

April 17, 1957

1553

A special meeting of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford was held on Wednesday, April 17, 1957, pursuant to a "call" from the President, George V. Connors, at Dolan Jr. High School Cafeteria, Toms Road, Glenbrook.

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

ROLL CALL was taken by the Clerk. There were 26 present and 14 absent. The absent members were: William Brett, Irving Snyder, Vincent Vitti, Salvatore Giuliani, Clement Raiteri, Jr., Robert Lewis, Doris Zuckert, Robert Findlay, Paul Plotkin, Eugene Barry, William Murphy, Norton Rhoades, Charles Bradbury, Jr., and John Lilliendahl, Jr.

It was MOVED and SECONDED and CARRIED to dispense with the reading of the "Call" which was as follows:

BOARD OF REPRESENTATIVES  
STAMFORD, CONN.

April 12, 1957

I, George V. Connors, President of the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford, pursuant to Section 202 of the Stamford Charter, hereby call a SPECIAL MEETING of said Board of Representatives, for

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1957

at the Walter Dolan Jr. High  
School Cafeteria, Toms Road,  
Glenbrook, at 8:00 P.M.

for the following purposes:

- (1) To receive the OPERATING and CAPITAL BUDGETS for the fiscal year 1957-1958 as transmitted by the Board of Finance.

(Note: Please bring your copies of the Operating and Capital Budgets with you, as they are in short supply)

- (2) To consider a request for an amendment to the 1956-1957 Capital Projects Budget, to authorize an increase in the amount appropriated for the HEALTH BUILDING from \$165,000 to \$233,087.60, as requested in the Mayor's letter dated February 5, 1957. (Approved by the Board of Finance at their meeting held March 25, 1957)

George V. Connors  
President  
Board of Representatives

vf

Re: Health Building - Request for additional appropriation

MR. FREDERICKS MOVED that the Board take up the Health Building matter first.

2221

April 17, 1957

Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED by unanimous vote.

MR. FREDERICKS: "Several people have spoken to me on this Health Building proposition. What we are being asked to do is to raise the appropriation up to the amount of the lowest bid, taking into consideration the architectural costs. I think it is in order to make this additional appropriation so that we can get our Health Building which we need so urgently. We have already agreed to build the new Health Building, and because time is of the essence, it must be brought up now. There have been several extensions of time given and April 25th is the deadline for the figure given by the lowest bidder."

MR. KAMINSKI: "If we do not approve this tonight, the deadline will be passed before our next meeting."

MR. KAMINSKI MOVED for adoption of the following resolution. Seconded by Mr. Topping and CARRIED by unanimous vote of the 26 members present:

RESOLUTION NO. 252

AMENDMENT TO CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET  
OF 1956-1957, AUTHORIZING INCREASE IN  
APPROPRIATION FOR HEALTH BUILDING.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford hereby approves an amendment to the Capital Projects Budget for the fiscal year 1956-1957 to authorize an increase in the item known as the Health Building, from \$165,000.00 to \$233,087.60 and

DE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Representatives hereby authorizes the appropriation of the sum of \$68,087.60 to be financed by general taxation for said building, which would include the following breakdown:

Federal Funds (1/3 of construction and architect's fees)-----	\$74,227.00
City Funds (2/3 of construction and architect's fees)-----	148,453.00
Contingency Fund (Required by Federal Government)-----	<u>10,407.60</u>
Total-----	\$233,087.60

Re: Operating and Capital Budgets for fiscal year 1957-1958 as transmitted by Board of Finance.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and CARRIED by unanimous vote, that the letter dated April 15, 1957 from the Board of Finance, transmitting the Budget, not be read at this time, as it is very lengthy and copies have been sent to all members of this Board. (A copy is on file in the office of the Board of Representatives)

MR. CONNORS proceeded to transmit the budget figures, as approved by the Board of Finance, allowing each member an opportunity to copy these figures in his own copy of the budget books.

