



# CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

## MEETING

**Tuesday, March 22, 2005**

The meeting for the Charter Revision Commission was called to order by Paul DiMauro at 7:10 P.M. in Room 303 at Shelton City Hall.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Attending: Paul DiMauro  
Ann Dougherty  
Bob Lally  
Charles Carroll  
Steve Bellis

Absent: Gary Cahill  
Sue Coyle  
Michael Davis  
Irene Smith  
Joe Konner

There was no one from the public that wanted to address the Commission. Chairman DiMauro concluded the public portion at 7:11 pm.

There was no quorum so the minutes from February 22, 2005 could not be accepted.

Representatives from the CARE Group were the invited guests at this evening's meeting.

***Paul DiMauro: If I'm not mistaken, we finished up with 5.4***

***Ann Dougherty: 5.4 is the last section***

***Paul DiMauro: ok, 5.4, does everyone agree?***

***Walter Sofian: Recommendation 27***

***Paul DiMauro: I can't correspond with that one, so you're going to try and follow our sections if you can. That was Board of Ethics? Were we done with Board of Ethics or***

*do you have more comments on that? So then we will go to Chapter 6, 6.1 Administrative Assistant. Do you have any comments? What? Did I miss that? Sorry about that. General Provisions, I'm sorry. Ok on General Provisions.*

*Walter Sofian: May I sit up here?*

*Paul DiMauro: Certainly.*

*Walter Sofian: First I'd like to thank the Commission for giving us the opportunity gain, we do appreciate it. This has a few changes, our recommendation 28 on Section 5.5, the chief of which no elected or appointed official shall hold more than one office in the City.*

*Paul DiMauro: What letter what that? Oh it's C?*

*Walter Sofian: It's C. Right now it reads members shall hold no more than one other elected office and or two other appointed offices*

*Paul DiMauro: What we've got for a recommendation here is members shall hold no and we've added other elected or appointed office in the City. That's what we have and I think it's the same thing what you're trying to do there.*

*Walter Sofian: Oh in your last recommendation?*

*Paul DiMauro: In our recommendation, we now have members shall hold no other elected or appointed office with the City, it should be within the City*

*Walter Sofian: That's fine*

*Paul DiMauro: It should be within?*

*Ann Dougherty: Yes*

*Walter Sofian: About the verbiage, how do you guys feel about reimbursement for reasonable*

*Paul DiMauro: We have added to that as established by ordinance, so we're saying as established by ordinance so they have to address it at a public hearing and address it that way, they can't just do what they want to do*

*Walter Sofian: And the last we just recommended here that Robert's Rule of order should, instead of each board or commission, another body shall establish their own rules of procedure, though maybe to standardize Robert Rules, not one of our biggies.*

*Paul DiMauro: Where are you now, I'm sorry*

**Walter Sofian:** *On G*

**Paul DiMauro:** *On G, each board and commission, what we do have in there and we've added to it is that provided they are not inconsistent with any other section of the Charter. That's so that it clarifies that but you're now suggesting that we also add it's own rules. I don't think this was meant to say whether to use Roberts Rules or not this was meant to say what they do for their own little procedures, I think Roberts Rules*

**Walter Sofian:** *This was the procedure above and beyond*

**Paul DiMauro:** *This is simple rules not rules as you're reading it as Roberts Rules, I don't believe and anyone can correct me that Roberts Rules do apply to all City agencies. Where they pick it up from I don't know, but my understanding is that what is used.*

**Walter Sofian:** *Alright, then Section 6.2.2, next to the last sentence it says Corporation Counsel subject to the approval of the Mayor shall appoint and may remove such personnel as may be necessary and we thought the Corporation Counsel should have his own powers to pick his own people without being subject to the approval of the Mayor is the way we wrote it, I don't know how you feel about that. We thought that Corporation Counsel being professional the way the office is, should be able to know what personnel he needs*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Well, let's follow that back a little bit. The Mayor appoints and may remove Corporation Counsel, therefore it's consistent that the Mayor approve anybody that he puts on his staff. If you read the sentence above it, it's the Mayor that appoints the Corporation Counsel*

**Walter Sofian:** *We understand that*

**Paul DiMauro:** *So why then would you, if you appoint someone that the Mayor didn't want to we could dump him anyway. He wouldn't have his own power anyway; get what I'm saying? Because the Mayor controls him, so I don't see any reason for making the difference*

**Irving Steiner:** *Doesn't this provide the Corporate Counsel with the initial selection of someone that would have good chemistry with him?*

**Paul DiMauro:** *it does, but let me say this, and I think that Mike might back me up, every Mayor has always picked Corporation Counsel that he can work with and they probably have, usually have the closest relationship, correct me if I'm wrong, but they usually have the closest relationship than anyone else with the Mayor, the Corporation Counsel does. Probably works closer with him, all the Mayors that I have known, their Corporation Counsel has been as much an advisor, a mentor, you can't do this, you can't do that, he's in contact with him probably more than anyone else. So I don't think there's a problem with saying that if the Mayor selects a particular attorney, he says look I need help, I need an assistant Corporation Counsel or whatever, he's going*

*to talk to the Mayor first and they're going to have an agreement on who it is. He's not going to go out and just appoint someone. I really don't see the need to change that.*

