butter costs just as much as the rest of the employees and thinks they should have been given consideration although they had no representation in regard to collective bargaining.

MR. RICH said he believes Mr. Kelly refers to those employees hired during the summer in the recreation and park programs as part-time help. He said they are not included in this appropriation and he would assume this matter of their pay raises is more properly considered by the Board of Finance and this Board in the Spring of the year, when the Budget is adopted for the succeeding summer. At that time he said, we can inquire as to the rate of pay being given these employees and if the Board thinks it is inappropriate, we can increase or cut the appropriation at that time.

MR. BUCHANAN said Mr. Rich may be correct about taking this up at the time of Budget approval in the Spring, but he raised this very question at the Budget meeting and no one was able to tell him what the seasonal people earned in any category. He said it may be possible that these various seasonal people fall into the various "W" categories, but somebody should get the answer to this question because at the Budget meeting, nobody had the answer.

MR. RICH said the Fiscal Committee did get the rates paid to these summer people for the Budget meeting of the Board and did know what salaries these various individuals were to be paid.

MR. BUCHANAN asked, through the Chair, why this information was not given to him when he asked for it at the Budget meeting. He said at that time he specifically said that this was a lump sum of \$200,000 or \$300,000 and no one could answer how it was split up, or how many people were on the payroll for these seasonal jobs and if the Chairman of the Fiscal Committee had this information at that time, then why didn't he come forward with it?

MR. RYBNICK said he just wants to answer Mr. Buchanan. He said after Mr. Buchanan had raised that question, he forwarded all the information that the Committee had asked for to Mr. Rich and if he wants to see this, he is sure that Mr. Rich will be happy to let him look at it.

MR. RYBNICK said he also wishes to state that the Personnel Committee concurs with the recommendation of the Fiscal Committee on this item.

MR. FUSARO said he thinks the manner or the way in which this came before the Board should have been more properly thought out. He said in this list we have 16 Civil servants and we also have appointed officials, or rather, 13 and 3, bringing it up to 16.

MR. FUSARO said in the future, he would urge the Board, the Fiscal Committee, the Mayor and the Board of Finance, to separate Civil Service employees from the appointed officials.

MR. RICH said they are so separated in the attachments to the Mayor's letter of July 8, 1966, the 3rd from the last page is entitled: "Schedule of Recommendations for Salary Changes for 16 Department Heads and 3 Appointed Officials" and there it is specifically spelled out.

MR. FUSARO said in other words, the Board may delete from this salary increase recommendation, any of these they so wish. He asked if this is true.



MR. RICH said if the Board cares to so vote, they may do so and can go through it, item by item.

MR. FUSARO said he is not in favor of voting on each item, but he thinks in the future, it should be more specifically defined and more clearly presented before this Board before any action is taken. He said it certainly was not clear at the time the Steering Committee met. He said he wants it understood he is not speaking to the merits of the motion.

MR. KELLY said he is not against this raise and has always been in favor of raises to City employees, but he does think it is about time that this Board try to have the Mayor and other interested parties, consider the part-time workers, because in the past three or four weeks alone, prices have increased considerably, and these people have no one who can go to "bat" for them as to their rights, as they do not belong to any Association or Union, and have no seniority. He urged that some consideration be given to these people when increases are given out.

THE PRESIDENT called for a vote on the question. CARRIED unanimously to approve item No. 7 on the Agenda.

LEGISLATIVE & RULES COMMITTEE:

MR. RICH, Chairman, presented the report of the above committee. He said the Committee met on Monday, July 25th in the Board Caucus Room, with the following members present: Messrs Bromley, Farman, LeBeau and Rich. Howard Kaplan and William Murphy were absent.

- (1) Final adoption of Ordinance CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND DALENE & RUSSACK, INC., covering land situated partly in the Town of New Canaan - ( To correct an ambiguity in an easement which was given to the City of Stamford by the sub-divider) - (Mayor's letter of 6/1/66)  
(Adopted for publication 7/11/66 - Published 7/16/66)

MR. RICH MOVED for final approval of the following Ordinance, with one modification to the published version: The Map No. referred to is improperly noted as "Map No. 8032" and should be corrected to read "Map No. 8084". Seconded and CARRIED with one abstention (John Fusaro, (D) Minority Leader, 10th District):

ORDINANCE NO. 129 SUPPLEMENTAL

CONCERNING EXCHANGE OF EASEMENTS BETWEEN CITY OF STAMFORD AND DALENE & RUSSACK, INC., COVERING PROPERTY LOCATED ON SLICE DRIVE (TO CORRECT AMBIGUITY IN ORIGINAL EASEMENT GIVEN TO THE CITY BY THE SUBDIVIDER)

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF STAMFORD THAT:

In conformity with Section 488 of the Stamford Charter and notwithstanding any provisions of Chapter 2, Sections 2-24 to 2-27, inclusive, of the Code of General Ordinances of the City of Stamford, the exchange of property between the City of Stamford and Dalene & Russack, Inc. of the following described property:

Property deeded to Dalene & Russack, Inc. by the City of Stamford:



ALL those said pieces, parcels or tracts of land situated in the City of Stamford, and partly in the Town of New Canaan, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, known and designated as Lots 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18 on a certain map entitled, "Map No. 2 of Property in Stamford, Connecticut Prepared For Anne G. Waters, et al", which map is on file in the office of the Town and City Clerk of said Stamford, as Map No. 8084.

Property deeded to the City of Stamford by Dalene & Russack, Inc.:

On the "Drainage Easement" portion of those certain pieces, parcels or tracts of land, situated in the City of Stamford, and partly in the Town of New Canaan, County of Fairfield and State of Connecticut, known and designated as Lots 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 16 and 18 on a certain map entitled, "Map No. 2 of Property in Stamford, Connecticut Prepared for Anne G. Waters, et al", which map is on file in the office of the Town and City Clerk of said Stamford, as Map No. 8084,

is hereby authorized.

The Mayor of the City of Stamford is hereby authorized and empowered to act for the City of Stamford and to execute and deliver all documents necessary to transfer title to such above described property to grant the easement aforesaid.

This Ordinance shall take effect from the date of its enactment.

