

MARCH 6, 1950

A regular meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held at the Burdick Junior High School on Monday, March 6, 1950. The meeting was called to order by the President, Samuel F. Pierson, at 8:10 p.m.

Roll Call was taken with 36 present and 4 absent.

Mr. Pierson then presented the minutes of the February meeting. On page 148 the words Bureau of Parks were changed to Board of Recreation. On page 133 in paragraph #9, the figures \$330.00 for pipe and \$400 for labor were added. In the first paragraph of page 140 the words "could be thought of in suggesting a way" were deleted and the phrase "will fit in with suggested plans", was added. On page 146 "investigation" was changed to "violation" in paragraph #5. On page 154, first sentence, "The motion was passed" was inserted. On page 140, the first paragraph was stated by George Lockwood and not Michael Laureno. On page 144 Mr. Kelly's statement to read 45-50 cents per hour. In the second paragraph on page 134 Mr. Shepherd wished his words to read 1600 to 2000 instead of 1000. On page 151 the name of Alfred Barrett was inserted in the first sentence.

James N. Mulreed recommended that each correction be put to the Board for a vote as a correction.

Mr. Pierson, the President, then stated that by and large the corrections had not changed the purport of the minutes.

John L. Cameron, 20th District, moved and it was seconded the corrections so far noted be accepted.

Upon motion by Leon C. Staples, 7th District, and seconded by James W. Harrington, 9th District, the minutes were accepted as corrected.

PETITION NO. 56 ✓

From the Red Cross asking for permission to place "the usual outdoor displays on public property".

Leon C. Staples, 7th District, made a motion, seconded by James W. Harrington, 9th District, that the petition be accepted.

It was so MOVED.

I. From the Mayor

1. Concerning new parking meters throughout the city. ✓
2. Referring to parking meters at Center St., Canal St., and Bell St. lots. ✓

The Mayor was asked to address the Board on this matter. The following tabulation was given by the Mayor:

| | Alfco | Rhodes | Duncan Miller | Karpark |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------|
| Total number of meters: | 29 | 42 | 590 | |
| When installed: | 1/21/49 | 12/15/48 | 66 - 6/20/40 | |
| Original Cost: | \$2,175 | \$2,436 | \$37,687 | |
| | Cr. 249 | Cr. 630 | 524 | None |
| | \$1,935 | \$1,806 | | Operated |
| Balance due July 1, 1949 | 1,461.91 | 1,492.18 | None | After |
| Balance due March 1, 1950 | 694.47 | 1,053.01 | None | Nov. 1947 |
| Revenue to City last Fiscal Year | 578.12 | 360.36 | 24,471.18 | |
| Revenue to City 7/1/49 to 1/1/50 | 632.66 | 348.31 | 23,878.68 | |

243

MARCH 6, 1950

Mr. Barrett was asked the following questions:

Is it possible to get the Duncan meters only for the three new parking lots?

Mayor: Yes.

And then replace the broken meters with Duncan meters?

Mayor: Yes.

What is the total cost of proposal to replace all meters?

Mayor: No appropriation needed. Total cost, to be deducted from meter receipts. If all meters are replaced, \$26,406.95.

What is the allowance to the City on present meters?

Mayor: About \$40 each.

What is the estimated cost of shipment and installation?

Mayor: About \$250.

Why were there 169 out of commission?

Mayor: Because the administration was refused the money to repair them.

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, said he questioned the ruling of the Corporation Counsel that the Mayor has the right to enter into a contract without approval of the Board of Representatives since the charter states installation of new meters is entirely up to the Board of Representatives.

John L. Cameron, 20th District, moved, seconded by Ralph Nau, 19th District, that the contract mentioned in those letters be referred to the Legislative and Rules Committee and the Fiscal Committee.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, wished to make an amendment to read "only so much of the communication as relates to meters in the three parking lots may be authorized."

A vote was taken and the amendment was not accepted.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, stated that we voted in February to instruct the Mayor to install meters in the Center St. and Canal St. lots. Through an oversight we neglected to cover the new lot at Bell St. That lot, at the present rate of removing the buildings, will be ready shortly and it would not then be necessary to go into that question all over again since we have expressed our policy in the matter. There is a price of \$80 for each meter. He recommended that the Board allow the installation of meters on all lots now owned and to be acquired by us in the future.

