



BOARD OF ALDERMEN
SHELTON, CONNECTICUT
Public Hearing on Ordinances
October 26, 2010

CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Aldermanic President John Anglace opened the Public Hearing at approximately 7 p.m. All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

ROLL CALL

Aldermanic President John F. Anglace, Jr. – present
Alderman Lynne Farrell – present
Alderman John “Jack” Finn - present
Alderman Stanley Kudej - present
Alderman Eric McPherson – present
Alderman Noreen McGorty - present
Alderman John P. Papa – absent
Alderman Anthony Simonetti – present

Alderman Anglace stated, the proposed ordinance for public hearing is the proposed political sign ordinance. If you would like to be heard, kindly raise your hand and be recognized, you can come forward here to the table, sit down in this chair, state your name and address for the record and let us hear what you have to say. The political sign ordinance, who would like to be heard?

Attorney Brian Tims – 1000 Lafayette Boulevard, Bridgeport

I am an attorney out of Bridgeport, I am also the president of the Fairfield County chapter of the ACLU of Connecticut. I’m here tonight to speak in opposition of the proposed ordinance. I should also mention for whatever it’s worth I was born and raised in Shelton, a 2001 graduate of Shelton High School. Shelton is near and dear to my heart and it’s good to be back.

I think that proposing this ordinance the board is heading down a treacherous path that is wrought with constitutional issues. I mentioned that on the outset because I want to remind the board that at least from our point of view this proposed ordinance is not a matter of good policy or bad policy but rather one of constitutional dimension. I also would like to point out at the outset that the signs that are at issue in the proposed ordinance as you probably know are protected speech. That was made crystal clear by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1994. I will acknowledge however, that in that case the court indicated that political subdivisions, municipalities may set forth some regulations with respect to these types of signs. However, we feel as though much of the limitations that have been included in the proposed ordinance cross the line into unconstitutional territory.

First, the most troubling restriction in the proposed ordinance concerns the temporal limitations, the time limitations, during which under the proposed ordinance the signs could be put up in someone’s lawn. It is our position that such temporal limits violate the first amendment right to free speech and in fact high courts in other states that have reviewed similar ordinances have struck them down.

Second, it is impermissible to afford greater protection to commercial signs as compared to residential, and it seems to me that issue is also working within this proposed ordinance.

Third, with all due respect to the drafter at least of the version that I've seen, it does appear to be poorly drafted and that can lead to ambiguity and vagueness, which implicate rights to due process. For example, the term "political sign" is defined but it doesn't appear to be used in the body of the actual ordinance. Furthermore, the word "campaign" is not defined. Therefore, it's very difficult for the residents of Shelton to know when a campaign starts and ends without any further definition. An example, it's very difficult to know when a campaign surrounding a public issue such as war or peace or abortion starts and ends, and so how would a Shelton resident know when they can put up the sign and when they have to take it down. Now, I mentioned these definitional issues, but it's our position that even if cleaned up, the ordinance would still violate federal and state constitutional principles of free speech.

In concluding, this ordinance on its face infringes on the free speech rights of Shelton residents and apparently the motivation is to improve aesthetics, although there are some other motivations mentioned in the purpose that don't seem to have much weight. In conclusion, I think the proposed ordinance ought to be rejected and if the ordinance were to be tested in a court setting, I think that a court would find the proposed ordinance at least as proposed unconstitutional. I would like to thank to the board for allowing me to offer the organization's view.

Alderman Anglace asked Mr. Tims for a business card, which he provided.

Alderman Anglace asked, is there anyone else that wishes to be heard?

Alderman Jack Finn

I would like to explain what is ordinance is all about, if I may, before anyone else wishes to speak then they may do so. This does not violate anyone's constitutional rights. It allows a person to put a campaign sign on anyone's front yard, as long as they have permission, because sometimes signs go up in people's yards without permission. What it does not allow are signs to be posted and displayed on publicly owned open space in the City of Shelton - that's where the main problem lies. For example, this ordinance was taken from various other ordinances in the State of Connecticut that are already in place in communities. If this is something constitutional then why isn't anyone going after the seven to ten communities that already have the ordinances in place and that are enforcing them? We should go after those people as well if this is a constitutional thing. For example, a homeowners association in Pennsylvania, condo association vs. Coppola 1996 that a condo association did not violate the first amendment rights by removing political signs in the court section of the association of rules. They can set the rules up, we have it here in Shelton, you can not display an American flag - condo association first amendment rights - freedom of speech to hang a flag, you can not do it. This condominium association in Pennsylvania - you can not put political signs up, it's the same in Shelton you can not put political signs up in condominium associations, and again that's first amendment rights. See where I'm coming from?