\*\*\*\*\*

- (2) Approval (for publication) of proposed amendments to Article 11 of SEWER CODE, by adding Section 57 thereto - CONCERNING ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS IN CASES WHERE IT WILL OVERTAX AVAILABLE SEWER FACILITIES - (Reactivated by letter from Thomas Morris, 15th District Representative, dated 3/21/66 - Originally brought before 8th Board and adopted for publication; published first time on 1/11/65; open hearing held 1/27/65; deferred 2/1/65; 3/1/65 and 4/5/65) (See Minutes of 5/2/66, pages 4318-19) (Adopted for publication in revised form 5/2/66; published second time 5/7/66 - Deferred 6/6/66 and referred back to Committee on 7/11/66)

MR. RICH said the above matter is being held in Committee for further investigation and pending an opinion from the Corporation Counsel.

- (3) Request in letter of 7/15/66 from Commissioner of Public Works, George Ferrara, that the Board initiate under Chapter 64 of Charter a resolution enabling them to proceed with the LAYOUT OF INTERVALE ROAD STREET LINE, FROM TURN-OF-RIVER ROAD EASTERLY TO NEWFIELD DRIVE (Description attached)

(Above also referred to PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE and PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE)

MR. RICH said the above matter is also being held in Committee, awaiting action of the Public Works Committee. He said he wishes to note that the Public Works Committee has acted on this and he received word of their action tonight. He said he has no report from the Legislative & Rules Committee at this time.

- (4) LEON N. LAPINE APPEAL from Planning Board's denial of application disapproved June 8, 1966 - (Filed with Board of Representatives 7/8/66)

MR. RICH said the Committee finds this Appeal to be in proper form and in condition for the Board to act on it and it will be reported on later under Planning & Zoning Committee

- (5) MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION REQUEST FOR AMENDMENTS TO CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES' PENSION PLAN - (See letter of 5/25/66 from Saul Kwartin, their Attorney)  
(See Chapter 73A of Charter - May be amended by resolution of Board of Representatives, being Special Act #463 adopted by 1951 General Assembly)  
(See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4726, item #9) (Previously deferred, pending more information, now presented)

MR. RICH said the above matter is being held in Committee for further investigation. He said the Committee had the Counsel for the M.E.A. and several Trustees of the Classified Employees Pension Plan, plus several other interested employees of the City, attend their meeting to discuss this matter with the Committee. He said, however, there are several things that should be discussed with the Actuary for the Plan, the Corporation Counsel, the Commissioner of Finance and the Board of Trustees for the Plan and until the Committee receives information and opinions from these people, it will be held in Committee. He said the Committee has asked for their opinion.

- (6) Proposed Resolution Concerning CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL DETERIORATION - (Presented in letter dated 6/6/66 from Paul Kuczo, (D), 8th District Representative)  
(See Minutes of 7/11/66, page 4678)

MR. RICH said the above item is not on the agenda, but with all due respect to the fact that it was referred to his Committee and to the author of the proposed resolution, he feels he should report on it.

MR. RICH said this resolution, presented by Paul Kuczo, was in regard to the formation of an investigation committee of the Board to determine accountability for the present condition of Cloonan Jr. High School. He said before requesting suspension of the rules, he wishes to inform the Board that he has no action to propose. He said the Committee considered this and finds the subject matter is a proper one for the Board to look into by its own Standing Committee. However, he said his Committee makes no report and takes no position with respect to the desirability of the formation of such a Special Committee.

MR. MURPHY MOVED for suspension of the rules to bring this on the floor. Seconded by Mr. Kuczo. Before a vote was taken on whether or not this matter can be brought before the Board, Mr. Kuczo asked the President and received permission to read the following proposed resolution:

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, in accordance with Section 204.2 of the Stamford City Charter, that the Board of Representatives form an investigation Committee:

- (1) To investigate those branches or agencies of the City Administration that were or are, responsible for the present deterioration and devaluation of the Old Cloonan Jr. High School Building.

- (2) Upon the findings and judgment of the Committee, all those found responsible for the present neglect and deterioration of the Old Cloonan Jr. High School Building should be properly reprimanded and relieved of any offices or duties concerning the City of Stamford, Connecticut.

MR. RICH asked the President to please proceed with the vote on suspension of the rules to bring this matter before the Board.

THE PRESIDENT called for a VOTE. LOST.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE:

MR. BITETTO presented his Committee report. He said a meeting was held in the office of the Commissioner of Public Works on July 27, 1966 at 7:30 P.M. Present were: Commissioner Ferrara, Messrs. Bitetto, Buchanan, Casale, and Longo. Absent: Dominick Mosca, Edward Dombroski, Carmine Longo and Stephen Kelly.

- (1) Request in letter of 7/15/66 from Commissioner of Public Works, George Ferrara, that the Board initiate, under Chapter 64 of Charter a resolution enabling the to proceed with the LAYOUT OF INTERVALE ROAD STREET LINE, FROM TURN-OF-RIVER ROAD EASTERLY TO NEWFIELD DRIVE - (See Legislative & Rules Committee report)

MR. BITETTO said the Committee finds that this survey work which has been done by the Engineering Department is in perfect form and should be brought out by the Legislative & Rules Committee at the next meeting.

- (2) Letter (dated 6/16/66) from George V. Connors, 8th District Representative, concerning EVICTION OF THE PALMER FAMILY FROM PALMER'S ISLAND, by the Federal Government and City Officials (See Minutes of July 11, 1966, page 4666 under report of Steering Committee)

MR. BITETTO said the above communication was noted and filed - no report.

- (3) Letter (dated 6/30/66) from Paul J. Kuczo and George V. Connors, 8th District Representatives, concerning drainage problem on the EAST SIDE OF LINCOLN AVENUE, in the area of #61 LINCOLN AVENUE - (See July 11, 1966 Minutes, page 4665)

MR. BITETTO said the Committee is awaiting the State's approval of funds for paving of City streets and this is one of the items that will be taken care of at that time.

- (4) Letter (dated 6/23/66) from William Murphy, 6th District Representative, requesting a report from the Commissioner of Public Works re CALDOR BUILDING TROUBLE WITH FACING - (See Minutes of 7/11/66, page 4665)

MR. BITETTO said the Building Department and outside engineers have made their recommendations and corrections are being made, which are all subject to review and inspection by the Building Department Inspectors.