*Bob Lally: One of the recommendations that I had made back in November and I couldn't figure out a place to fit it in, was that when there is a conflict, since the Mayor chooses the Corporation Counsel, when there is a conflict between the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen, Planning or Zoning or any other board, could the Corporation Counsel (inaudible), if that happens, the Board has no place to go.*

*Paul DiMauro: Yes they do.*

*Bob Lally: No they don't, not at this point*

*Paul DiMauro: Well let me say this, if you read the Section 6.2.3, other counsel, assistant counsel. The Board of Aldermen may appoint and remove such assistant Corporation Counsel and such other counsel, as the Board deems necessary or convenient. The board of Aldermen at any time, the way I read this, the Board of Aldermen any time they wish can hire a counsel because it says right in this document that such other counsel as the Board deems necessary or convenient and it says nothing about the Mayor approving it, says nothing about the Mayor approving it or having to authorize it or anything else.*

*Walter Sofian: But the logic that he just gave you was on 6.2*

*Paul DiMauro: Inaudible, Corporation Counsel wants staff, or wants another attorney, a paralegal, or whatever and wants someone to cover for him for his duties, then I think the Mayor and him would make, in this case, if you read the language on 6.2.3, has nothing to do with the Mayor, it strictly allows the Board of Aldermen to hire any counsel they deem necessary for whatever purpose they deem necessary. That's already in here*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: It's usually not the way it works.*

*Paul DiMauro: If the Aldermen can't step up to what the Charter says, I can't help that. But this gives them the authority.*

*Walter Sofian: The Mayor appoints the Counsel*

*Paul DiMauro: he appoints Corporation Counsel*

*Walter Sofian: And he approves any sub-counsel*

*Paul DiMauro: No, go to the next paragraph, it's a separate paragraph. You've got appointment or removal (inaudible), Powers and Duties, then it says other Counsel*

*where it is another section. And I'll read it again, the Board of Aldermen may appoint and remove such assistant Corporation Counsel and such other counsel as the Board deems necessary or convenient, if they haven't exercised that right shame on them. I think they've got the right to.*

*Walter Sofian: But appointed by the Mayor?*

*Paul DiMauro: It does not say appointed by the Mayor.*

*Inaudible*

*Charles Carroll: The Board of Aldermen can hire their own counsel.*

*Ann Dougherty: Is that a conflict? In other words Corporation Counsel can appoint people who he wants and then over here it says Aldermen can appoint who they want*

*Paul DiMauro: Yes, and that goes to what we just discussed, a second ago when Bob said if Corporation Counsel wanted to hire his own attorney, they should be able to and I think that's what you're getting to, and I'm saying they can under the way I read this Charter*

*Ann Dougherty: So then Corporation Counsel appoints who he wants, does that have to be approved by the Board of Aldermen?*

*Paul DiMauro: No*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: No, it says the Corporation Counsel, subject to the approval of the Mayor shall appoint or may remove such personnel as necessary or convenient to the operation of his office, which is the Corporation Counsel office. That's a separate entity. The Board of Aldermen wants to hire a counsel to do whatever, they have the right to do it*

*Walter Sofian: Doesn't the problem come up by using the word Corporation Counsel?*

*Paul DiMauro: No*

*Randy York: Well is one contracted employee and another one is a hired*

*Paul DiMauro: No, no they are all the same. They're appointed. There are no City employees as Corporation Counsel in the City of Shelton. They are not City employees, they are "professional people", appointed as such, political appointees technically. Technically you can't call it anymore than a political appointment whereas in the second situation, technically the way I see this, if the board of Aldermen decided to hire a counsel (inaudible), have their own counsel. It's clear that the assistant and if they*

*call someone the assistant Corporation Counsel (inaudible), but this says two things, it says assistant Counsel and it also says other counsel. And it does say it and even in the wording it says such assistant Corporation Counsel and such other counsel*

*Walter Sofian: It's the word Corporation that draws the confusion in there because the Corporation Counsel is a Counsel that is hired by the Mayor.*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't think there is any confusion in the fact that they can hire their own attorney*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't see it that way*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: A lot of things were not done by practice Bob because people don't read the whole thing.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Sometimes they would hire in a particular situation, as you're well aware if Corporation Counsel has a conflict of interest*

*Michael Pacowta: I was thinking support staff. It's not support staff*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't think support staff ever come into it because most of them have their own staff in their offices, they're only using them on a part time basis*

*Michael Pacowta: I think that was the premise that we were going on*

*Paul DiMauro: Yeah, but I think in most cases what it is is a couple of things. One, goes to the Mayor and says look I represented Mike Pacowta on this issue, we're getting involved with Mike Pacowta, I've got to go outside of Counsel, this is who I'm thinking of hiring. So he goes to another law firm. It's totally different, like I say the Aldermen clearly have a right if you read this to hire their own Counsel*

*Walter Sofian: They should have the right to hire their own*

*Irving Steiner: they have to be called Corporate Counsel*

*Paul DiMauro: They have to be called Corporation Counsel because they're going to be working for the City in an official capacity, they answer to the Board of Aldermen by the way, not to the Mayor.*

*Walter Sofian: I thought of the Corporation Counsel as a fixed position, I didn't realize that it applies to a City Corporate Counsel that worked with the Mayor and the one that worked for the Board of Aldermen*