April 17, 1957

1555

Upon MOTION of MR. FREDERICKS, seconded by MR. DEFOREST, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

*George V. Connors*

President, Board of Representatives

vf

22223

Presented to Board at April 17<sup>th</sup> 1957 meeting

April 15, 1957

TO:-

The President of the Board of Representatives  
The Fiscal Committee of the Board of Representatives  
Members of the Board of Representatives.

GENERAL REMARKS

The Board of Finance transmits herewith to the Board of Representatives the Operating Budget, the Capital Budget and the Budget of the Board of Education for the fiscal year 1957/1958.

The Operating Budget submitted to the Board of Finance for the fiscal year 1957/1958 contained requests for appropriations substantially in excess of those approved for the fiscal year 1956/1957. The increase in requested appropriations over the prior fiscal year amounted to \$1,808,742.38, as set forth below:-

	<u>Appropriations</u> <u>1956/1957</u>	<u>Requested</u> <u>1957/1958</u>	<u>Increase</u>
General Government	\$ 1,324,389.52	\$ 1,527,817.79	\$ 203,428.27
Debt Service	1,371,076.33	1,449,386.84	78,310.51
Education	5,431,842.03	6,381,661.00*	949,818.97
Welfare	355,721.70	413,847.20	58,125.50
Protection to Persons and Property	2,163,493.40	2,298,814.08	135,320.68
Public Works	1,791,559.50	1,881,015.00	89,455.50
Recreation	364,670.90	403,507.55	38,836.65
Others	<u>10,253.70</u>	<u>265,700.00**</u>	<u>255,446.30</u>
Totals	<u>\$12,813,007.08</u>	<u>\$14,621,749.46</u>	<u>\$1,808,742.38</u>

\* Includes an additional request of \$58,319.00 by the Board of Education for an increase in salary payments to all classified employees and cafeteria employees employed by the Board of Education.

\*\* Includes request for salary adjustment of \$242,000.00 for city employees other than those employed by the Board of Education.

The Board of Finance was again confronted with a difficult task of evaluating the increased requests of the various departments which have been rising considerably in past years. Requests for increased appropriations were made for General Government, which requested

\$203,428.27 over last year's appropriation; for Education, which requested \$949,818.97 over last year's appropriation; for Protection to Persons and Property, which requested \$135,320.68 over last year's appropriation; and for salary adjustment of municipal employees other than those employed by the Board of Education, which request amounted to \$242,000.00.

Because of the amount of the increased requests, the Board of Finance scrutinized and studied individual as well as departmental requests with great care, keeping in mind at all times its duty to provide for the needs of the city within its ability to pay. The budget as submitted, after consideration of estimated revenues from sources other than taxation, would have resulted in an average tax increase of approximately 3.1 mills. The budget, as approved by the Board of Finance, after consideration of estimated revenues from sources other than taxation, is expected to result in an average tax increase of about 1.1 mill. The increase will, of course, differ in the various tax districts, and may be more or less than the estimated amount, depending upon the effect of the allocation of the appropriations to the respective tax districts, and, also, upon the variations in the increase in the Grand Lists in the different districts since the Grand List has not increased as rapidly in the sewer district as it has in other districts. It should be noted, however, that the anticipated revenues from sewer assessments will affect this in part.

The budget, as submitted to your honorable Board, is one which we believe will provide for the reasonable needs of the municipality as well as for the reasonable extension of essential municipal services without imposing an undue burden on property owners, many of whom will this year be required to pay an additional special assessment for sewers. We, therefore, present for your consideration the following budgets for operating expenses, for education and for capital projects, which budgets have been reduced below the requested amounts, as follows:-

	<u>As Requested</u>	<u>Approved by Board of Finance</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
Operating Budget	\$ 6,790,701.62	\$ 6,526,556.67	\$ 264,144.95
Education	6,381,661.00	5,913,060.00	468,601.00
Total Operating	<u>\$13,172,362.62</u>	<u>12,439,616.67</u>	<u>732,745.95</u>
Debt Service	1,449,386.84	1,443,186.84	6,200.00
Total Operating and Debt Service	14,621,749.46	13,882,803.51	738,945.95
Capital Projects	<u>2,344,160.00</u>	<u>1,791,660.00</u>	<u>552,500.00</u>
Totals	<u>\$16,965,909.46</u>	<u>\$15,674,463.51</u>	<u>\$1,291,445.95</u>