MR. MURPHY said he hopes that with all the construction that will soon be going on all over the Southeast Quadrant, he hopes the City won't have this trouble again.

MR. BITETTO said one of the reasons this occurred in the Caldor Building was due to expansion from the tremendous heat that was applied there and the bolts were insufficient to hold these facings in place because of expansion. He said this has been corrected and in the future this will be watched very carefully to make sure it does not happen again.

- (5) Concerning Complaint - FERRO DRIVE - Unsanitary conditions (Complaint by Steve Kelly, 4th District Representative, in letter of 6/30/66)

MR. BITETTO said the cleaning up of the debris and shrubs on FERRO DRIVE is now in the process of being completed.

- (6) Concerning request submitted by George Connors, 8th District Representative, (letter dated June 20, 1966) for acceptance of BIRCH STREET as a City street  
(See Steering Committee report, item #18)

MR. CONNORS asked what happened to his request for acceptance of BIRCH STREET as a city street. He said every time the representatives on the East Side present something, it seems to "die" somewhere along the line. He said last month Mr. Bitetto was on vacation, but he expected a report on it this month and still nothing. He asked what are we going to do with the numerous streets in Stamford that have not been accepted as City streets and yet the City is maintaining them as if they were public streets. He said he thinks it is about time either the City accepts this street, or they don't accept it. He asked, through the Chair, how the City could go on year after year, putting in sewers on these streets, maintaining them and keeping them clear of snow and yet they are never accepted as city streets.

MR. BITETTO said he would like to state that, as noted in the report of the Steering Committee, this is in two Committees, having also been referred to the Planning & Zoning Committee and his Committee has done nothing for the simple reason that they are waiting to hear from the Planning & Zoning Committee first.

MR. RUSSELL said the reason the Steering Committee did this (referred to two Committees) was that it is for information only and does not require any action by this Board.

MR. CONNORS said he is going to read this letter, because if he submits it to the Steering Committee and they fail to take any action, he has to get it on the floor some way, as his constituents expect something to be done on their behalf.

MR. RUSSELL (President) said Birch Street is a private street, but he thinks it has long been known by the members of this Board that streets that have not been accepted, even though they might have received some services by the City, does not necessarily make them a City-owned street. In other words, he said, plowing is done when it's not supposed to be done.

MR. CONNORS said he does not agree with Mr. Russell - that Birch Street is one of the oldest streets in the City of Stamford and back in 1951 the Board accepted all streets, even Atlantic Street, which was never an accepted City street, and Prospect Street and Strawberry Hill. He said he would like to cite a few streets in Belltown, such as Belltown Road, from Burdick Street to Newfield Avenue; Bellmere Road, from Belltown Road to a dead end; Fourth Street, from Bedford Street to a dead end; Flint Rock Road, from Den Road east to Iron Gate Road; Iron Gate Road, from Flint Rock Road to a dead end and many others. He said you have Birch Road which is in the same category and is one of the oldest streets in the City of Stamford and should have been accepted back in 1951 when other streets were accepted.



MR. RUSSELL said for correction, as he happened to be the unfortunate one who brought in those streets for acceptance at that time - the Board DID NOT ACCEPT ALL STREETS IN THE CITY OF STAMFORD, but did accept, roughly, 100 to 125 streets which they had to as a Committee, and had the Public Works inspect each and every one. He said the streets that were not accepted had certain shortcomings and were held up for those reasons. He said at that time, there were roughly at least 250 streets in the City of Stamford which were private roads, or even main highways, including Atlantic Street, parts of Main Street, Bedford Street (which had never been officially accepted.) He said they went through the motions of accepting certain streets which were da bona fide good condition, properly built, with no drainage conditions, and if they were otherwise, they did not accept them and only accepted about half the amount of roads that came before the Board at that time. He said these streets were never accepted as one block.

MR. CONNORS said he thinks it is about time that the Board accepted all these old City streets that have been accepted in "drips and drabs" over a period of years, and once and for all accept them and get it over with as they will probably have to be accepted eventually. He said he thinks it is wrong and unjust to the people who live on these streets, as they pay taxes the same as everyone else and should receive the same treatment.

Concerning item #2 Re: Palmer Family (See Committee report):

MR. CONNORS said he also wants to ask Mr. Bitetto a question, through the Chair. He said he would like to know what happened to the Palmer Family down on Wallace Street.

MR. BITETTO said this property is in litigation and being in litigation, we have no cause to interfere with the Courts.

MR. CONNORS said that is not the question he asked. He said when he submitted his letter, he asked the question why did they see fit to deviate 12 feet when the City had a 25 foot right-of-way to take this man's house when he had a right-of-way coming in from another direction, from Mitchell Street, and, to make matters worse, the mother, father and four children were dispossessed and they had to move into a garage - one room.

MR. CHIRIMBES rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said inasmuch as all these matters have already been referred to the Public Works Committee and suggested that Mr. Bitetto send a letter to Mr. Connors answering all his questions. He said it is holding up the Board meeting and is not on the agenda.

MR. CONNORS replied that he has done everything in accordance with the rules of the Board; it has gone through the Steering Committee and been referred to Committee, and he wants an answer - not a brush off.

THE PRESIDENT said the members are just going on and on improperly.

MR. BITETTO said his Committee makes a practice of reporting on all matters that are referred to it. He said the answer on this matter is, as he previously stated, in litigation in the Courts and therefore this Board can take no action, either pro or con at this time.

THE PRESIDENT said he believes it is proper as stated by Mr. Bitetto. He chided the members for bringing too many items before the Board which are not within its jurisdiction, when answers could be gotten from department heads and are not legislative matters to begin with.

(7) Concerning OUTLOOK STREET

MR. LOCKHART asked Mr. Bitetto what happened to his letter dated June 4, 1966, concerning Outlook Street.

MR. BITETTO said that is being checked into by the Engineering Department and he has no facts to give him at this time.