The question was raised that since the revenues from parking went into the General Fund, a new appropriation is required.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, stated the Corporation Counsel had ruled that we do not require any such appropriation since the meters are paid for out of revenue.

Mr. Wise stated he received a letter requesting his opinion on why parking revenue was different than fines, etc. In connection with this he went on to say that when the matter was first presented to him it was in connection with a proposed parking meter trial lease between the City and Duncan Meter Corporation. By the terms of this arrangement, the meters were leased to the City with an

option on the part of the City to purchase the meters by applying the rentals which had been paid in by the City to the Meter Corporation against the agreed value of the meters. Also a special parking meter fund was to be established into which all receipts from the meters were to be kept. Payment is made from an agreed percentage of the net receipts from the meters. The balance of such receipts is turned over to the General Fund. Mr. Wise discussed this particular lease contract with the late Mr. Matthew H. Kenealy, Chairman of the Board of Finance, and also with Mr. Coates and Mr. Harmon of Hadfeld, Rothwell, Soule and Coates, city auditors. They agreed that since the transaction does not require an appropriation for the purchase of the meters because of the fact that the meters are installed on a lease arrangement, that it would be legal to set up a special parking meter fund and to pay the percentage of the net receipts for the purchase of the meters from this fund. Aside from the terms of this particular agreement, there is no difference between revenue from parking meters and revenue from licenses, permits, fines, sewer revenue, etc.

Mr. Wise said that the company relies on the integrity of the officials and the deposits made in one of the banks.

John L. Cameron, 20th District, stated we are acting as agents, then.

Mr. Wise said yes.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, stated the following amendment to Mr. Cameron's motion:

The Board declare its intentions to instruct the Mayor to install parking meters at Bell and South Streets and that we resolve that we approve of his signing a contract for the acquisition and installation of parking meters in that lot and in the lots we own or operate.

This amendment was seconded by Patrick Scarella, 3rd District.

Michael E. Laurenno, 3rd District, stated he thought we should specify that they be the versatile type and not be the kind we have today because that would mean more meters later for the parking lots. We want them in terms of one, two, three or four mechanisms.

The Amendment was carried and the motion passed as follows:

That the contract mentioned in the letters be referred to the Legislative and Rules Committee and the Fiscal Committee, and that we resolve that we approve of the Mayor signing a contract for the acquisition and installation of parking meters in the Bell and South Streets lot and in the lots we own or operate.

3. Concerning ordinance prohibiting sweeping dirt into gutters.

Upon motion of Michael E. Laurenno, 3rd District, seconded by Robert G. Shepherd, 9th District, it was MOVED that this communication be sent to the Legislative and Rules Committee.

4. Concerning the purchase of "Black Swamp".

Jeanette L. Bell 17th District, then rose and stated she did not think it was necessary for a committee to meet with Mr. Bromfield as had been suggested. We passed the motion here 35 - 3 that the Mayor request the Board of Finance to acquire the property. The next move is up to the Mayor.

Hunt Sutherland, 17th District, said the Planning Board stated that it was their intent that the Mayor determine what a fair and reasonable price is, and he thought a competent appraiser should be sent to the property and then the

MARCH 6, 1950

Mayor request an appropriation of that amount by the Board of Finance.

In answer to a request by James N. Mulreed, 4th District, Mr. Barrett stated he was now trying to get someone to appraise the property but there are no funds for the appraisal.

Mr. Pierson stated he thought it should be referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee.

Upon motion made by Michael Wofsey, 1st District, seconded by John W. Cook, 15th District, it was so MOVED.

5. Concerning the contract with the city and American Cyanamid Co.

Upon motion made by Daniel Miller, 16th District, and seconded, this letter was referred to the Legislative and Rules Committee.

II. From the Planning Board

1. Recommending the deference of action on West View Lane until the road is further conditioned to meet the requirements of the Planning Board.

2. Concerning a new street line on Cove Road from the intersection of Elm Street and Shippan Avenue to Weed Avenue, with the optional lay-out between Van Buskirk Avenue and Willowbrook Avenue, contingent upon the acquisition of land under alternate plans at the most reasonable expense to the City.