The level of expenditures has continued to increase, due, in part, to increased costs and, in part, to the need for increased services which have resulted from the growth of our city. This Board has attempted to control the level of expenditures and to keep it from rising too rapidly in order to prevent large rises in the tax rate from adversely affecting homeowners and other property owners, as well as business and industry, all of whom require a steady, stable tax rate and tax structure for the orderly conduct of their affairs. Although the Board of Finance made reductions in the requested budget, it believes that the increased amounts allowed over last year's appropriations will provide for the needs resulting from both increased costs and the demands for increased services. The following comparison of last year's appropriations with those approved for 1957/1958 bears this out:-

	<u>Appropriated 1956/1957</u>	<u>Approved by Board of Finance</u>	<u>Increase or Decrease Over Last Year</u>
Operating Budget	\$ 6,010,088.72	\$ 6,526,556.67	\$ 516,467.95
Education	5,431,842.03	5,913,060.00	481,217.97
Total Operating	11,441,930.75	12,439,616.67	997,685.92
Debt Service	1,371,076.33	1,443,186.84	72,110.51
Total Operating and Debt Service	12,813,007.08	13,882,803.51	1,069,796.43
Capital Projects	1,881,775.00	1,791,660.00	(90,115.00)
	<u>\$14,694,782.08</u>	<u>\$15,674,463.51</u>	<u>\$ 979,681.43</u>

The increased tax revenues to be derived from the increase in the Grand List of approximately \$14,000,000.00 and the additional revenues to be derived from sources other than taxation, including State aid to education, will not be sufficient to meet the increased appropriations, and it will be necessary, as previously stated, to finance the increased budget by a tax increase of approximately one mill, more or less. It should be noted that the estimated revenues to be obtained from sources other than taxation is expected to be about \$451,965.00 greater than in 1956/1957 and that the increase in State aid to education is expected to account for approximately \$300,000.00 of this increased amount.

The capital budget is to be financed as follows:- \$1,407,360.00 by bonds of the City of Stamford and \$384,300.00 by current taxation.

In making its decisions, the Board of Finance has attempted to act reasonably and prudently, and has tried to resolve all matters in a fair and just manner. It should be noted that the needs of the various departments were dealt with realistically, and it is expected by this Board that the various departments will operate within their

budgets as there will be no approvals of requests for additional appropriations during the next fiscal year unless there is an absolute emergency, or unless the request arises from a need that could not be reasonably foreseen. The failure to keep within budgeted amounts in accounts subject to control will not be considered an emergency by this Board regardless of reason, and department heads will be expected to keep a close scrutiny of the unexpended balances in their accounts at all times and not to incur any expenditures nor make any commitments in excess of these amounts.

#### COMMENTS ON OPERATING BUDGET

Accompanying the budget and in the interests of the voters and taxpayers whom we serve and to whom we are responsible is a summary of the opinions and comments by the members of this Board, together with a record of their votes where the Board was divided on major items of importance. In considering the operating budget, your Board has, in general, been guided by three principles:-

1. To provide adequately for continuation of existing programs on a basis consistent with the growth of the City;
2. To permit, where possible, introduction of new or expanded programs, but on a more restricted scale than the departments or agencies involved might have preferred to initiate;
3. To accept, without reduction, the nominal day to day operating expenses indicated by department heads, where a reduction made in previous budgets has only resulted in additional appropriation requests later in the year. The apparent exception to the last principle is in connection with the telephone accounts where in many departments increases requested were reduced because the requested increases were in excess of amounts set forth by the Southern New England Telephone Company's survey of costs for additional services. Sufficient funds have been appropriated for the present facilities which were enlarged last year, as well as for the new additions suggested by the Telephone Company.