(8) Resolution No. 498 - Directing improvements by establishment of a Street Line on VIADUCT ROAD, from Larkin Street Northerly to Viaduct Road Underpass, under provisions of Chapter 64 (Sec. 640) of Charter (First step)

MR. BITETTO said he wishes to MOVE FOR SUSPENSION OF THE RULES in order to bring the above matter before the Board, which is an item he had in Committee. Motion seconded by Mr. Buchanan and CARRIED.

MR. BITETTO MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Buchanan:

RESOLUTION NO. 498DIRECTING IMPROVEMENTS BY ESTABLISHMENT OF A STREET  
LINE ON VIADUCT ROAD, FROM LARKIN STREET NORTHERLY  
TO VIADUCT ROAD UNDERPASS (Under provisions of  
Chapter 64 of Charter

BE AND IT HEREBY IS RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CITY OF STAMFORD:

That it is the opinion of the Board of Representatives that the public health, safety, welfare, convenience and necessity require the construction, widening and layout of the highway known as VIADUCT ROAD, and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that it is the intention of the Board of Representatives, with the approval of the Mayor, to construct, widen and lay out said highway, together with any curbing, drainage or other incidental installations required to carry out said project, pursuant to the powers granted it under Section 640 of the Charter of the City of Stamford; and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor be and is hereby requested to direct the Department of Public Works to do the preliminary engineering work, including preparation of surveys, plans, profiles, specifications and estimates of the total cost of the improvement and to submit a report thereon to the Commissioner of Finance, who shall make estimates of the value of any land proposed to be taken and of the amounts of the benefits or damages which should be assessed against or in favor of each piece of property affected; and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Mayor be requested to submit a report thereon to the Board of Representatives; and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that the total cost of work and improvements, as aforesaid, shall be borne by the City of Stamford as a Capital Project, except to the extent that any adjoining property shall be benefited, in accordance with the provisions of Section 649 of the Charter, in which event, said improvements or benefits shall be assessed to the adjacent owner of property or properties benefited thereby; and

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED that all necessary and requisite steps be taken toward the construction and layout of said highway, curbing, drainage and incidental installations in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 64 of the Charter of the City of Stamford.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. RYBNICK said he understood in the Steering Committee meeting that this project would take no money and that monies had been appropriated for this project and now he hears that we are being asked to vote on something that is coming back to this Board later on for an appropriation.

MR. BITETTO said he does not believe any appropriation will be necessary, because there is very little land to be acquired and this will be beneficial to the City and will work out "amicable, one way or the other".

MR. RYBNICK reminded Mr. Bitetto that he just stated in his resolution that the Mayor will come before the proper Boards seeking funds to correct this street line.

MR. BITETTO said that's just a matter of form.

THE PRESIDENT said it could just as well be the other way and not have any funds involved, or having funds coming in.

MR. RYBNICK said he will go along until it comes to the appropriation, because he was told that "we do not have any money for the correction of curves in roads" and until the time that Cove Road is completed, he will vote against this kind of project.

THE PRESIDENT said if anyone knows Viaduct Road, that it is impossible for the sewer project to proceed under there under present conditions.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know how the City is going to get underneath that railroad bridge and who is going to pay for the widening of the railroad bridge, because the railroad is broke now, so he doubts if we can get any money out of them. He said he wants to know if the City is going to pick up the tab on that also.

MR. BITETTO said there isn't any widening to be done under that bridge and the vehicles that are using it will continue to use it "as is".

VOTE taken on the resolution presented by Mr. Bitetto. CARRIED with several "no" votes.

#### HEALTH & PROTECTION COMMITTEE:

MR. KAPLAN reported a meeting was held on July 19, 1966 with a member of the Safety Board, Donald Zezima, Mr. Chirimbes and himself - no quorum was present.

- (1) Letter (dated 6/27/66) from Donald F. Zezima, Board of Public Safety, requesting the adoption of an Ordinance to RAISE THE MAXIMUM FINE FOR OVERTIME PARKING FROM \$1.00 TO \$5.00 - Also requesting an Ordinance re ILLEGAL PARKING IN FRONT OF FIRE HYDRANTS, DRIVEWAYS AND RESTRICTED ZONE - (See Steering Committee report, item #3)



MR. KAPLAN said, after discussion, the Board of Public Safety withdrew its proposal to raise the price of parking tickets from \$1.00 to \$5.00 and, instead, there have been discussions taking place as to better enforcement of the \$1.00 parking fine. He said the Committee is therefore not reporting this out of Committee.

(2) Concerning complaint from John Buccuzzi re contamination of street drain at corner of Harvard Avenue and Selleck Street by Standard News Company

MR. KAPLAN said they have written to the Health Department and received a reply, saying the Health Department has investigated the complaint that the septic system of the Standard News Company is draining into a storm water drain which empties into a catch basin. He said the Health Department made a dye test on July 5, 1966 and the dye came out the same day. An order was then issued to disconnect the septic system from the drain within ten days; the Standard News contacted the Health Department and said the correction is being made.

(3) Letter from William Murphy (dated 6/23/66) 6th District Representative, requesting the Board look into the conditions of the beaches and adjoining water - (See Minutes of 7/11/66, page 4665, item #14)

MR. KAPLAN said he met with Dr. Costanzo, Health Director and with Public Health Engineer Andrew Thorpe on July 7th and requested that the Health Department give a 7 year coliform survey - a report for each Stamford beach, as to whether or not the bacteria count is getting better or worse at the beaches since 1960. He said the Committee received a detailed report, which showed no appreciable trend as to any changes in the condition of our beaches so far as the coliform count is concerned from 1960 through 1966. He said a copy of this is submitted along with his Committee report. He said the report does show, however, that the purity of both Southfield and Dyke Beaches have been and still are far below the other City beaches - in other words, every beach to the west of Shippan Point and on the West Side of Shippan, is far below other City beaches. He said this is undoubtedly due to the discharge of sewage which is not entirely treated by the City and is evidently blocked by the existence of Shippan Point, so that the entire area west of Shippan is much more polluted than the area east of Shippan.

(4) Request for STOP SIGN AT CORNER OF ALVORD & CATOONA LANE (Dated 5/9/66) -  
(Presented in letter from Theodore Boccuzzi, 9th District Representative -  
See Minutes of 6/6/66, page 4728, item #20)

MR. KAPLAN said the Police Department has been contacted on the above request, after repeated requests from our Representatives from the west side.