Upon motion of Robert G. Shepherd, 9th District, seconded by Michael E. Laureno, 3rd District, it was so MOVED that this be referred to the Planning and Zoning Committee.

3. Concerning the change of the name of Blueberry Hill to Blueberry Drive.

Upon motion of Michael E. Laureno, 3rd District, and seconded, it was MOVED that the name be changed.

4. Concerning the acceptance of Sanford Lane and Kensington Rd.

5. Concerning the acceptance of Lawton Avenue from the westerly line of Lot No. 6 to the westerly end of the road.

These were deferred. Jeanette L. Bell, 17th District, made a new motion to accept Lawton Avenue.

At Mr. Patrick J. Hogan's, 10th District, request, Robert G. Shepherd's letter was read, concerning the acceptance of streets.

James W. Harrington, 9th District, stated that all communications pertaining to the Public Works Commission be turned over to the Public Works Committee.

Sherman R. Hoyt, 19th District, stated that sometime ago, in very early December, a procedure was established which was that after the Planning Board has made a recommendation on the acceptance of a street, that it would be given to our Planning and Zoning Committee to check first. To date 16 streets have received acceptance of some sort. Only three of those have been given to the Planning and Zoning Committee by our Board. His recommendations were that the Board of Representatives, instead of passing or confirming the reviews of the Planning Board, give the Planning and Zoning Committee a chance to fulfill their

job. He also stated that it was his understanding that the City Engineer is in no way adequately staffed to check on all the roads. He suggested that from now on we go back to the old arrangements which was for the Planning and Zoning Committee to look at the streets that are proposed and to look into any other real estate that the Board is expected to pass on and turn in a report.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, suggested that the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Committee and the Public Works Committee sit in with the Planning Board and City Engineer and whatever city officials are involved, to make definite recommendations for the acceptance of streets.

James N. Mulreed made the motion, duly seconded, and it was **MOVED**.

Jeanette L. Bell, 17th District, asked that Mr. John Hickey be given three minutes on the floor. The Board granted permission.

Mr. Hickey stated that in the September meeting of the Board of Representatives, Page 114 of the minutes, the Board accepted Lawton Avenue subject to the approval of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission had the road inspected. Mr. Tuttle found the general situation was that Lawton Avenue runs out of one old development into a new development. The portion of the road asked to be accepted was 700 feet at the end. Through a possible misinterpretation by the Planning Commission of Mr. Tuttle's report, to the extent that the acceptance was for 200 feet in the middle of Lawton Avenue, they actually accepted that part of the road which is under six feet of water.

5. Concerning the waiver of Section 706 of Charter to permit the Planning Board to select a Director not a resident of Stamford.

It was **MOVED**, seconded, and **PASSED**.

A recess was called at 10:10 P.M. The meeting was again called to order at 10:25 P.M.

III. Concerning the offer by the Fair Lawn Corporation permitting the City to use the property at Lawn Avenue and Main Street and to improve the entrance of Lawn Avenue. This letter was referred to the Planning & Zoning Committee.

IV. Letter from Curtis, Brinckerhoff and Barrett concerning release of the the City's lease on the Bangall property, was referred back to the Legislative and Rules Committee

V. Letter from Police Chief Brennan concerning our request for a traffic light at Hoyt Street and Strawberry Hill was referred to the Health and Safety Committee.

In answer to James Harrington's question on how much was budgeted for this item, Louise Seeley stated that \$2,500 for traffic lights and timers was appropriated and that there was an expendable balance of \$1,247.36

VI. A letter from Representative Melvin Dichter stating that he would draft legislation granting DeCarlo pension, for the special session of the General Assembly, and if it was not possible to introduce it then that he would have to wait for the next regular session.

MARCH 6, 1950

VII. HOUSING AUTHORITY

James Mulreed questioned items No. 7 and 8 on the agenda, concerning requests from the Town Housing Authority and the City Housing Authority.

Samuel Pierson explained that these requests came following the steering committee meeting and requested that the Town Housing Authority request be considered because a time limit was involved.