Four main areas require more extensive comment than the specific remarks listed under each separate department:-

1. Salaries - Our Board has granted appropriations to cover salaries to employees other than those employed by the Board of Education (salaries of those employees

being included in the Board of Education budget) on the basis of the scales as increased last year. Provision has been made for the normal increments and for reclassifications made by the Personnel Commission. In only a very few instances has the reclassification involved increases which our Board would have considered excessive for a single year, and in these cases, the Board decided not to reduce the amounts requested. In addition, our Board has approved inclusion in the budget of \$242,000.00 for "salary adjustments;" this is included with the understanding that the usual transfer procedure will be followed before any amount is transferred from this account to the individual salary accounts. Our Board is not willing to approve specific allocation to salaries in accordance with the formula suggested in the Mayor's communication prefacing the budget, in view of discussions still in process between the Personnel Commission and certain employee groups. Furthermore, in any allocation which is made, we feel consideration should be given to the effect on the respective pension funds.

2. Pension Funds - Of the four pension funds, the Classified Employees' Retirement Fund is the only one making provision to cover the cost of the pension an employee earns, year by year as the service resulting in the pension is rendered. Pensions are based on salaries at retirement (average of highest two years in the last five years). The actuary points out that the appropriations required can be figured to allow for regular salary increases, but when the overall salary level is changed, the rates computed have to be increased to cover the increased pensions to retiring employees. No such adjustment was heretofore made for changes in the salary levels since 1952 when the plan was adopted. As a result, it was necessary to increase the appropriation for the Classified Employees' Fund to \$130,646.00 this year, compared with \$84,000.00 last year. This is figured at 6.54% of payroll and could be expected to remain at that rate for the next 25 years unless the salary level is again raised, in which case, the percentage would have to be increased again. Such an adjustment should be made whenever the salaries are changed in order to avoid such a substantial increase as was required this year. Social Security taxes also show an increase -- from \$42,000.00 to \$54,100.00. Even so, the combined Social Security taxes and pension contributions are about 9% of payroll, which is in line with provisions made for employee retirement benefits in many industries.



In the Firemen's Pension Fund, the Policemen's Pension Fund and the Custodian's Pension Fund, no provision is made for the pension until it is granted, and the city's costs will be expected to increase steadily and rapidly, both in dollars and as a percentage of the active payroll. The amount required for the Firemen's Pension Fund, \$93,373.00, is already over 13% of active payroll, and our actuarial survey indicates the benefits promised even a new man actually cost over 40% of pay. In the Police Pension Fund, the appropriation required is \$98,164.00, or more than 10% of current salaries, and that too, will increase to about the same level as the ultimate cost of the Firemen's Pension Fund. The Custodian's Fund is in the same situation.

Public attention has been called in the press to the enormous future burden the City will face if this situation is allowed to stand. This Board has repeatedly referred to the problem. A solution is not easy, but it is vital that some steps be taken before the next session of the General Assembly, so that proper provision is made for facing the liabilities which the Charter places on the City. It is neither fair to the citizens nor to the members of these funds to continue to promise something, and to accept contributions from the members toward something, which may ultimately not be possible of fulfillment.

3. Board of Education Budget - The Board of Education Budget, excluding the appropriation for the Wright Technical School (approved by a vote of 4 to 2), is \$5,900,000.00, an increase of \$480,433.00 over last year's appropriation, and a reduction of \$468,601.00 from the amount requested. While this Board has no jurisdiction over the allocation of the amount appropriated, we feel it is not out of order to set forth the fiscal principles applied in arriving at the amount of the appropriation.

In the area of teachers' salaries, the Board of Education has proposed implementation of the scale adopted and partly put into effect last year. Under this scale, the top classroom teaching salary would be \$7,800.00, and more than half the teachers would have salaries over \$5,800.00, while only three would be receiving less than \$4,000.00. Adoption of this schedule would mean an increase of \$550.00 for teachers below the top of their salary grade and \$300.00 for those at, or over the top of their grade. We consider this proper.