Mr. Tims stated, the condominium associations are governing private property. To back up one moment - I know you mentioned that perhaps one of the main motivating factors was to address signs on public property. I think I would have to concede that would probably not violate any constitutional provisions. It's the town governing what's placed on its own property. I want to make that clear that I'm not contesting each and every restriction. I pointed out the ones that were troublesome to me. The case that you're mentioning I have not read it, I'm not familiar with it but it seems to me that if a condominium association is governing the signs that are placed on private property and it's a private association that's doing so; that's a different ball game.

Alderman Finn stated, that's the same thing as a homeowner. As private property, the homeowner can either say yes or no, but if the sign goes up in somebody's front yard and you didn't ask for it, they have the right to take it down or they have the right for the political party to come and remove it from there.

Mr. Tims stated, I think the main point that I'm trying to make is that in those cases you have a private, often it's an incorporated entity, that is trying to restrict the signs that

are placed on that private property, whereas here we are dealing with a political subdivision which has to play by sometimes similar but sometimes different rules, sometimes more onerous rules.

Alderman Finn asked, would your association be going after the existing communities that have these ordinances on the books and they are being enforced for several years?

Mr. Tims replied, I'm personally not aware of them. Are any of them in Fairfield County?

Alderman McPherson interjected, I know one's in Middlebury.

Alderman Finn stated, one is in Monroe. You can't attach them to trees and if you do there's a certain nail you have to use. I believe there are other communities in Fairfield county that might have them as well. I got all my ordinances from the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities and from there I went through the ordinances and picked out some that can be used in that community before it came here and went to Corporation Counsel. Corporation Counsel approved it and from there it went to the Street Committee, from the Street Committee it came here tonight.

Mr. Tims stated, I mean, to the extent that it is in place elsewhere, we will take a look at those municipalities as well. We are in no way singling out Shelton. I know that when I do come to meetings such as these, residents and board members often wonder are they being singled out - and no, that's not the case. And, to the extent that Monroe, you said Monroe?

Alderman Finn stated, Monroe, I do know, I know they're environmentalist over there. In Shelton they do use nails and screws. In Monroe there's a particular nail they can use on the tree that would not harm the tree. That's the only type of nail they can use to post a sign on a tree.

Mr. Tims stated, I would just follow up on your comment on the chain of individuals who have reviewed it. I think given the decisions that have come out in other states, for example, there was a case in Ohio where the high court in Ohio concluded that a similar ordinance was unconstitutional.

Alderman Anglace stated, let me clarify one point, we're here to take comment with respect to the Shelton proposed political sign ordinance, not to judge any other municipalities whether they're right or wrong.

Mr. Tims stated, I know, I'm not here to do that.

Alderman Finn stated, I appreciate your comments.

Alderman Anglace stated, I'm going to set this for the record. Other municipalities may have sign ordinances that haven't been challenged. That doesn't mean that they couldn't be challenged and they're right or they're wrong. I guess Alderman Finn collected from the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities the existing signed ordinances and that's what he used to build his proposal.

Alderman Finn stated, there's another one here if I may, lower courts have cited that the city of Lado, where ever that is located. It says right here, it's in Maryland. The district court of Maryland signed ordinance that limited posting political signs on the private residents to forty-five days before and up to ten days after the election.

Mr. Tims stated,

There's a Ladue case in 1994 U.S. Supreme Court.

Alderman Finn stated, this is 1999.

Mr. Tims stated, I'm not familiar with that case. I would have to take a look at that.

Alderman Finn stated, I got this off line underneath Valley Independent Sentinel. Someone wrote a comment that we should visit this website; I did visit the website because I wanted to make sure this was not violating anyone's constitutional rights. I went to Vietnam for almost four years, 3 years 9 months and 6 days. We were over there to make sure that your right to vote and your right for freedom of speech was to stay intact. So I assure you this one thing that I would never do is interfere with anybody's amendment rights no matter what it might be out of the 16 amendments.

Mr. Tims stated, I certainly appreciate your service. I respectfully disagree on this issue.

Aldermen Simonetti stated, thank you for coming, Mr. Tims. One of those things you said in the actual, it should say in the political signs instead of just the sign over thing to define.