*Paul DiMauro: Totally different.*

*Richard Widomski: Does the Corporation Counsel appoint assistant Counsel?*

*Paul DiMauro: He should not appoint Assistant Counsel.*

*Richard Widomski: A few years ago when I had to go to Corporation Counsel, I went down to the office of Welch*

*Paul DiMauro: Tom*

*Richard Widomski: Tom, and he they instructed me to get a hold of Ray Sous. Ray Sous actually reported to Tom Welch.*

*Paul DiMauro: And he can*

*Richard Widomski: But that's what's going on.*

*Paul DiMauro: But that could happen.*

*Richard Widomski: I know that's what's going on.*

*Paul DiMauro: But that's ok*

*Richard Widomski: It is ok but is it according to Charter?*

*Paul DiMauro: Yes because he*

*Richard Widomski: My question is this, does Tom Welch appoint assistant Corporation Counsel or does he appoint just*

*Paul DiMauro: No, associate Counsel or whatever, whatever he wants to call him it's his own*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I'm not going to get hung up on what he calls him*

*Richard Widomski: But to make it correct, Ray Sous should be reporting to the Board of Aldermen*

*Paul DiMauro: No, absolutely not*

*Richard Widomski: He in fact is the assistant Corporation Counsel*

*Paul DiMauro: If they're calling him the assistant Counsel, then it's wrong in calling him that. Does it make it wrong, legally wrong? No. I think it's wrong in using the title that way, I think he should be an Associate Counsel or make up your own word for it but that's what he should be called*

*Richard Widomski: But that's legally wrong*

*Paul DiMauro: It's not legally wrong, he has the right to hire such other Counsel provided the Mayor goes along with it, subject to the Mayor's approval he can hire Ray Sous, Joe Blow or anybody else to work along with him in "the Corporation Counsel's office", in the office of, he should not be called the assistant Corporation Counsel as far as I'm concerned, but who am I to argue an attorney but I would, because I don't think this reads that way. I think that if there's an assistant Counsel it's someone hired by the Aldermen. I think if he hires someone he should be called whatever he wants to call him, and Assistant Corporation Counsel is probably a better word, and Associate Counsel or whatever he wants to call him, but what it is in many cases is that and I can remember back when Welch was Corporation Counsel before, Ben Winnick would work on some things. Someone else in his office would work on some things. Now we have both Welchs in that office working in the same capacity from time to time and they've had Ray Sous work on some other matters, because I know I've put some contracts together and I had to go through Ray and I understand, but he should not be signing his name as far as I'm concerned Assistant Counsel because he wasn't appointed by the Board of Aldermen.*

*Richard Widomski: But he was appointed by Welch*

*Paul DiMauro: He was appointed by Welch in conjunction with*

*Richard Widomski: He can't be appointed by the Mayor*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: He's appointed by the Counsel subject to the approval of the Mayor. And I think that works in that paragraph and I think the next paragraph works and if we need clarification from Counsel whether they're doing it right or wrong we should just tell them*

*Walter Sofian: So Assistant Corporation Counsel is a Counsel that assists the Board of Aldermen*

*Paul DiMauro: That's the way I read this, it's a one sentence*

*Inaudible*



*Ann Dougherty: Can the Corporation Counsel be a firm?*

*Paul DiMauro: Yes, I imagine it could be. The Mayor could appoint the firm and so and so to be Corporation Counsel and they'll assign whomever they want*

*Michael Pacowta: Ray Sous is not the Assistant Corporation Counsel?*

*Paul DiMauro: No he's not. You know what, stop. If he was appointed by the Board of Aldermen*

*Richard Widomski: Because when I went to the Tax people downstairs I got into a tiff with Ray so immediately they sent me to Tom, ok so Ray Sous reports to Tom Welch*

*Paul DiMauro: I tend to agree with what he's saying and I'll tell you why, because why would*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: And you know what, they may have had the Board of Aldermen approve him because they thought they had to have to do it and I don't think they needed to. If he's acting in the capacity as an "Assistant" is what I'm saying would be to Tom Welch or to John Welch whichever one is Corporation Counsel, if he's acting as an Assistant to him, he never should have been ratified by the Board of Aldermen, he should have been*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Here's why I say it, we have another Counsel ask him, because the Board of Aldermen has the right to appoint or remove the Assistant Corporation Counsel, well if he's working for Corporation Counsel (inaudible), it doesn't work. To me it doesn't work*

*Walter Sofian: It's a separate title.*

*Paul DiMauro: It's a separate title. Let me give you a quick summary of it. The issue is Corporation Counsel is appointed by the Mayor and such other personnel as he needs, which could mean another associate, attorney, it could be another firm because he's got a conflict, it could be I need help I need another attorney so and so to work on certain types of cases, so that's the issue there. Because they were saying approval of the Mayor, and I'm saying if the Mayor appoints the Corporation Counsel, then the Mayor should have a say on who else he's using because it's part of the same package, the same office. Now you go to the next section as put by Bob Lally, if the Board of Aldermen decide that they want to have Counsel because they don't agree with it, why shouldn't they be able to. I contest that Section 6.2.3 which is other Counsel, Assistant Counsel and states the Board of Aldermen may appoint or remove such Assistant*