(5) Request from John Boccuzzi, 2nd District Representative for STOP SIGNS ON STREETS INTERSECTING CONGRESS STREET

MR. KAPLAN said the Police Department has also been contacted on the above.

(6) COMPLAINT FROM RESIDENT RE NOISE AT POLYCAST (Letter of 7/8/66) - Presented by John Boccuzzi, 2nd District Representative, at 7/11/66 Board meeting - See Steering Committee report, item #14)

MR. KAPLAN said he happens to be associated with a law firm which represented the people who recently brought the suit against Polycast, so that he disqualifies himself in this matter and has requested Mr. Chirimbes to report on this matter.



MR. CHIRIMBES reported on the above matter and said he and Mr. John Boccuzzi are having a meeting with Polycast, the people in the area and management of the company, tomorrow evening at 7 P.M. and will report it out at the September Board meeting.

CONCERNING ITEM #4 UNDER FISCAL COMMITTEE - \$2,700.00 - POLICE DEPT. - Resolution  
amending 1966/1967 Capital Projects Budget for SIGNAL LIGHT AT OLD NORTH  
STAMFORD ROAD AND BEDFORD STREET - (Mayor's letter of 7/8/66)

(Note: Above matter also referred to Health & Protection Committee)

MR. NATHANSON said he is shocked, because according to the rules of the Board, when any appropriation over \$2,000.00 comes before this Board, it must be reported on by two Committee, and when the above matter came before the Board, the Health & Protection Committee offered no report, but kept the matter in Committee. He said this traffic light which is no longer working, may leave the City open to a liability suit. He asked Mr. Kaplan to clear up the reason why his Committee did not have a chance to meet on this matter.

MR. KAPLAN said this was referred to his Committee and they held a meeting at which time two members were present and were able to discuss matters which do not require a vote by the Board, but he felt it improper to report out either favorably or unfavorably, on this request because it would require a vote by the Committee. He said Robert's Rules of Order requires that a majority be present for a vote to be made by any Committee and they only had two members present out of five, which is not a majority, and therefore is the reason why he did not report on it. He said he had expected it would be brought up for a vote under Fiscal Committee, which did not happen.

MR. NATHANSON said he feels that what Mr. Kaplan says is ostensibly correct, but he does feel that under Rule #10, since this Board by a majority vote did not waive the report of the Health & Protection Committee, that the matter of the traffic light at the corner of Old North Stamford Road and Bedford Street is still legally before this Board.

MR. KAPLAN rose on a POINT OF ORDER. He said inasmuch as it was not reported out by his Committee, that in order for the matter to be brought on the floor for a vote, it would require a motion to take it out of Committee.

MR. NATHANSON said he has no objection to this being put off until next month, to enable a study to be made to determine whether or not the City is liable in the event of serious injury there, because the light is not in proper repair. He said he feels that this matter is still before the Board and would like to have a report on it from the Health & Protection Committee, to find out just why the Police Department would like to have the light fixed, and to see if the City is responsible for any accidents that may occur there. He said before this Board says don't fix a traffic light on which they have already spent several thousand dollars, that we ascertain the facts before we arbitrarily vote on it.

MR. KAPLAN said he can assure Mr. Nathanson that the Health and Protection Committee WILL report this matter out of Committee at the next Board meeting if it still is before their Committee, unless the Chair declares it not before the Committee, due to the earlier vote taken under the Fiscal Committee. He said they will abide by the President's decision.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Nathanson if he agrees with what has been said.

MR. NATHANSON said he would ask the President to state, specifically, just what he is going to do this time. He said he has already been "hornswoggled" once tonight.

MR. RICH asked for the floor and said that since this matter has come up again, and properly from another Committee to whom it had been referred, he feels it incumbent upon him as Vice Chairman of the Fiscal Committee, to state something which he failed to state before. He said the two reasons why the Fiscal Committee voted to deny this appropriation, and he wishes to remind Mr. Nathanson that the whole thing has been denied by this Board and the whole process must be started over again in order to get the appropriation before the Board.....and the two reasons why the Committee denied this, are: (1) the City - the Police Department feels very strongly that the Lighting Company is responsible for fixing this damaged light because they feel that what happened was the result of a high tension wire falling on the traffic light and ruining certain parts of it. He said they therefore feel it is the responsibility of the Lighting Company to fix the light and they are going after them, and the Corporation Counsel is pursuing this matter to get back the \$2,700 which the City feels is required. (2) the second reason for denying the appropriation, was that they felt that more serious study should be given to alternate division of traffic in that area and that there is the thought that if you just reverse the traffic flow on Old North Stamford Road, that you would have an easy right turn there without the need for a red and green light.

MR. NATHANSON said he would like to ask the Committee if they looked into the City's liability if an accident does happen there while the light is not operating properly.

MR. RICH replied they did not.

MR. RICH said before we jump to any conclusions, he would just like to point out that there are many intersections in the City that have no stop lights.

MR. CHIRIMBES MOVED THE QUESTION. Several members spoke at once.

THE PRESIDENT called for order. He reminded the members that they are on the air and the confusion of voices makes it very difficult for the President to hear and he is sure, also for the public listening audience. He asked for people to await their turn to speak. He said it is true that the matter is not before the Board, but it is also true that Mr. Nathanson got up on a point of order, because the matter had been referred to the Health & Protection Committee, and also, according to the Board rules, anything over \$2,000 goes to a secondary Committee to report on. He said apparently what Mr. Nathanson is requesting is that this be considered later which we will try to do.

MR. NATHANSON said he maintains that according to Rule No. 10 this item is still in the Fiscal Committee since this Board did not vote to waive the report from the Health & Protection Committee, to whom it had also been referred. He requested a ruling from the Chair.

THE PRESIDENT said unfortunately he had loaned his copy of Robert's Rules of Order to Mr. Selsberg and it had not been returned. He said the Board rules say that Robert's Rules of Order shall govern in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with these Rules. He also read Rule No. 10 to which Mr. Nathanson had referred. He called Mr. Nathanson's attention to a rule contained in Robert's Rules of Order where it states that once a matter has been voted upon, you cannot return to it in the manner in which it was just done.