Mr. Tims stated, right. Typically when an ordinance defines a term, there should be consistency thereafter, for example if there is a reference to a sign I assume that means that the drafter intended to refer to political sign as defined earlier.

Aldermen Simonetti stated, you would like to see that in there.

Mr. Tims stated, as I mentioned, I think that even if it is cleaned up with respect to those drafting issues, I think that there still would be a problem but I point them out because in the event that an ordinance similar to this one is passed, it ought to have as much direction to the residents of Shelton as possible so they know where the boundaries are.

Alderman Finn stated, so in other words you're saying that the political campaign signs A thru I, should say in front of it "political campaign sign may not be erected, see political campaign signs shall be not erected on private property" the other one's public property and "political signs should not be located as to obstruct the view of any pedestrian or motor vehicle." You just want it indicating that the word "political campaign sign" should be incorporated in each paragraph?

Mr. Tims stated, at least as drafted it would be "political sign," that's what has been defined "political campaign signs" has not been defined as I also said "campaign" itself has no definitional support, and as I said, given the definition of political sign refers to public issues and then later there's a reference to campaigns about those public issues without any definition about what the campaign is. As an example, a campaign about abortion, just as an example, where is the start of that campaign and the end of that campaign. I know that when you're talking about elections it's much easier to define the parameters and I think that's more of what you had in mind. But I just wanted to highlight some of the vagueness that is apparent from my point of view.

Alderman Finn stated, there's no objection, "I" says nothing in this ordinance should be interpreted to restrict or limit the constitutional right of a citizen's respect to views or political matters or public interest by means of signs.

Mr. Tims stated, I did notice that, that however does not provide much comfort for me because the only way I can read it is in such a way as to limit the constitutional right.

Alderman Finn stated, that came out of one of those ordinances I made reference to from the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities.

Mr. Tims stated, I think as indicated earlier simply because something has gone through the Conference or has been adopted by another municipality therefore, does not mean that it is valid constitutionally. I think only after proper court challenge would we be able to determine once and for all whether it is improper. We feel that based on what courts have done elsewhere we can predict with good certainty that an ordinance of this magnitude would be struck down.

Alderman Finn stated, just for my understanding, if this would be struck down then why do we have these existing ordinances in place around the State of Connecticut that the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities sent me and they have not been challenged?

Mr. Tims replied, simply because they have not been challenged doesn't mean that they won't be. Given that you have mentioned it, I will speak to those higher in the ranks and discuss whether appropriate action should be taken with respect to those municipalities and I know I don't want to go too far afield, Mr. President.

Aldermen McPherson stated, just one thing, the only thing that I could see here would be section G, with four feet by four feet. I would agree with you on that point - that would be limiting someone's constitutional right. I believe Aldermen's Finn overall intent of the ordinance that I agree with and we did send it forth from the Street Committee, was to regulate some signs, political signs or campaign signs whatever you want to call them being put on city property, and because as you see, the State on their right of ways. You go up Route 34 and remove them, they take them and put them all in a big pile over on their yard over in Orange. They do that and I think we should do the same thing. I don't think you have the right to put a political sign for whatever political purpose that it is on any city property.

Mr. Tims stated, this goes beyond city property, wouldn't you agree?

Alderman Finn stated, yes, it says if you're a homeowner you have the right to post any sign on your property. It can be a political sign it could be a sign "Go away no community gardens", another sign "slow down children live here". Any sign that a resident wishes to put up on your property, it's freedom of speech has as long as it's not to attack a person.

Mr. Tims stated, now, would that such placement of a sign be regulated by this temporal limitation as to time? As to when it could go up?

Alderman Finn stated, yes, the reason I put the time limits in is what we have here in Shelton we have had signs up since August 1st. We are now into October. That is a long time for signs to be up after a primary. Maybe the signs should have come down and then back up. Other communities as I indicated, that's where I have the limitation from, other communities of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities. Some of the communities, I think mine was a week after the Election Day come down, some of the other communities have less than that, some other communities had longer than that. Myself, when I run for office I take mine down the next day. I know it's hard to take them down city wide the next day, but that's why there's the time limit after that so they can get out and take their signs down.

Mr. Tims stated, if I may address that, given that the proposed ordinance goes beyond placement of signs on public property that's where the concern is. If the main motivation is to address the signs on public property then I would strongly urge that the board seek to limit the proposed ordinance just to that effect. To the extent that it goes beyond that and limits the ability of a Shelton resident to place a sign up only within these prescribed time periods, I think that's where the problem lies.