However, the Board of Education proposes further to apply a cost-of-living adjustment involving some \$95,000.00 in accordance with their long-established practice. Our Board is of the opinion that when the cost-of-living adjustment fails to keep salaries in line with changing conditions so that a whole new scale has to be adopted, the cost-of-living factor should not be applied in addition to the general increase. The cost-of-living approach has been abandoned in all of the other city departments, and there is no indication that it is any longer being used in nearby communities. We feel, therefore, that there should be uniform treatment throughout the city.

The Board of Education proposes increases in existing services and establishment of new services in certain areas. The Board felt that, desirable as these increases and innovations may be, requirements of economy in the budget indicate that approximately half of the proposed increases be eliminated or postponed.

The Board was unanimous in its decision that the Consumers Price Index factor should not be applied to salaries when a general adjustment was being concurrently made. It was also unanimous in its opinion that approximately half of the proposed new program for special services should be deferred, and that some \$50,000.00 projects in connection with buildings could well be eliminated.

Messrs. Cameron and Hogan voted against reduction of the appropriation beyond this point. They felt that any further reduction would involve largely maintenance items which would only defer the cost and not be an actual saving. The majority, however, concluded that further reduction could be made without impairing the educational program, since the amount approved was \$480,433.00 more than last year's appropriation. The majority also believes that this reduction would not appreciably interfere with the maintenance program because of the fact that a good portion of the requested appropriation consists of new innovations, the omission of which would not materially affect the maintenance program.

4. Rents - Many of the city departments are located in rented space, -- a number of them in the building at 303 Main Street. The owners have offered the building for sale to the city and suggest, as an alternative, a lease at increased rentals.

While the Board was not willing to consider the purchase of the building on the terms now being discussed, it also

did not feel the budget should make provision for additional rentals. Our Board urges that the question of re-location of the departments be seriously explored, having in mind the possible use of the old Museum building or the Elm Street School building, both of which the City owns; or, if this proves not to be feasible, other rented space.

The following comments cover specific items under each particular department or agency. In most cases, the reason for any reduction or elimination of an appropriation is evident without particular comment.

#### Registrar of Voters

Election and Primary Expense accounts have been reduced by \$5,800.00, as the Board believes these accounts should be controlled as closely as possible, and it is difficult to estimate in advance of the elections what the actual requirements will be.

#### Mayor's Office

The Board has eliminated the requested appropriation of \$6,000.00 for salary for new personnel, to cover the salary for an assistant to the Mayor. It is our opinion that the department heads should be held responsible for the administrative functions assigned to them by the Charter, and that, in the absence of the Mayor, the present setup of having the President of the Board of Representatives act as Mayor has proved to be satisfactory.

The appropriation for the Traffic Engineer was reduced to \$1,800.00, the amount which was in the previous year's budget. Our Board is of the opinion that the difficulty with the solution of traffic problems is not due to the lack of competent professional advice, but rather, to the difficulty in resolving the conflict of interests between the requirements of smooth traffic flow and the business needs of the central city areas.

The Board has also reduced the requested appropriation for travel, allowing an amount of \$1,250.00 -- \$500.00 more than last year.

#### Department of Law

Our Board has approved the addition of a legal aide, and, as a result, has reduced the amount appropriated for outside professional services to \$3,500.00, which is the same amount that was included in the previous year's budget.

### Stamford Museum

All the members of our Board are very much impressed with the program of the Museum in its new location, and with the administration of the program, as well as the presentation of the fiscal problems of the Museum in the report submitted with the budget. Because of the general necessity of curtailing increased services, the majority of the Board felt that we could not approve funds to cover the entire increase in the program requested by the Museum, even taking into consideration the substantial funds which the Museum would raise itself.

By a vote of 4 to 2, the appropriation was set at \$65,000.00, an increase of \$15,000.00 over last year, but \$22,000.00 less than requested. Mr. Cameron and Mr. Gorman voted against the reduction in the appropriation, as they believe that the same standards should not be applied to a new kind of operation of this type as might be applied in weighing increases requested in an established department or agency.

### Ferguson Library

By a vote of 4 to 2, the Board reduced the appropriation requested to \$254,670, an increase of \$20,670.00 over last year, but a decrease of \$20,000.00 from the amount requested. Mr. Cameron and Mr. Gorman dissented, since the amount of the reduction could affect not only the proposed increase in the program of the Library, but even jeopardize the normal expansion required by the growth of the city.