MR. KEGGI said he wished to ask a question about item No. 4 under Health & Protection Committee concerning a stop sign at the corner of ALVORD & CATOONA LANE. He asked Mr. Kaplan where is this stop sign proposed to go - is it going to stop the traffic coming out of the three houses at the dead end of Alvord Lane, or is it going to be just an obstacle to normal traffic flow to the people going back and forth to work.

MR. KAPLAN said this raises an uncertainty in his own mind as to the function of a Committee such as the Health & Protection Committee. He said they are trying not to place themselves in the role of being traffic experts and the question as to whether or not something is needed should properly rest in the expert hands of our Police Department. However, he said, we reserve to ourselves the right to make recommendations to the Police Department, or merely to call their attention to certain problems. He then read the letter in question from Mr. Theodore Boccuzzi, and his letter to the Police Department. He yielded the floor to Mr. Fusaro at this time, as he said he has spoken to him about the need for this stop sign.

MR. FUSARO said this is at the point of the northerly flow of traffic from the Post Road on to Catoona Lane and up towards Havemeyer and Myano Lane is very heavy during rush hours. He said this is the point where the stop sign is requested. He said he feels that all of this discussion is out of order, because it was in the Steering Committee and was referred to the Health & Protection Committee, who acted upon it and now it is in the hands of the Police Department.

MR. CONNORS said he doesn't think this Board should even be discussing stop signs. He said why don't they go directly to the Police Department, who will tell them that if they need a stop sign there, that they will put one there.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMITTEE:

MR. MOSCA, Chairman, presented his Committee report. He said a meeting was held on July 27, 1966 and was an open meeting. He said all members of the Committee were present, with the exception of Mr. Durso. Also present were George Russell, President, and John Boccuzzi, Board member.

#### (1) LEON N. LAPINE APPEAL from Planning Board's denial of application disapproved on June 8, 1966 - (Filed with Board of Representatives 7/8/66)

MR. MOSCA reported that the Committee, after hearing all testimony for and against, studying the exhibits and reading the transcript of the Planning Board hearing, and personally visiting the area involved with various members of the Board, have come to the conclusion that they wish to reject the appeal, thus upholding the unanimous decision of the Planning Board. However, he said, the Committee offers no motion to the Board of Representatives.

THE PRESIDENT asked if anyone wishes to speak.

MR. KAPLAN said he wishes to note for the record, his abstention from discussion or participation in this matter.

MR. RICH asked if it would be appropriate to ask the Committee on what grounds they denied the appeal.

THE PRESIDENT asked if anyone wishes to make a motion for the appeal. There being none, he declared the appeal lost. (applause)



MR. RICH said he still would like to know the reasons why the Committee denied the appeal.

MR. MOSCA started to answer Mr. Rich.

MR. FUSARO objected to this procedure. He said there is nothing on the floor to discuss - the appeal is lost, and therefore there is nothing to discuss.

MR. GRANT said they are proposing that this property be either left as it is, or houses be built on it. He said he thinks the question Mr. Rich is asking is to what possible best use for this land is being proposed by the Planning or Zoning Board. He said he would also ask the same question.

THE PRESIDENT said Mr. Mosca has already given his report and there was no motion on the floor to support the appeal, and for that reason he believes the Board should move on to the next item on the agenda.

MR. RICH said he would like to point out that this is a matter of significance to the City and four members of a Committee, out of a 40-member Board decided this important issue and we don't know on what basis they made this decision.

MR. CHIRIMBES said as one of the members of the Committee who considered this appeal, they studied it very carefully from all angles and came up with this decision. He said, as Mr. Rich says "it was significant" and is he insinuating by this that the Committee did not consider this to be "significant"?

THE PRESIDENT said the Board will move on to the next subject. The audience started to leave at this time, and there was a pause in the proceedings for this reason.

- (2) REGARDING DISPOSITION OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY - Recommended by Planning Board at their meeting of 6/30/66, pursuant to request of Commissioner of Finance under date of 6/2/66 and requirements of Section 2-24 of Code of Ordinances (List mailed to all Board members)

MR. MOSCA said all members of the Board have received in the mail, a list of City-owned properties, and the Planning Board has requested all members of this Board to study same and convey the thoughts of the members as to the disposition of said properties. He asked the members to please notify the Planning & Zoning Committee within the next month and before the September Board meeting.

- (3) Mayor's letter (dated 7/18/66) concerning proposed RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION TO DEPT. OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF REVISED WORK PROGRAM AND EXPANDED BUDGET FOR THE COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM (Providing for a one-year extension, terminating September 1967) (Mailed to all Board members)

MR. MOSCA reported that his Committee met on Wednesday, July 27, 1966 with Mr. Broun, Director of Community Renewal Program and also with Mr. McCulloch of URC. He said all members of the Committee were present with the exception of Mr. Durso. Also present was John Boccuzzi, a member of the Education, Welfare & Government Committee, representing that Committee, to whom this was also referred.

MR. MOSCA said, inasmuch as the Board has already committed itself to this program, it would be foolish not to grant this request, especially at this time, with all the information gathered towards completion. He said his Committee feels that these reports, when completed, will be of great assistance to the general planning efforts of the City.

MR. MOSCA MOVED for approval of the following resolution. Seconded.

RESOLUTION NO. 497

APPROVING THE EXTENSION AND ENLARGEMENT OF THE STAMFORD COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM, AND THE FILING OF AN APPLICATION FOR A FEDERAL GRANT TO ASSIST IN FINANCING ITS PREPARATION

WHEREAS, under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to make grants for the preparation or completion of Community Renewal Programs; and

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 380, passed by this Body on January 8, 1962, duly authorized the City of Stamford to file an application for a grant not exceeding \$200,000; and

WHEREAS, the City of Stamford, under an amended contract with the United States Government, dated July 2, 1965, is presently preparing a Community Renewal Program, in accordance with Resolution No. 380; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and in the public interest that the City of Stamford extend and enlarge its Community Renewal Program for the City of Stamford, situated in Fairfield County in the State of Connecticut; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the Federal contract for a grant to assist in the extension and enlargement of the Community Renewal Program will require, among other things: (1) preparation by the City of Stamford of the Community Renewal Program with all practicable dispatch; (2) conformance of the Community Renewal Program with the general plan of the locality as a whole; (3) provision of the locality's share of the cost of preparation of the Community Renewal Program; and (4) other local obligations and responsibilities in connection with the Community Renewal Program;