Alderman Finn stated, why would want them up after the election?

Alderman Anglace stated, or the size.

Alderman Finn stated, John, the size came in only because we had some intersections in the city where they had a four by four wooden signs on wooden stakes at intersections covering the intersection. You cannot see coming out of a street, this way or this way, when you have such a large sign at the intersection. We have an ordinance in Shelton that nothing shall be in the five foot right of way of an intersection. These signs were right on the intersections themselves, if they weren't there, this wouldn't be in the ordinance.

Alderman Anglace stated, if we have such an ordinance on the books, it's a question of enforcing it as opposed to amending it or proposing a new ordinance. I think if I understand you correctly here your proposal wants to allow people the right to place signs on their property as opposed to the city right of way. On their property instead of the State right of way, which is nine feet in from the curb.

Alderman Finn stated, the City right of way, I don't think that makes any difference. What I'm referring to is City open space. Do we need them on Nells Rock Road on City open space, do we need them on Shelton Avenue on open space, and do we need them on Land Trust property which is open space.

Alderman Anglace stated, what you're saying is you would like to see this ordinance pertain to not putting political signs on City property regardless of where it is - City owned property or State owned property for that matter. If that is the extent of the ordinance then that's a whole different...

Mr. Tims interjected, and if that was the extent of the proposed ordinance I probably wouldn't be here tonight.

Alderman Finn stated, we want to make sure also that the sight line at intersections is not obstructed by anybody whether a pedestrian or someone traveling in a vehicle.

Alderman Anglace stated, I'd like to propose that we not close this hearing on the ordinance but give you a week to ten days to submit something in writing if you'd like to look beyond what you have commented on tonight and some of the other ordinances etc. and the comments you've heard tonight.

Alderman Finn stated, I have no objection.

Alderman Anglace stated, the consensus of the board then is that we will keep this open for ten days and allow you an opportunity for further comment, and for the entire general public. Anybody can comment in writing.

Mr. Tims stated, I would appreciate that opportunity.

The next full Board of Aldermen meeting will be held Wednesday, November 10th.

Alderman Anglace stated, if there are no other speakers, we'll hold this hearing open for 10 days to receive written comment, and then it will be taken up in the regular order of business.

2. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED ETHICS ORDINANCE

Wayne Bragg, 85 Park Avenue

Good evening. On several occasions I've met with the Ethics Commission to discuss the Ethics Code. I have read it on several occasions myself, discussed it with several members of the democratic town committee which I'm a member. I've forwarded a copy of the code to Mr. Robert Wexler who is a subject matter expert on municipal codes of ethics in Hamden, he is also an attorney and I have return comments from him. I've also been in contact with the State Office of Ethics to look at their model code that they have provided and I would like to offer some comments regarding the code as it's currently proposed.

This is a bit of a conundrum. I think the town desperately needs a current code - one that was written in 1977 clearly is not adequate at this point. With that being said, we need a good code, a code that's going to protect everyone's interests yet set the bar very high for what conduct is acceptable and what conduct is not acceptable, and I think that is being clear, concise and non ambiguous. I think there are several flaws in the existing code and from the outset I would have to say that this code should be rejected as it currently stands it is seriously flawed. I have very brief comments; I have picked three areas that I think are very important. First off I think the code as has three areas that should be of concern to the Board. It has inconsistent, subjective and confusing language. It has procedural problems that divides the code against citizens and it has structural problems that affect the Board of Ethics independence which is obviously very important. I'll give you an example of each.

Section 2-14 under definitions, for some reason we decide to define conflict of interest. Conflict of interest is typically allowed its own separate section in a code because it's

the most important. For some reason in this code it's a definition. It's much too subjective, the language reads that its based upon what is compatible, what is proper discharge in the course of performing their duties, and what would tend to impair judgment or action. No one believes that their judgment is impaired when they perform their duties so this becomes far too vague. It needs to be very closely tied to the definition of what interest is, in terms of financial interest or public interest or city interest. There are a number of definitional issues like that that I think need to be revisited. There are multiple definitions of gifts that could be combined, consolidated and made much more concise, and there are several other areas like that.