### Board of Finance

The only significant item to be called to your attention here is the appropriation requested for outside professional service of \$4,000.00. Our Board, in general, scrutinizes carefully a request such as this, and realizes that our own request should be subject to the same scrutiny. We feel, however, that there may be circumstances where the use of outside professional services can help us make substantial long-run savings by establishing sound fiscal policies. We would further call to your attention the fact that the services of the auditor may not be available at the \$10,000.00 figure established, in which case, we would expect that some amount might be transferred from the account for outside professional service.

### Debt Service

The reduction of the interest item by \$6,200.00 was due to the proposed reduction in the Capital Projects program under which bonds required should not amount to more than \$1,407,350.00.

### Welfare Department

The amount appropriated for Cash Relief was reduced to the amount appropriated in last year's budget. We realize that the actual amount which will be spent must be determined by the needs as they arise during the year.

### Police Department

Under the salary item, your Board concluded by a vote of 4 to 2 to reduce the appropriation requested for new personnel to cover three new patrolmen instead of nine. Messrs. Mackler and Hogan are opposed to the addition of new personnel in the Police or Fire Departments until concrete steps are taken to put the pension systems of both these Departments on a sound actuarial basis. In considering the other items, we would emphasize to your Board the reductions which made in the request of the Police Department before the budget was presented to our Board.

### Fire Department

The only item requiring comment here is the reduction in the amount requested for newer equipment. We would suggest again that the question be considered of having the relatively modern equipment which is available for the Civilian Defense Department be made available to the regular Fire Department, using the older equipment for the training necessary for the Civilian Defense personnel.

### Volunteer Fire Departments

In general, the amounts appropriated are in line with last year's appropriation, except in the case of the Long Ridge Fire Department and Turn of River Fire Department. For the Long Ridge Department, no amount was requested or included in this year's budget toward the building project. An item of \$2,181.00 requested for interest and amortization on the \$30,000.00 mortgage was, in the opinion of the Board (by a vote of 5 to 1), an item which should not be covered by city funds. In the case of the Turn of River Fire Department, it was felt that the \$10,155.00 item for equipment, repairs and replacements should be reduced.

### DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS Administration

Your Board approved an appropriation for the salary of the commissioner at the rate of \$9,000.00 as requested by the Mayor. Messrs. Cameron and Gorman dissented, as they are not willing to accept the proposition that appointed commissioners should necessarily receive a higher salary than the long service, experienced, top personnel who may serve under them.

Garbage Collection

The item for new equipment was eliminated.

Building Bureau

The salary item was reduced to \$35,932.00, eliminating the new personnel requested.

Board of Recreation

The salary account was reduced by \$8,695.35 because of transfer of responsibility for certain seasonal employees previously under the jurisdiction of the Board of Recreation to the Park Commission.

Parking Authority

For the third consecutive year, the Board of Finance calls to the attention of the Mayor, the Commissioner of Finance and to your Board, the failure of the Parking Authority to submit an annual budget of estimated revenues and expenditures, as demanded by Section 582 of the Stamford Charter. This Board is not possessed of legislative or executive powers, but it is its duty to remind the above mentioned Officers and Board of the provisions of Section 619.1 of the Charter, i.e., "No liability shall be incurred or expenditure made by any officer or employee which is not provided for in the annual appropriation resolution or by a special appropriation, resolution, or by a bond issue, nor shall the controller pay out any money for any purpose not authorized by an appropriation."