*Corporation Counsel and such other Counsel as the Board deems necessary or convenient. Appoint or remove so they would answer to the Board of Aldermen.*

*Steve Bellis: That's the way it's always been*

*Paul DiMauro: It's a separate situation*

*Bob Lally: (inaudible), well I sat on the Board and I don't remember*

*Paul DiMauro: Well you should have spoken up*

*Bob Lally: You're absolutely correct, I should have but I didn't, and to correct that probably what might correct the whole thing is to change may to shall*

*Paul DiMauro: No, because then you're forcing them to hire somebody even if you don't need it*

*Bob Lally: No, absolutely not, that's not the case at all, as he deems necessary, we always had an Assistant Corporation Counsel and it is a responsibility*

*Paul DiMauro: Here's my problem with that. Ray answers to John or Tom, right?*

*Steve Bellis: No, he's the Assistant Corporation Counsel*

*Paul DiMauro: He is, appointed by the Board of Alderman?*

*Steve Bellis: Yes, once he's appointed, that's it.*

*Paul DiMauro: Then he answers to Tom or John? He gets his work from them, they delegate the work to him, see here's my problem with that, is he's doing the function of the Corporation Counsel in the corporation Counsel's absence and he's appointed by the Board of Aldermen, then the Board of Aldermen could fire him under that pretense. I don't think he's an assistant Counsel, I don't think that's what he should be if he's working with Corporation Counsel. If he's working with Corporation Counsel, but Steve you can't have one guy appointed by the Mayor working at the pleasure of the Mayor, having someone that's appointed by the Board of Aldermen, talk about conflict if you ever got into a difference of opinion, what I'm saying quite honestly Counsel can hire as many attorneys as he wants subject to the approval of the Mayor within his budget. Corporation Counsel can hire whomever he wants subject to the approval of the Mayor within his budget. The Board of Aldermen can appoint if they wish an Assistant Corporation Counsel and any Counsel. Technically, if Tom Welch has somebody else working for him, it can be an associate, assistant Counsel, Assistant Corporation Counsel or whatever, or maybe the Assistant Counsel here shouldn't be Assistant Counsel, just get rid of Assistant Counsel on the wording here and say they should hire such other Counsel as the Board deems necessary.*

*Steve Bellis: And just delete assistant?*

*Paul DiMauro: And just delete assistant and then in the previous paragraph if the Corporation Counsel wants to have an assistant, he can simply go hire him by going to see the Mayor. I think that clarifies it and now you know, see what I'm saying is if you had a situation where someone did appoint a firm, as Corporation Counsel, and say I'm going to appoint his firm and they are going to supply us with people that are going to do the job, then you would never need an Assistant Corporation Counsel. But the Board of Aldermen may in fact want to hire a Counsel on their own behalf. So why force them to hire someone and you're saying they don't have to by saying shall, but to me it should like they should fill that position and that's how they're going to interpret and they're going to do it whether they need it or not. So what I would suggest is then if you remove the language on 6.2.3 or any reference to Assistant Counsel, and simply say the Board of Aldermen may appoint or remove such other Counsel as the Board deems necessary or convenient you're allowing the Board of Aldermen to have full reign if they want to hire their own Counsel because they either they don't like the opinion that was rendered by Corporation Counsel and want to hire their own Counsel to give it a second look, they would have that authority, they have that authority now. And you don't get into conflict over titles. You don't need to name an Assistant Corporation Counsel. Just for discussions in the next go around I would like to do that, cross off Assistant Counsel and remove*

*Walter Sofian: Mr. Chairman, while you're on this, a lot of things that would make this go faster in the ones that remain, with regards to necessary or convenient, is convenient really required? Shouldn't necessary to do the job enough? It pops up all the time necessary or convenient.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: It's been in here for as many years*

*Inaudible*

*Ann Dougherty: I think that one of the lawyers in the group said that sometimes that word convenient is appropriate.*

*Steve Bellis: Gary said he sees it a lot.*

*Irving Steiner: May I mention just one scenario? It may not fit what we have here, recently the P&Z took action on something the mayor didn't like, he was going to sue. P&Z is an independent body, not necessarily have to be supported fund wise by the Board of Aldermen, what does the Charter do in a case like that where P&Z must get their own counsel to defend themselves*

*Paul DiMauro: I'm not looking at P&Z language here, but I'm sure they can get their own.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Corporation Counsel would normally defend Planning & Zoning, at that time I'm assuming that the Corporation Counsel would say sorry guys, I've got a conflict here because I'm representing the Mayor, alright, therefore you have to get your own counsel. And I think Corporation Counsel would actually funnel the monies right through his own budget. To fund it no?*

*Bob Lally: We had a situation like that in P&Z suing ZBA and of course Corporation Counsel (inaudible), the Board of Aldermen funded additional amounts to cover separate counsel.*

*Paul DiMauro: Ok, but in this case here, to go back to your question, on that particular case the Board of Aldermen could have stepped up to the plate and said we're hiring an attorney to take the challenge.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: There's never been a situation, we've had cross suits in the City before*

*Irving Steiner: But couldn't the P&Z left without counsel?*

*Paul DiMauro: No, it would never happen. Because isn't the primary Counsel the Corporation Counsel? So he's got the responsibility in defending them, quite the contrary the Mayor or the Board of Aldermen in that case would have to go to someone else. Only when you have P&Z and ZBA fighting each other that's a different situation*