Secondly, this one is very bothersome to me. My background, I'm currently instructor at the University of Connecticut School of Business, prior to that I had 35 years in the United Technologies Corporation, many of which as finance executive. It had lots of exposure to compliance programs so I fully understand what these things are supposed to do. The procedural problems, in Section 5b there are no monetary fines or consequences against the City employee or official when a violation is found, yet in 5C there are double damages and legal fees against a citizen that brings a complaint without foundation. I find that to be very biased. In the same paragraph, the city employee or official has their legal expenses paid, but the citizen who unknowingly submits a false claim is subjected to potential economic hardships. I think it completely tips the scale in favor of the City and it doesn't promote, it does the exact opposite, it doesn't promote the citizens to be involved in this process. It has a chilling effect on the citizens if they know they have to not only certify and notarize a complaint. In corporate compliance programs, issues are presented anonymously and if you go up on the United Technologies website they in fact cite that they have received 81,000 issues since their compliance program has started and they take that as a fact that the program is working wonderfully. At your last meeting it was said that you've only received one notice of ethical violation in the past number of years, I think that shows that the program is not working.

The structural problems I think are also problematic. For any compliance program to work effectively the commission has to be independent. There are a number of ways that this can be handled; the City of North Haven has just come up with a methodology that allows a number of appointed individuals to the commission are picked by a number of different departments or commissions. The City of Atlanta in fact goes out to some community commissions such as Chamber of Commerce, or appoints someone to the program, that gives it a much more unbiased view. The fact that there are only three members appointed obviously that's fraught with issues from a political stand point. Further the Mayor has appointed the commission and I would have to question whether the Board could act impartially and without political influence under those conditions. Further with the commission having to report to the Board of Aldermen all their findings, again, it does throw this into a political environment where it needs to be completely independent, that's very much a concern.

If I look at just those three areas, the ambiguity, the procedural problems, structural problems I think this code has some very serious flaws to it. I think it should be rejected, I think it should be completely re-written and I would offer my services to participate. Those are my comments.

Aldermen Finn asked, how would you recommend too take the politics out of it?

Mr. Bragg stated, my experience is primarily in a corporate environment were we refer to these as compliance programs which are a bit of a different animal. I think, and I spoke to the State Office of Ethics about this just a few days ago, and I think one of the things you can do is to perhaps go to the Board of Education, go to Planning and Zoning and give each of those organizations an opportunity to appoint someone so that a number of different parties are participating in this. I think like Atlanta did, they went outside and said we want the Chamber of Commerce to appoint somebody and I think that is a great idea. You got to get the citizens involved in this - you can't just have people that are involved in politics on a daily basis. This is the reason why I ended up getting involved in politics a bit, because of this thing. I felt that it was so seriously important.

Alderman Anglace asked if anyone else wished to speak.

Chris Jones, 24 Mustang Drive

I just want to make a few comments that I feel that this ordinance has been dragged on for a long time. I did some research and I go back to June 16, 2005, when it was a special meeting of the Board of Ethics along with Corporation Counsel Welch, Alderman Anglace and Alderman Finn. During that minutes here, on item number three was a discussion of proposed ethics ordinance with Alderman Jack Finn, Alderman John Anglace, and Attorney Tom Welch and Attorney Welch stated that at the last legislative session in June 2004 an ordinance was proposed for the State of Connecticut and it didn't come out of committee. At that time Aldermen Anglace and Finn stated we should look at our ordinance, Alderman Anglace states it was brought to their attention by Mr. Steiner. That's 2005, that's five years ago - a lot has transpired over the last five years which I think would fall under the umbrella of the Code of Ethics. Mr. Bragg had some good suggestions about bringing the community into a bipartisan group, take somebody from each committee. I commend the work of the Board of Ethics; I don't think their job is to really write ordinances. It took them two years to write it, and then back in 2007 they presented it to the Board of Aldermen and here it is three years later and still no resolution. I understand that the City is waiting for the State to write something but why can't we lead by example and hire a consultant to work with each member of each committee and Mr. Tims is an attorney just a suggestion; a Shelton boy home grown. To have an attorney present, this is all legal, fines and a lot of constitutional stuff here.

They put a lot time and effort into this ordinance and I think there are some good points and there are some flawed points and until we have a professional or professional group look at this and examine it and reword it and rewrite it. This has got to be done tomorrow, not five years. This is five years in the making. Just look at what's going on around us these days and ethics is a very important thing that this community needs at this time. That's all I have to say, I just suggest that we expedite this issue accordingly. Thanks.

Aldermen Anglace stated, thank you very much. Anyone else wish to be heard?
Aldermen Finn?