Catherine Cleary, 8th District, stated that since March 10 was the deadline for requesting the money for low cost housing, and since there is such a great need for this type of housing, that the Board consider this an emergency time.

The motion was made by Mr. Scarella and duly seconded that the request of the Town Housing Authority be placed on the agenda as an emergency measure.

After considerable discussion about the need for more information by members of the Board on the need for such housing and the cost thereof, Michael Lauréno suggested that the Town Housing Authority was mainly interested to know if the Board of Representatives was interested in securing the State funds. He pointed out that we would not qualify for a period of six months for this money if we do not make our application by March 10.

At the request of Mr. Pierson, the Board granted permission to Joseph Dombroski, Chairman of the Town Housing Authority, to address the Board.

Mr. Dombroski explained that his request did not reach the Board in time for Steering Committee consideration because of the detail involved in filling out the forms and in getting acceptance by the Attorney General. He stated that there is just about another year and nine months in which to dispose of the temporary housing and the low cost units which would be provided by this State appropriation would help take care of some of the low income families now living in the Quonset huts and on High Ridge Road. He stated the Town Housing Authority now has 1200 applications on file, most of them families in dire need of housing. Mr. Dombroski mentioned that he was opposed to extending the temporary housing units for another five years. He also defended the Town Housing Authority as a competent group able to handle a housing project and stated that he felt that the problems of the Town Housing Authority had been aggravated by the delay in securing housing after the war.

James N. Mulreed, 4th District, asked if our consent to this resolution would be expressing only our interest in securing the funds or if it committed us to any program.

Mr. Dombroski's answer to ^{the second part of Mr. Mulreed's question} ~~this~~ was no.

Babette Ransohoff stated that she was disturbed that we have two housing authorities functioning in a consolidated government. The City Authority was established to provide for low cost housing. She asked if the 400 units now contemplated by the City Housing Authority would relieve a good deal of the shortage now existing in the community. She also asked if Mr. Dombroski could foresee the establishment of one authority in the near future.

Mr. Dombroski answered that he hoped that housing would be taken care of by one authority eventually but that the Corporation Counsel had ruled that it was not legal for the City Housing Authority to take over Town Housing Authority responsibility.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, then asked if we would have no further opportunity until September 10, to secure these funds.

MARCH 6, 1950

Mr. Dombroski said probably not, and stated again that the Board would only be expressing its interest in securing the funds by passing the Resolution.

Mr. Pierson read Resolution No. 74

RESOLUTION NO. 74

WHEREAS, the Town of Stamford Housing Authority is applying to the Public Housing Administration in accordance with the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for a preliminary loan in the amount of \$100,000.00 to cover the costs of surveys and planning in connection with the development of not to exceed approximately 300 dwelling units of low-rent public housing; and

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of Stamford WHEREAS, there exists in the City of Stamford a need for such low-rent public housing at rents within the means of low-income families, especially families of living or deceased veterans and servicemen, which need is not being met by private enterprise; and

WHEREAS, such a condition constitutes a menace to the health, safety, morals and welfare of the inhabitants of the said City;

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

That the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford does hereby approve the Application of the Town of Stamford Housing Authority to the Public Housing Administration for a Preliminary Loan in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.00 to cover the costs of surveys and planning in connection with the development of not to exceed approximately 300 dwelling units of low-rent public housing in the City of Stamford; and does hereby declare its intent to enter hereafter into an agreement with said Housing Authority for the local cooperation by the City in the provision of said low-rent public housing which may be required by the Public Housing Administration pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

It was then recommended that this Resolution be studied by the Legislative and Rules Committee, however since the deadline was March 15, it was suggested that we approve the Resolution provided we are assured there is no financial obligation involved.

Louise T. Seeley, 1st District, asked if this \$100,000 was to be given to the Housing Authority and not to the City of Stamford, to which Mr. Dombroski answered yes. She then asked if the conditions did not meet with the approval of the Public Housing Administration would the \$100,000. be returned.

Mr. Dombroski said that the officials would go over proposals as well as the need for this low-cost housing. Depending on their findings the funds would be provided or refused.

Mr. Dombroski pointed out that unless the resolution was passed no action would be taken by the Public Housing Authority.