*Inaudible*

*Richard Widomski: If P&Z needs an attorney*

*Paul DiMauro: They could hire them if they had the money*

*Richard Widomski: With the approval of the Mayor based on the Charter*

*Paul DiMauro: Based on the Charter, that professional in that particular sentence was never meant to be counsel, that was meant to be engineers, that type of thing, that's what that was*

*Richard Widomski: What would you call an attorney?*

*Paul DiMauro: It's a professional, but I'm trying to tell you that the intent of having that term in that particular context was to cover engineers, planning consultants*

*Richard Widomski: Yeah but it doesn't say that*

*Paul DiMauro: I'm just trying to tell you*

*Richard Widomski: I know that, I know what you're saying*

*Paul DiMauro: I can only tell you what the intent is, we can't cover every part of it there, we have never been in a situation where a board or anything has been left without counsel. Ok? And quite honestly, the P&Z could go to the Board of Aldermen and say we need counsel for such and such, as far as the idea of necessary or convenient, I'm going to defer to counsel, Steve you tell me whether it's important or we'll go to Corporation Counsel or we'll ask Gary. If anyone feels strongly because there are some terms that do have some legal things, it's hard for me to believe this word, I don't know.*

*Ann Dougherty: I don't think it's used too much*

*Steve Bellis: It's used so much*

*Ann Dougherty: Convenient to whom?*

*Steve Bellis: Something with necessary, you could even argue what's necessary or not*

*Walter Sofian: Necessary has a definite meaning, it's what you need to get the job done and convenient is a whole different thing.*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't know*

*Walter Sofian: I thought that if the Board deems something necessary*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't remember ever getting into something where we've been challenged, but we could certainly check. We would delete convenient and keep necessary*

*Walter Sofian: It was one of our recommendations, but it isn't one of our strongest ones*

*Steve Bellis: No, I understand.*

*Paul DiMauro: But let's look at it, less words are better*

*Walter Sofian: On the next paragraph 6.3, the same thing pops up in the last sentence it says the City/Town Clerk shall pay to the*

*Paul DiMauro: Deposit, we've got deposit*

**Walter Sofian:** *Ok, the next one is covered by the previous comments. Section 6.8 it's our recommendation 33 Health and Public Assistance.*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Changed it, we've already changed it, the City shall have a Health Department provided however that the City is not participating in a district Health Department as prescribed in Section, so we eliminated the whole concept of Director of Public Assistance*

**Walter Sofian:** *May participate? Or may not participate?*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Listen, the City shall have a Health Department provided however, that the City is not participating in a district Health Department as prescribed in section such and such, which we do. We do participate therefore we do not have a Health Department but if for whatever reason the Board of Aldermen decided that we were going to pull out of the Naugatuck Valley Health then we would need a position there called*

**Walter Sofian:** *The original Charter says may, it doesn't use a negative that's why*

**Paul DiMauro:** *That's because it's changed around completely because we do belong to the Valley and the language on the proposed changes.*

**Walter Sofian:** *6.8.3 again dealing with the Public Health and Assistance. We're commenting basically that we don't have a Director of Public Assistance*

**Paul DiMauro:** *We took that out already. That has been taken out, respectively has been taken out. There has been changed to the, etc. so we cleaned all that language up.*

**Walter Sofian:** *Ok, the only other is Director, and shall report to a duly appointed Board of Health.*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Let me read it, what we've got is, I'm sorry say that again?*

**Walter Sofian:** *You just added a sentence that says the Director shall have such other related powers and duties as described by the Mayor or Board of Aldermen and shall report to the duly appointed Board of Health*

**Ann Dougherty:** *that's been changed to the Administrative Assistant*

**Paul DiMauro:** *There is no Board of Health.*

**Walter Sofian:** *the Administrative Assistant?*

***Paul DiMauro: Yeah, it's like having any other position within the City. It's not anything different, the Director of Health is like having a Chief of Police or like having a Director of any other position***

***Walter Sofian: The Chief of Police doesn't report to the Administrative Assistant***

***Paul DiMauro: Well he reports to the Mayor.***

***Inaudible***

***Paul DiMauro: You may but you'd have to create that separately.***

***Randy York: So I think that the fact that we don't have a Director Health but if you're leaving anything in the Charter in there looking towards the future that we might have one (inaudible – cannot hear speaker), report to a Board of Health rather than an Administrative Assistant.***

***Paul DiMauro: But then what you're saying is that you'd have to***

***Randy York: But right now it doesn't mean anything***

***Paul DiMauro: The whole thing means nothing, I don't see changing it quite honestly, but if you did that you'd have to state in here that the Board of Aldermen shall establish such and then you have to go through it all, let them establish what they want to***

***Randy York: How do you have it?***

***Paul DiMauro: The way we have it is the Director of Health shall administer the public health program (inaudible) to the operations of the offices***