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

- (1) That the extension and enlargement of the Community Renewal Program referred to above by the City of Stamford is hereby approved.
- (2) That the financial assistance under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, referred to above, is required to enable the City of Stamford to finance the extension and enlargement of the Community Renewal Program.
- (3) That it is fully cognizant of the obligations and responsibilities that are imposed by a Federal contract for a grant to assist in the preparation of the Community Program, and that it is the sense of this Body that such obligations can and will be fulfilled.
- (4) That the filing of an amended application by the City of Stamford for a grant under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended in a total amount not to exceed \$260,000 to assist in financing the preparation of a Community Renewal Program for the Locality, is hereby authorized and approved.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. MURPHY, Chairman of the Education, Welfare & Government Committee said his Community approved the proposed resolution.

MR. KUCZO said he would like to know what guarantee this Board has that this Community Renewal Program will be finished in a certain period of time. He asked what period of time they contemplate it will take to finish. He said it would seem to him that by now they would have completed their program, but he sees they are hanging on and intend to hire additional staff.

THE PRESIDENT asked Mr. Mosca if he wishes to give that guarantee.

MR. MOSCA replied that all he can say is that Mr. Broun told him that the reason that they didn't have a complete staff, they were unable to hire people who were eligible to do this kind of work and this is why the work has not been completed. He said they told him they now expect to complete their staff and come forth with completion of this work very shortly.

MR. KUCZO said he feels that the community of Stamford doesn't need this Agency and that we already have enough agencies without constantly adding to it. He said he wants to know why we have to have all this duplication of work being done by so many different agencies in Stamford. He said all they can say is that they haven't turned in a report and have about half an inch of what they have done and about eight yards of what they are going to do. He said he wants to know why we are continuing this agency when they can't even complete what they were assigned to do in the first place.

THE PRESIDENT said he understands that Mr. Mosca's report recommends favorable action and is enough to say what is needed. He said he does not think it is up to the Planning & Zoning Committee to guarantee anything.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know just how much all of this is costing the City of Stamford. He asked "Is this for free?"

MR. MOSCA said the biggest part of it is free- that there is no request for money, and that \$15,000 has already been appropriated by this Board and are receiving from the City, in man-hours, money, but not actual money - services in lieu of money. He said they are also getting money from the United Fund and agencies of that type. He said Mr. Broun told him that if there are any questions from any Board member, he would be happy to answer, if they will stop in his office.

MR. CONNORS said he would like to know how many man-hours a year is this costing the City?

MR. RICH said a great deal of these so-called "man-hours" is work that is being done by the City anyway, and is not additional work.

MR. MOSCA said part of the report he has states that the CRC is financed by a Federal Grant covering two-thirds of its cost. The other one-third which is the local share, can either be made up in cash or services. He said our current approved Budget totals \$293,000 of which \$195,000 is a Federal Grant and we have, to date, accumulated \$70,000 in local credits, including \$22,500 from the United Fund, Community Council and Stamford Foundation; \$15,000 in cash from the City, as approved by the Board of Representatives Feb. 7th and over \$30,000 in local staff time and services.



MR. BUCHANAN said he has a question along the same lines. He said he understands that the original application was for \$200,000 and what we are now being asked to approve is to increase this to \$260,000 of Federal Government funds. He asked if this is correct.

MR. MOSCA said two-thirds of that sum would be the correct figure in Federal Grants and, as he said before, our share would be in services, rather than in cash. He read the following:

"The request before you this evening is for passage of a resolution, authorizing the City to apply to the Federal Government for an extension of the Community Renewal Program. Specifically, it raises the maximum amount of the Federal Grant from \$200,000 set in 1962 to a total of \$260,000, the local share, which will not exceed \$130,000 can be made up in continued staff services and is not likely to require any City cash."

MR. BUCHANAN said he has another question. He asked is there any record of just how much of this Federal Grant has actually been expended of the first \$200,000?

MR. MOSCA said he will have to look that up before he can answer.

THE PRESIDENT said in the future, it would be much easier for the Board members, when they get their tentative agendas, that they would check with the Chairmen of the various Committees, because when the members start asking these questions on the floor of a Board meeting, it drags out the length of the meeting and confuses matters. He said, certainly any Committee is open to questions from Board members when something has been referred to that Committee.

MR. BUCHANAN said he would agree, in essence to that line of reasoning. However, if the information is not forthcoming from the Chairman, he believes it should be asked at the time the Board is expected to approve it, so that all the Board members will know what the status is of any given question.

THE PRESIDENT said he thinks it is unfair to start asking a lot of questions of a Chairman at the last moment, forcing him to do a great deal of research during a Board meeting, thus dragging out the length of a meeting unnecessarily.

MR. CONNORS said he wants to know how you can ask questions of the Chairman when you don't know what it's all about. He said the only thing the Board members have is a "Status Report" which tells absolutely nothing. He said it forces the members to ask questions at the time they are asked to vote on the question.

MR. MOSCA said he has a 16 page report which he will be glad to read if the members wish him to do so. He said he felt that since the Board of Representatives, since 1962 has granted these requests, he did not expect such a lot of questions. He said we are now trying to get a completed report, and it seems that the only way we are going to get it is by granting this request. He said they have done all this work up to now and the Board has ok'd it and he thinks if we go along with this that we will soon have the completed report.

MR. CONNORS said it seems strange, but the members have been under the impression all along that the City has no available funds, because the members from the East Side have been trying to get Cove Hill fixed since 1933.

MR. MOSCA said he explained earlier that the \$15,000 involved here was in services and not in cash.

MR. CASALE asked, if we now reject this, are there any strings attached to our URC program - in other words, if this is rejected, does it mean that something is going to happen to URC?

THE PRESIDENT said it has no connection with Urban Redevelopment.