It was MOVED by Catherine Cleary and seconded that this matter be placed on the agenda. The MOTION was PASSED 34 for and 2 opposed.

Catherine Cleary, 8th District
John Cameron, 20th District, then moved that Resolution 74 be accepted, seconded by James Harrington, 9th District. (see page 165. TP 4 for details)

Sherman Hoyt, 19th District, pointed out that anything we passed that has to do with housing must have the concurrence of the Planning Board and proposed the following amendment to the motion, that ~~Mr. Pierson's~~ motion be accepted with the approval of the Planning Board.

MARCH 6, 1950

Hunt Sutherland, 17th District, speaking against two housing authorities in the consolidated community pointed out that the Town Housing Authority was established on a temporary basis and he therefore intended to vote against this motion.

Louise Seeley, 1st District, felt that the Board should take no action on this resolution in violation of Section 523 of the Charter.

Leonard DeVita, 5th District, said that in his opinion since the resolution comes from the proper office in the Federal Government, it must be accepted on their terms. What we are asking for in this resolution are funds to relieve our low-cost housing needs. The question of site, etc., is for the approval of the Planning Board which provisions can be worked out later. Mr. DeVita did not believe that the Federal Government would accept a conditional acceptance on our part.

Corporation Counsel Wise stated that he felt this Board could declare that there is a need for future low-cost housing, but that when it comes to the development of such a project the Board cannot take action without the approval of the Planning Board.

Michael Wofsey, 1st District, MOVED, seconded by James Mulreed, 4th District, that action be deferred until Mr. Wise could study it further.

VIII. Letter from Leon Tuttle concerning Cowing Place.

Upon MOTION of James Mulreed, 4th District, seconded by Michael Wofsey, 1st District, it was MOVED that all of this correspondence relating to Cowing Place be sent to the Captain of the Police, Precinct II, with copies of Mr. Wise's opinion to petitioners.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. A letter from Sherman Hoyt, 19th District, was read and placed on file. This letter referred to references made at the February 6th meeting to nonconformance with the Charter in relation to the procedure followed by the Board of Education in making purchases.

2. Appointments Committee

There was a unanimous recommendation by the Committee to accept the appointment by Mayor Barrett of Maurice Buckley to fill the vacancy on the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Board then proceeded to ballot and the President announced a unanimous vote.

3. Fiscal Committee

Louise T. Seeley, Chairman, read the report which is attached to these minutes.

Upon motion of James Harrington, 9th District, seconded by Sherman Hoyt, 19th District, it was MOVED the report be accepted.

4. Legislative and Rules Committee.

Michael Wofsey, Chairman, reported for the Legislative and Rules Committee. He stated that action on the part of the Board would be necessary concerning the Building Code ordinance and that the Committee was waiting for a final draft of the State Building Code which is being revised. Concerning the deadline of April 15 provided for in the Charter for publishing the ordinances, the Committee empowered by the Steering Committee is seeking legislation in the special session of the General Assembly for the purpose of amending this deadline and for the

MARCH 6, 1950

further purpose of striking out the necessity for reading and printing in a newspaper all of the code or ordinances as finally passed. The expenditures for printing would be approximately \$10,000, and the reading would involve over 400 pages of reading matter. The Committee requested the Board of Representatives to authorize the President of the Board to join in the petition containing the signatures of the Mayor, the Corporation Counsel, the Chairman of the Republican Town Committee, the Chairman of the Democratic Town Committee, and the Representatives and Senator.

Upon motion by Michael Wofsey, seconded by Babette Ransohoff, the report of the Legislative and Rules Committee was ACCEPTED.

Corporation Counsel Wise reported back to the Board that a declaration that there is a need for low-cost housing in Stamford would not be in violation of Section 523 of the Charter.

Mr. Dombroski felt that such a declaration would be of value.

It was MOVED by Michael Wofsey, 1st District, seconded by Daniel Miller, to adopt a revised resolution properly drawn up.

The vote was 35 for, 1 opposed.