COMMENTS ON CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET

A summarized form of this budget, showing amounts requested by the Mayor and amounts approved by the Board of Finance, is set forth herewith:-

<u>Department</u>	<u>Requested</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Reduction</u>
1. Public Works			
(a) Sanitary Sewers	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ ---
(b) Storm Drains	241,000	212,500	28,500
(c) Highways	214,000	205,000	9,000
(d) Incinerator	300,000	300,000	---
(e) Bridges	70,000	70,000	---
(f) Flood Control	75,000	75,000	---
(g) Heliport	62,500	---	62,500
Total Public Works	\$1,162,500	\$1,062,500	\$ 100,000

Brought Forward	\$1,162,500	\$1,062,500	\$ 100,000
2. Park Commission	134,000	131,500	2,500
3. Board of Public Safety			
(a) Police Department	75,000	75,000	----
4. Board of Education	494,460	494,460	----
5. Hubbard Heights Commission	2,000	2,000	----
6. Ferguson Library	10,000	10,000	----
7. Welfare Commission	450,000	----	450,000
8. Health Department	8,200	8,200	----
9. Registrar of Voters	<u>8,000</u>	<u>8,000</u>	<u>----</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$2,344,160</u>	<u>\$1,791,660</u>	<u>\$ 552,500</u>

This budget will be financed by the sale of bonds in the amount of \$1,407,360.00 and the balance of \$384,300.00 by current taxation.

On January 10, 1957, the Commissioner of Finance reported to this Board the amount and nature of expenditures which, in his opinion the city could safely make for capital projects during the fiscal year 1957/1958, which amount was stated to be \$2,200,000.00. This Board subsequently certified to the Planning Board, pursuant to the Charter \$2,200,000.00 could safely be expended for capital projects in that year. The amount we have approved for such expenditures, in the present budget, is well within the figure so certified, viz.: \$1,791,660.00. The requests before us exceeded the certified figure by \$144,160.00. In approving, reducing or denying the requests set forth in the budget we have been mindful of the need for economy in our city government, and we have likewise been mindful of the needs of our people for reasonable municipal services at reasonable costs. With these thoughts in mind, we have carefully studied and examined each individual request to determine the merits of the same and to justify their inclusion in the budget. We are also aware of possible requests to amend the budget after its adoption and have, therefore, created a margin within which future amendments might be considered with safety to the financial structure of the city.

Comments relative to various items above set forth in the budget are, as follows:-

## Convalescent Home

In eliminating the appropriation for the Convalescent Home from this year's capital projects program, by a vote of 5 to 1, Mr. Stashenko voting for the appropriation, your Board is acutely aware of the need for facilities to care for the chronically ill and to care for those convalescents who need care outside their own homes.

However, the Board is not satisfied, nor does it sense that the community is satisfied, that the project has had the professional study required to define clearly the field within which the proposed Convalescent Home would operate, the type of staff required, or what agency should be responsible for its admissions policy, schedule of service charges, and day to day operations. As presented to us, its operation is not necessarily characteristic of the function of the Welfare Department except to the degree that an institution like Sunset Home has been responsible to the Welfare Commission. Many of the phases of this project's operation are quite dissimilar from the Sunset Home operation in that regular medical and nursing care is likely to be a normal rather than an unusual requirement. Despite the year which has elapsed since the appropriation for plans was authorized, fundamental problems do not seem to have been satisfactorily resolved. Your Board further was not satisfied that a structure built within the cost estimates submitted (basically \$15.00 per square foot) would, at present construction costs, afford the services which would be expected of such a building, whether designed primarily for chronic invalidism or for convalescent patients. Until these questions have been satisfactorily resolved, the Board feels it should not approve an appropriation for the project.

Mr. Stashenko believes that Stamford is one of the large cities in the State which does not have a municipal nursing home and hospital, although surveys have been made for many years which indicate that there is a definite need for one in Stamford. He further believes that since this Board has appropriated funds for architects' fees and plans for this worthwhile community project, it ought not to be delayed, but should be built now.

## Heliport

This request was denied until such time as the Board has received further data as to anticipated revenues, operational expenses, cost of construction, lease arrangements, and such other information as may be necessary regarding capital expenditures by the City of Stamford in order to make this project reasonably functional.



### Storm Drains

The Board notes that aside from the Springdale and North Glenbrook section, all the other highways marked for storm drain construction are located in an area of more or less recent development. No requests were submitted to this Board for storm drain construction in other areas of the city which are well populated and where the need for storm drains has long existed. It is to be noted that the request for the Eighth Street project has been denied by this Board for the reason that the contemplated improvement runs through private property and would seem to be of more benefit to individual property owners than to the general public. We also feel that the amount of \$6,500.00 is ample to take care of the High Clear Drive project.