Aldermen Finn stated, I have to agree with Mr. Bragg as well as Mr. Jones. I do believe that once this goes back to the full board we should send it back to Ethics Commission. We will also give the Ethics Commission the authority to go outside and hire an outside consultant who's an expert in ethics and writing ethics and have them come aboard in the system where assistance might be needed. When we originally wrote the ordinance I was sort of in favor of those seeking office having to fill out all the information that was required underneath this proposed ordinance. But now I'm leaning more towards the fact why should somebody that may not be elected have to fill out all that paperwork and why can't we just wait until they are elected to office, then they fill out the paperwork and the sign for it saying they do understand it. The other thing I know is a sticking point is gifts. I just want to say in plain words, I wrote this down so I wouldn't forget it. In plain words "The public presumes a public official owes the public a duty of honest services." Most of us are familiar that it takes proof that a public official is going to do something in return for gifts. All public officials, whether you're elected, appointed or an employee owe a duty to the public to make governmental decisions in the public's best interest. We recently had a second developer who did plead guilty, admitted it's true to give cash and gifts to city employees and elected officials. When we as a Board of Aldermen sat down to discuss our new proposal of ethics ordinance I clearly stated no elected, appointed or city employee shall accept gifts, period. I know we have a difference of opinion on this but do you really want to have our elected, appointed or city employees with the temptation of receiving gifts? For example, and I'm not saying anyone has received gifts of this nature but such gifts would include golf junkets, expensive meals, luxury seats to sporting events, vacations, loans, and other undisclosed gifts provided by anybody. In closing again I hope we can take into consideration my recommendation that no elected, appointed official or city employee may receive any gifts.

Aldermen Anglace stated, thank you, anyone else wish to be heard?

Alderman McPherson stated, Mr. President I know in our last workshop session on this issue it has been talked about to find somebody versed in ethics with that experience to perhaps give us a hand. It is something that we are looking at. This is an important issue and we have to get it right and we're working to get it right. I appreciate your suggestions as well.

Aldermen Anglace stated, at our last meeting of the Board of Aldermen, with two added consultants, Marty Coughlin and Ken Nappi, it was a consensus at the meeting that we should go to public hearing on the ethics ordinance which we did tonight for the purpose, express purpose, of getting public input because this was observed that public input was conspicuously absent from the manner in which the Board of Ethics went about writing this. It may have taken them two years, but they never got any public input on it and the committee felt that that's the first place to start. They asked us to have this hearing tonight and they asked us to come back with the minutes so that they could digest what was in there and of course in addition to the Board of Aldermen we have the other two invited consultant people who are consulting to the board on this and we want a chance to talk about it and see what evolves.

We have a variety of opinions, some specific with respect to what's included in the ordinance, and some opinions with respect to how we go about getting the hearts and the minds of the elected, appointed officials and those who serve the city. There was some speculation that equally important to having a document and not having something that represents the Ten Commandments necessarily, but to project in a series of annual meetings what the ethics ordinance is all about, and what we would like to it accomplish, and how to project the discipline that goes along with developing behavior appropriate and correct behavior, in the area of ethics. We felt that this was the first step and that's what I believe the group wanted to do tonight - to get as much input as possible and then go back and talk about it. All I can tell you is at the next meeting we have we will have the minutes of this meeting and we will talk about it and digest and determine what an appropriate course of action is to follow.

Alderman Finn stated, it's important John that we have an ordinance well drafted to go hand in hand with the educational aspect to all city employees whether it be elected, appointed or city employees. Everybody has to be educated in the ordinance.

Aldermen Anglace stated, you have to have document then you have implement it and the implementation is probably as important as the document itself because you just throw that document out there and some people even though they sign for it once a year as many businesses, private businesses do, they give it to you and say you have to sign for this and people sign anything. I think there are things that people need to know, need to be reminded of and when you talk about the kinds of things that Jack spoke about a few minutes ago its good to remind everybody what constitutes a gift and what constitutes a quid pro quo, etc. I'm sure we're going to kick it around.

Alderman Anglace asked if any other person wished to speak.

Being none, Alderman Simonetti MOVED to close the hearing on the Proposed Ethics Ordinance; SECONDED by Alderman Kudej. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

ADJOURNMENT

At approximately 7:47 p.m., Alderman Kudej MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman McGorty. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 7-0.

OCTOBER 26, 2010

BOARD OF ALDERMEN
PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCES

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Giaimo
Temporary Clerk

DATE APPROVED: _____

BY: _____

Mark A. Laretti
Mayor, City of Shelton