(The following resolution was drawn up by the Town Housing Authority and signed by Samuel Pierson, President, and Babette S. Ransohoff, Clerk):

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford that there exists in the City of Stamford a need for such low-rent public housing at rents within the means of low income families, especially families of living or deceased veterans and servicemen, which need is not being met by private enterprise, and such a condition constitutes a menace to the health, safety, morals and welfare of the inhabitants of the said City.

5. Health and Safety Committee.

Upon reading of the report by Leon Staples, Chairman, John Cameron requested that a copy of the report be sent to each member of the Board.

Upon motion by Leon Staples, seconded by Patrick Scarella, the report was ACCEPTED.

Daniel Miller, 16th District, made a motion that the question of appropriating \$15,000 to renovate the town hall be reconsidered by the Board. He stated that the rooms were necessary for proper administration of the City's business and that it was our duty to reconsider the question.

Mr. Pierson pointed out that the motion to reconsider must come from the winning side of the vote taken at the last meeting.

Jeanette Bell, 17th District, questioned the Board's right to reconsider this without another request from the Board of Finance.

Mr. Wise stated that since the final vote of this appropriation comes from the Board of Representatives the question can be brought up again.

Catherine Cleary, 8th District, referred to Section 707.1 of the Charter. She said that since a vote on this question might be a close vote the legal right of Joseph Zdanewicz, 13th District, to vote at these meetings should be established. She therefore requested a ruling from the Corporation Counsel before any vote was to be taken.

MARCH 6, 1950

Mr. Wise stated that he would hesitate to render an opinion on this matter without further opportunity for studying Section 707.1. He pointed out that a question such as this requires careful research and study, and requested that on such an intricate question as this he be permitted more time to give an opinion.

George Connors, 10th District, asked if we would not be setting a precedence by raising this question of the \$15,000 appropriation again.

Edward J. Wojciechowski, 2nd District, stated that since this appropriation did not go through, could the Board consider a motion to give the GAR Room back to the veterans.

It was motioned by Michael Wofsey, duly seconded and PASSED that the following resolution be sent from the Board of Representatives to the family of Matthew Kenealy:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Representatives that we express our deep sense of loss in the death of Matthew H. Kenealy, Chairman of our Board of Finance, and throughout his lifetime a valued and devoted leader in our community. His death leaves a gap in our civic life which will be almost impossible to fill and we join with his family in a feeling of great bereavement. And we FURTHER RESOLVE that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the Board of Representatives and a copy sent to the family of the late Matthew H. Kenealy.

Leonard DeVita, 5th District, made the motion to adjourn which was duly seconded. The vote was 22 for, 9 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 A.M.

N O T E S

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Health and Safety | - Traffic light on Hoyt Street (Pet. #23). |
| 2. Planning Board | - Report on Health & Safety Committee. - Report on John's Road. |
| 3. Legislative & Rules Committee | - Two letters on parking meters. Ordinance on sweeping dirt in gutters. Contract with Cyanamid. Lease on Bangall Property. |
| 4. Planning and Zoning Committee | - Fair Lawn property. "Black Swamp" property purchase. Recommendations from Planning Board and Robert Shepherd's letter. |
| 5. Public Works Commissioner | - Wise and Bromfield letters re Cowing place. |

REPORT OF THE FISCAL COMMITTEE of the BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 6, 1950

The fiscal position of the City of Stamford as of March 1 appears to be as follows:

| | Total Appropriations | Appropriation Balances |
|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Appropriation Balances: | | |
| I. General Gov't..... | \$ 806,021.41 | \$ 268,486.36 |
| II. Debt Service..... | 862,286.51 | 273,505.06 |
| III. Education..... | 2,950,940.00 | 1,507,188.17 |
| IV. Welfare..... | 510,871.70 | 186,097.17 |
| V. Protection to persons & Property..... | 1,039,896.24 | 359,667.47 |
| VI. Public Works..... | 1,216,581.41 | 457,992.82 |
| VII. Capital..... | 99,453.03 | 22,985.88 |
| Totals..... | \$7,486,050.30 | \$3,075,922.93 |

Total original appropriations.. \$7,294,086.67
 Appropriated since July 1..... 191,963.63

These figures (from the Controller) show that with 1/3 of the fiscal year to come, the total appropriation balance is well over 1/3 of the total appropriation. The largest item, however, in column 2 is for Education, in which the Controller's figure for appropriation balance is considerably larger than that of the Department report.