MR. RICH said he would have to disagree - that this is not quite correct, because part of the requirement for Federal monies in a project such as Urban Renewal, is that we have what is known as a "Workable Program" of community improvement, and part of this "Workable Program" is the kind of thing that the Community Renewal people are working on. He said although it is not tied 100% and directly and immediately into the Urban Renewal Project, but it is one of the conditions under which the Federal Government will award money to us for Urban Renewal projects, because then they feel assured that we have looked at the whole community and decided that this is where an Urban Renewal project ought to take place and this is going to happen there.

MR. CASALE said perhaps he should have addressed his question to Mr. Keggi, since he is Chairman of the Urban Renewal Committee.

MR. KEGGI said he believes Mr. Rich is as well informed as anybody on this matter.

MR. MOSCA said he would like to answer the question. He said the Community Renewal program is connected, more or less, with the Urban Renewal program, but is also very helpful to our Planning & Zoning Boards and will be a help, not only to Urban Renewal, but to the entire Planning and Zoning Boards of the City.

MR. CASALE said he thinks we should not act on this until all the questions are answered, because he would hate to see our Urban Renewal program in jeopardy.

MR. CASALE MOVED this matter be held in Committee. Seconded by Mr. Buchanan.

MR. RICH said he cannot see what more can be learned than the answers he presented. He said there definitely IS a relationship to Urban Renewal and Mr. Casale's fears are very well founded.

THE PRESIDENT said he would like to correct this - that there is an indirect relationship, not direct.

MR. NATHANSON said if we do away with this "Workable Program" it only means that we will then need another one, so instead of having the Federal Government paying for it, the City will be paying for it.

MR. MURPHY MOVED the question. Seconded by Mr. Fusaro and CARRIED.

VOTE taken on Mr. Casale's motion. LOST.

VOTE taken on adoption of Resolution No. 457. CARRIED with two "no" votes.

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE:

No report, due to vacations, there was no meeting.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE:

MR. RYBNICK said the Personnel Commission does not meet during the months of July and August and he has no report to present.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE: (Special Committee)

MR. KEGGI said his Committee did not hold a meeting during the month of July. However, he offered a short progress summary of Urban Renewal, as follows:

Fifteen properties were acquired by the Commission during the month at a cost of \$703,000 which brings the total of acquisitions of 154 parcels at a cost of \$6,653,000.

Twelve families, one single person householder and 10 roomers were added to the family relocation caseload during July. Ten families and six roomers were relocated during the same period, leaving an active caseload of 272 cases, consisting of 170 families, 39 single person householders and 63 roomers. To July 25th a total of 250 cases have been disposed of. These consist of 108 families, 45 single households and 97 roomers.

Five businesses vacated during July. 127 cases have been disposed of, to date, and 233 still remain on the active caseload.

Work on all the unspectacular and necessary aspects of the Project continued during the month.

\*\*\*\*\*

RESOLUTIONS:

NAME FOR NEW CLOONAN JR. HIGH SCHOOL REPLACEMENT

MR. CHIRIMES presented a proposed resolution on the above matter, which was referred to the Steering Committee.

CONCERNING SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CONFLICT OF INTEREST (Authorized at 7/11/66 meeting)

THE PRESIDENT announced the members of the above Special Committee which was authorized at the July 11th Board meeting and pertains to Sec. 708 of the Charter:

J. ROBERT BROMLEY, CHAIRMAN (R)  
THOMAS A. MORRIS (R)  
WILLIAM P. CAPORIZZO (R)  
LYNN H. FARMEN (R)  
JOHN C. FUSARO (D)  
PAUL J. KUCZO (D)  
CARMIN V. LONGO (D)

MR. BROMLEY said an organization meeting was called last night, with Mr. Fusaro and himself present. He said he hopes that the entire Committee will be able to meet within a week, so that they can get going and will have some kind of a report at the September Board meeting.



COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER BOARDS AND INDIVIDUALS:

- (1) Letter from PUC (dated 6/15/66) acknowledging receipt of Resolution No. 496 adopted by Board at 7/11/66 meeting (Re: Docket 10464)

THE PRESIDENT read the following letter:

This will acknowledge your letter of July 13, 1966, citing the resolution of the Board of Representatives (Resolution No. 496 Concerning Protect to PUC on Increased Water Rates for City of Stamford) on which hearings have been concluded.

Your letter, and the resolution, will be made a part of the file and will receive the consideration of the Commission in its determination of this matter.

Very truly yours,

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

George J. Griffin,  
Executive Secretary

\*\*\*\*\*

OLD BUSINESS:

Concerning action of Planning Board on Recommendations of Board of Representatives to hire a Consultant on the matter of City Water Supply

MR. NATHANSON said he attended a Planning Board meeting last Thursday, upon invitation, and the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the hiring of a Consultant in the matter of the City water Supply. He said he brought the Special Water Committee report to their attention. He said he thought the members would be interested in knowing that the Planning Board is taking action on the recommendations of this Board.

Concerning Ordinance No. 97 Supplemental - "Tow Zone"

MR. KUCZO said that back in February 1966 he sent a letter to the Board addressed to the President and to this date he still has not received any answers to his questions, nor has he seen anyone brought up on charges, as he stated in his letter. He asked why it is necessary to wait so long for an answer?

THE PRESIDENT said this was referred to the Health & Protection Committee and the Public Works Committee.

MR. KUCZO said there have not been any answers as yet.

MR. BITETTO said as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, if Mr. Kucso would take the trouble to check out on the reports presented by the Public Works Committee, he will see that two months after Mr. Kucso's letter was written, a report was presented and read into the Minutes of the Board. He said, to his knowledge, they are awaiting a final report from the Health & Protection Committee.

NEW BUSINESS:

Concerning Restoration of Veterans Service Center

MR. KUCZO MOVED that a letter be written to the Mayor, requesting that the appropriation that was deleted in the 1966-1967 Budget for the above Service Center, be initiated by the Mayor so that this Service can once more be rendered to the Veterans of this City. Seconded by Mr. Kelly, Mr. Fusaro and several others and CARRIED by a vote of 13 in favor and 8 opposed.

ADJOURNEMENT:

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion, duly seconded and CARRIED, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

Velma Farrell

Velma Farrell  
Administrative Assistant  
(Recording Secretary)

vf

APPROVED:

George E. Russell  
George E. Russell, President  
Board of Representatives

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

V.F.