***Randy York: You're going to leave the powers and duties in, if you're going to leave this in the Charter,***

***Paul DiMauro: One of the things that you might be missing here is that you will find that health related items are very closely controlled by the Connecticut State Statutes as they are with the health district they would be the same for the municipality and without going to the State Statutes and reading it I'm guaranteeing you that there are very strong State regulations and guidelines that they have to follow. It's just like having saying you need to have a Board to oversee the Fire Marshal or the Building Inspector, Building Inspector especially when they're living by state codes they answer basically to the State. There's so much Statute on those types of positions that if they had a Board it might muddle things, I don't know if I'd be in favor of having a Board. I wouldn't want to debate that right now because it's a non-issue, but I don't know, I'd have to really consider it whether or not you would want to have a Board. It's just like the opinion of someone wanting a Board for the Police Commissioners.***

*Randy York: (inaudible- cannot hear speaker) why have it in the Charter?*

*Paul DiMauro: Because we can't force the Board of Aldermen to stay in it. It's an elective thing, we joined the Valley Health District back, I'm trying to remember when, a long time ago. But we didn't have to. We could have established our own Health Department and a lot of large communities do have their own Health Departments. If we ever got to the point that we felt that the Valley Health Department was running out of control, which they did at one time, they started accessing fees or whatever to the City, residents and all for their own activities, if we got to the point where it became most cost effective to hire a Director to run our operation, why shouldn't we have that right? So we don't have to*

*Walter Sofian: Isn't the Valley considered a duly appointed Board of Health*

*Paul DiMauro: Oh yes.*

*Walter Sofian: An our Director*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: We wouldn't be part of them if we had our own Director. We would lose them and we would have our own Director*

*Irving Steiner: Either or*

*Paul DiMauro: Either or and if we ever got into a situation, it's more cost effective, why wouldn't you want that latitude? You don't want to tie the Board of Aldermen's hand and say you have to be part of*

*Walter Sofian: But what you're saying is if we had a Director of Health, ok, he would have to report to the Administrative Assistant*

*Paul DiMauro: He'd have to report to someone*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: No, I wouldn't say that, I wouldn't want to have a Board of Health no more than I would want to have a Board overseeing the Building Official or a Board overseeing the Police Department or whatever. I'm not big on that.*

*Walter Sofian: So who does he report to?*

*Paul DiMauro: The Administrative Assistant, he's going to be following State Statutes, he's got to report to someone that he's going to show up and be there in the morning and someone got to be able to manage his time, activities, etc, how many inspections and all that. Someone's got to report to somebody, technically in this City,*



*the Administrative Assistant is the catchall person that's in charge of personnel. The Administrative Assistant is in charge of personnel.*

*Walter Sofian: Including the Zoning Enforcement Officer or the Inland/Wetlands?*

*Paul DiMauro: Pretty much so. No, no, no, not for daily orders*

*Walter Sofian: That's what I meant.*

*Paul DiMauro: Not for daily order and I think what we were doing is we were going to go to Counsel and try and come up with some definition of what their responsibility is, of what the chain is, because as far as setting policy, every Board, P&Z, Parks Z& Rec and the rest of them all set policy for their staff. They set policy but they've got to answer to someone on a day-to-day basis as to where they are, did they show up for work, are the following OSHA, who runs the OSHA classes. We run the insurance, the Boards don't know the insurance the City's got, nor do they really get into it. So we've got to be following all of that. I'm satisfied with that, it's not absorbing any power of any if the Boards or Commissions in my opinion, it strictly as an administrative type function.*

*Randy York: Well it can*

*Paul DiMauro: Well it can, you know what, and it can no matter how it's put in*

*Randy York: (inaudible – cannot hear speaker) powerful position in the administrative' position*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Hey the whole point is, I don't know who else you would report to. Who else centrally in the City do they report to?*

*Walter Sofian: The Commission*

*Paul DiMauro: No, no, no, the Commission can't oversee labor matters. They're not there every day, they don't understand labor situations*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Guys, I'm sorry you've got to get involved in labor matters, you need someone to know what the hell their doing*

*Randy York: Right, I don't think it should be the Administrative Assistant*

*Paul DiMauro: The Administrative Assistant goes to the Human Resource person, quite honestly, in mist cases when it becomes a legalistic type, goes to our labor*

*counsel, but they're the body that we work through, isn't that really what it is? You know, we have a Labor Counsel in the City that hired through the City*

*Randy York: You could also make a point that the Mayor's office might want to stay removed from personnel issues because it's probably isn't a good idea to make it look like the Mayor is doing the hiring and the firing of everybody in town. It's a personnel issue that's why we have a personnel department and that should be*

*Steve Bellis: Why do you want such a weak Mayor?*

*Randy York: That should be separate.*

*Steve Bellis: Why are you advocating such a weak Mayor? We've never had a weak Mayor*

*Randy York: Well because I think (inaudible)*

*Steve Bellis: And that makes you want a weaker Mayor?*

*Paul DiMauro: You need a stronger Mayor.*

*Steve Bellis: We need a stronger Mayor not a weaker one.*

*Randy York: I think that we could run into problems*

*Steve Bellis: Do you want a Town Manager instead?*

*Paul DiMauro: Let me ask you, do you know how the State of Connecticut works?*

*Randy York: What I don't want is an Administrative Assistant pulling up and saying the Mayor wants to get rid of that guy fire him.*

*Paul DiMauro: Do you know how the State works?*

*Randy York: I work in a department and I'm the Department Manager and I get a call from the Mayor's office saying I have someone that wants that job, you're going to hire them. You don't think that's a dangerous situation?*