In approving the requests for storm drains, the members of this Board feel that the work should have been done by the developers of the acreage involved. There are many areas in the older sections of the city that should have priority as to storm drains. However, since the Planning Board and the Mayor felt that these areas needed immediate attention and have placed them in the capital budget, these requests were granted.

Mr. Mackler does not subscribe fully to the views stated in the prior paragraphs as he believes that once a road is accepted, it becomes the city's responsibility to maintain the road and any drains required therefor, and that after acceptance it serves no purpose to say that the developer should have done the work since he can no longer be required to do this. Therefore, since it is the responsibility of the city, he is of the opinion that the recommendations of the officials properly charged with the determination of the priority of these projects should be followed, provided the city is financially able to carry on those recommendations. Mr. Mackler agrees that the older sections which require rectification should be completed first, but only if the priority is determined by need and not solely by time.

### Highways

The \$4,000.00 request for repairing the Turn-of-River bridge, which is no longer used, was denied. This bridge leads to private property. The Board members unanimously feel that the developer of this property should repair the bridge.

The members of this Board voted 5 to 1 against appropriating funds for pedestrian shelters, Mr. Stashenko casting the dissenting vote.

### Sanitary Sewers

The requests in the amount of \$200,000.00 to complete the balance of the Center Street-Scofield Avenue area and to construct a

sanitary sewer in the northeast section -- west of Hope Street -- is in furtherance of the overall North Glenbrook-Springdale project. The construction of a sanitary sewer in the northeast section -- west of Hope Street -- will eliminate a particularly unsanitary condition in this area and should put an end to a problem that has faced the residents of this area and the city for many years.

#### Incinerator

The construction of another incinerator is a necessary step toward providing adequate incineration for a steadily growing Stamford. Our Board feels that this project must be furthered and is aware of the fact that an additional expense of \$300,000.00 must be provided for in a future budget. The expenditure provided for relates largely to the protection of health in our city, and we approve such expenditure as called for in the budget.

Mr. Mackler voted against this proposal because he does not believe that appropriations for projects of this kind should be made until the plans and specifications are completed, and is, therefore, of the opinion that the appropriation should have been limited to an amount sufficient to cover the costs of plans and specifications.

#### Flood Control

Our Board now feels that enough work has been done on flood control so that we are better able to evaluate the work that has been accomplished and to have some conception of what the ultimate amount required to eliminate flooding will be. Much of the work planned by the Army Engineers has been completed and the overall picture has been clarified as to the probable cost of the remaining work to be done.

#### Park Commission

All the requests made for the Park Commission are approved by this Board with two exceptions. We do not feel that there is any need for the further expenditure of funds for Lione Park in view of expenditures made for this Park in recent years, nor do we feel that an expenditure of \$1,500.00 for grading and landscaping at Stark-Northrop is justified at this time as this work was done several years ago. We feel that the current provisions made for the Park Commission will enable the Commission to proceed with its plans and to advance further towards the ultimate complete development of our parks.

\* \* \* \* \*

## CONCLUSION

Conscious of its obligations to all city employees and beneficiaries of the tax dollar, but not oblivious to the tax burden borne by numerous small home owners, as well as small businesses and our large industries, the Board members were forced to remind themselves of the "goose and the golden eggs," and that even Santa Claus, with all his ingenuity and largesse, is unable to satisfy the needs of many, and, consequently, the wishes of others. Many suggestions of real merit and undoubted value to the community have to be refused on the simple grounds that their cost is beyond our means. We have to live within the limits of a sane and realistic budget as a municipality just as we do in individual and family life. This is an economic principle very easy to forget in these days of enormous government spending, but we cannot forget this principle if we are to maintain a sound and solvent fiscal system for our city.

Isadore M. Mackler, Chairman

John L. Cameron

Nicholas J. Gorman, Jr.

Patrick J. Hogan

Russell C. Roberts

John Stashenko