We have spent or contracted for \$4,419,127.38 since July 1st.

2. Income to March 1st.

| | |
|---|----------------|
| The Tax Collector's figures for taxes from the current levy, that is for this year are..... | \$4,620,111.10 |
| Back taxes due the Town collected to date..... | 274,816.03 |
| Income from other sources to date..... | 409,954.60 |
| Total income.... | \$5,304,881.73 |
| Minus total expenditures current year..... | 4,419,127.38 |
| Should give us a balance to date of..... | \$ 885,754.35 |

3. Probable income to June 30th.

| | |
|--|----------------|
| The tax levy for this year was..... | \$6,638,019.75 |
| Collected to date..... | 4,620,111.10 |
| Balance due..... | \$2,017,908.65 |
| Of this, 90% may be paid..... | 1,816,117.79 |
| Calculated income from other sources..... | 249,695.40 |
| To which we can add the balance above..... | 885,754.35 |
| Calculated amount available to 6-30..... | \$2,951,567.54 |
| This amount is short..... | 124,355.39 |
| of the balance of appropriations..... | \$3,075,922.93 |

In addition to which, the former Town Government had a continued appropriations of \$205,478.70, which were a charge against the back Town taxes above. It seems possible, therefor, that we may end this fiscal year with an operating deficit.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH & PROTECTION

Meeting held on February 20, 1950

All five members were present

Dr. Brown was also present on invitation

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

The City Health Department has been in existence for many years as an agency of protection and has nothing to do with socialized medicine. It exists in part, because the State Laws demand it, and because municipalities have no other means of maintaining a reasonable standard of health where people gather in ever-increasing numbers in a relatively small area.

Under consolidation, the task of this department has increased by one-third more population and by four times the area for inspection and coverage.

Recently, the Citizens Committee has rendered a report on this department to the Mayor. The Chairman of our Committee, at least, has read this report and Dr. Brown's comments on same.

Consolidation added a burden to this department, and in the annual budget Dr. Brown asked for an increased appropriation of \$17,000 to meet the new demands. To date not one cent has been granted. Standard practice requires one nurse for every 5,000 population. This would require twelve nurses. Yet the Health Department is employing only five at the present time. Contrasted with the school health work, this figure is an absurdity. Standard practice requires a \$1.50 expenditure per capita for efficient health service. We are actually expending less than seventy cents per capita. The Health Department is supposedly employing an engineer for sanitary inspection. This position has been vacant for over one year and will probably never be filled again at a salary of less than \$4,500. A complete coverage is made to both town and city, but adequate services under this hop, skip, and jump program are not possible. We are definitely not meeting our obligations in the town area.

The report of the survey on the Health Department reads like something written by the Man from Mars. In the first place, it is our opinion that only a man trained in the field of public health has any business attempting a survey in this specialized department. He seemed to feel that this work could be organized as an operative department in a factory, and he was perfectly willing to eliminate some of the functions of a health program usually accepted as standard in Connecticut. Through a misconception, he characterized the well child conferences as "infant hygiene" and seemed to think that the doctors and nurses went around giving lectures to poor mothers who don't, he said, exist in Stamford. He poo-hoed health statistics and would eliminate them entirely. He did not seem to sense that this is the best measure of the success or failure of the community health program. Finally, he would make the Commissioner a straw boss and tie him in his office. He eliminated his car entirely, and this with other eliminations totaled \$7,500. The objectives of a public health program could be easily obtained by writing the State Health Commissioner or the Department at Yale.

It seems to your Committee that a very important department in our consolidated government is being shamefully abused and neglected.

We therefore recommend the following:

(1) We call for an immediate resurvey of the Department of Health by specialists in that field. We believe an essential injustice has been done and needs correction.

(2) We insist on a review of the requested appropriations for this department and that at least \$4,500 be found for the employment of an engineer.

(3) We believe that we have every right to demand a health department commensurate with the needs of Stamford.

Respectfully submitted,

Leon C. Staples
Ed. J. Wojciechowski
Ralph C. Nau
John W. Cook
Patrick Scarella