*Paul DiMauro: let me ask you something, the State of Connecticut is a much large entity than we are, they have a completely separated Governor's office here, [personnel office for testing and hiring, etc, and you have department here that request personnel when they need personnel, do you honestly feel that the Governor's never had any influence on putting someone into a position? Even though they've got all the separation and they have a separate personnel department that does all the testing, if anybody here in this room thinks the Governor didn't have any influence on helping somebody getting a position, not only this Governor, but the last Governor and so on,*

*has not said (inaudible), so no matter what you do there, elect the right individuals and if you don't have the right one get rid of him. It's that simple, you are not going to put enough safeguards in to try and prevent every situation. You shouldn't be sitting here, you should be sitting on a couple of other boards then that have a lot more power than the City does.*

*Randy York: Well it's actually a good discussion because in this case we don't have a Director of Health*

*Paul DiMauro: it's a very good thing and if someone could put a magic wand and who should all these people report to on a regular basis, I don't know. Can it be the Human Resource person? Is that person strong enough? I don't know.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I'm not talking about hiring, I'm talking about*

*Randy York: It can be done by memos, it can be done administratively, that we're granting this person an awful lot of power when we say that the Department Heads are to report to the Administrative Assistant.*

*Paul DiMauro: Who would you have them report to? Give me a suggestion on who'd they report to.*

*Randy York: You're talking personnel functions*

*Paul DiMauro: A Department Head, who does the Department Head report to?*

*Walter Sofian: Like John Cook?*

*Steve Bellis: The Engineer*

*Bob Lally: That's a different situation.*

*Inaudible*

*Randy York: You're talking personnel matters*

*Paul DiMauro: Ok, let's go Water Pollution and Control.*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: Wait a minute, may I say something because this is a discussion I put on the board a few months ago, where you have an elected body that's regulated by the Charter i.e.: P&Z, the Library Board and the Board of Education, the responsibilities for the staffing belongs to the elected officials of the Board*

*Steve Bellis: But I said City Engineer Bob.*

*Bob Lally: The City Engineer is a higher hand*

*Paul DiMauro: I think Bob is excluding hose*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: Inland/Wetlands is appointed by Charter, by the Mayor and it's his responsibility to run that but the three elected Boards one of which you brought up P&Z is not the responsibility of the Mayor's office, it's the responsibility of the elected officials i.e., the chairman of the board.*

*Paul DiMauro: And I would tend to agree with you on most matters*

*Charles Carroll: But the Chairman of the Board doesn't know who comes to school everyday, the Superintendent does*

*Bob Lally: But we're not talking about that*

*Paul DiMauro: Same parallel*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: But the Board of Education has the final say on who is hired and who is fired in the Board of Education and that's a fact and the Planning & Zoning Commission should have that same right and it is not the case.*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't feel strongly one way or another about who Planning & Zoning, Zoning Enforcement Officer answers to on a daily basis on that situation when it comes to labor law, but I do know that before you allow an elected Board to act in that capacity, you better have a check and balance. Because if they do something stupid, like fire someone without just cause, and they haven't done the proper research and not all of them are labor related or understand labor, you just can't discipline someone that's in a union, who's going to keep or maintain the personnel records for these individuals? Who's going to administer the insurance? Where does the personnel file get kept? I mean we can go on and on with this. I'm sorry, they work for the City, they work for the City, they work for the City and they've got to live by the rules of the City or you're going to get in trouble.*

*Bob Lally: Why is there a problem in the Board of Education?*

*Paul DiMauro: They do the same thing, they have their own counsel, they have their own labor counsel*

**Bob Lally:** *The Board of Education, the elected officials not the Superintendent of Schools*

**Inaudible**

**Paul DiMauro:** *But they do it all by his recommendations, let's be honest. Nothing goes on without Leon knowing about it Leon makes the recommendation, and he's done the research on it before he sends it to his Board, he has done the research. Who is the Leon of Planning & Zoning? Who is the Leon of the Library Board? Tell me who the individual is and if you tell me someone that's elected in the Chairman's position, I'm sorry I'd have to go against that because I've had some experience in it, you could have a Chairman that's had no experience in labor matters, knows nothing about it and you're going to tell me you're going to put him in charge of employees and jeopardize the City's position? That's what you're saying.*

**Irving Steiner:** *Maybe the problem is in the wording reporting to. Where you could say reporting to on an administrative basis*

**Paul DiMauro:** *I said before Irving, at the last meeting, that we would try and find language that clarifies what the responsibility of report to means. Whether it's the guy in Planning & Zoning, more importantly for the Library Board, P&Z, Board of Education, well Board of Education takes care of their own now anyway, if we had language that made it clear on what they were reporting for, and inserted that somewhere, I think that's what we said last time what we would do, we'd try and have Counsel come up with something like that as a catch all to define what the reporting means that'll satisfy everybody here.*

**Irving Steiner:** *That's right. Because if you exclude*

**Paul DiMauro:** *So let me leave it to Counsel to come up with "the proper language to do that". I'm not going to attempt to do it. OK? Is that fair enough?*

**Irving Steiner:** *Yes, if you exclude that they are not reporting for technical*

**Paul DiMauro:** *No, no, no, it's no different than, here's where you slice the pie, the Building Inspector answers to the Administrative Assistant on a day-to-day basis*

**Paul DiMauro:** *or a Fire Marshal's going to go bless a space unless it's warranted. They're not going to do it, they answer to the State. It's just a matter of cleaning up the language, I think the intent is correct, I mean look is there going to be abuse, there's always going to be some, but that's not to say a Chairman wouldn't abuse it either. So what's the difference? Next issue?*

**Walter Sofian:** *6.9.1 EMS is part of Public Safety*

*Paul DiMauro: What we did is we said Office of Emergency Council, we did add them to be part of the Public Safety Council, we added them and what we did is we said is representative of the Ambulance Primary Service provider as designated by Connecticut State Statutes because we don't know if it'll be Echo one year or somebody else the other year, so we made it a catch all phrase. By recommendation of Petrillo was it?*

*Walter Sofian: The next one is mute. We're up to 5.2*

*Paul DiMauro: 6.2?*

*Walter Sofian: 5.2, we went back. Basically this is, I guess there's a feeling that there is people that are serving that have not been reappointed officially by the Mayor. Because we can't get the information to the contrary and this is just putting language in place that said that within fifteen days of expiration of a member's term, the member shall inform the Mayor in writing of such expiration, member shall continue to serve at the pleasure of the Mayor an additional sixty days following the expiration date of his term. If the Mayor has not replaced the member (inaudible). Right now the Mayor is supposed to appoint, it means that people are serving beyond their terms and can be yanked at any time.*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't like that type of situation, it's not a healthy situation, when someone's going on a month to month, because then I think there could be the appearance at least of control of someone, I see where you're coming from*

*Irving Steiner: I brought up this fact of all those terms that have expired to the Mayor and his response was verbal through his secretary, I'm going by the Charter. That's all he said.*

*Paul DiMauro: I would certainly entertain some sort of language if it said if someone is appointed within x number of months from the time of their expiration date, if nothing's been done, then it would give them an automatic renewal*

*Inaudible*

*Richard Widomski: What's 9.6*

*Bob Lally: May I remind the Chairman, that there's been discussion on this already*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: What I had suggested about the re-appointment, (inaudible) and they have thirty days to decide one way or another whether they want to continue or be removed (inaudible), the Mayor has sixty days to finish that whole process*

*Paul DiMauro: What section is that?*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Any vacancy in any appointed office shall be filled within thirty days*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: That's if someone leaves the position. It's really not a vacancy. Tell me something, if I'm appointed for three years, I don't have any authority three years and one day. Why do I have any authority beyond three years? My term's done. If I was elected to a position*

*Inaudible*

*Steve Bellis: But it's also like a lease*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: It's not a lease, I disagree. It's to say that if the City of Shelton decided not to have an election this November, then everybody stays in office. It doesn't work that way.*

*Inaudible*

*Ann Dougherty: That's at the State level as well*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: But they may have it in their language and their documents that may say id someone is not appointed he may continue in the office, unless there's language that says*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Well we have to fix the wording somehow to say that the person's term is either done or not.*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: It should be the Administrative Assistant's job to notify those people that their terms are up not up to the individuals*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: You can't leave it up to the individuals, it's got to be an automatic process from*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: The problem is, if you take the situation like the Inland/Wetland Commission where you have all appointed members and their all expired, the question is what you said, then everything they've ruled on is not legal. So they have to be careful of that.*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: I think an outfit like Avalon might pick up on something like that and just go into it.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: There probably is a State Statute that over-rides what I just said*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: We are allowed to be more stringent and I don't see any reason why we can't have a thirty-day window for re-appointment.*

*Inaudible*

*Charles Carroll: Then you have to come up with something else, if he doesn't do it, what do you do?*

*Inaudible*

*Charles Carroll: Leaving them out there is dangerous.*

*Inaudible*

*Steve Bellis: Bob, what section did you have your change to?*

*Bob Lally: 5.5*

*Paul DiMauro: But wouldn't you put it as a catch all for all?*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: I added it as (l) because there is no (l)*

*Paul DiMauro: I see what you're saying you put it under General.*



*Walter Sofian: We put it under appointed by the Mayor*

*Paul DiMauro: I'd rather have it here.*

*Irving Steiner: We just appreciate you recognizing the same problems we do*

*Paul DiMauro: We are*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: 6.9.3.2 Fire Commissioners, you guys recommended that the Board of Fire Commissioners be elected by the members of the Fire Commission. I'm going to back off too, as far as we're concerned, I understand there are a lot of problems there too, (inaudible – cannot hear speaker), our position is that whatever the Fire Department wants*

*Paul DiMauro: Yes, if we could ever figure out what they want. We have a real problem deciphering who wants what*

*Walter Sofian: We thought that it would be a real good idea that if the one appointed by the Mayor wasn't automatically the Chairman.*

*Paul DiMauro: I think he has to be*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: There has to be a Chairman, but it doesn't have to be the one the Mayor appoints.*

*Paul DiMauro: Yeah, but you don't want deals made between companies. They all want their own, this one's out, this guy didn't go along with whatever. Believe me it's just a can of worms.*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: You don't want to put one of our four Commissioners in there*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: They feel very strongly about two people from one company*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: The only part that he was receptive to was if another individual outside of the four were elected or brought in by the Mayor. That would be more acceptable*

*Inaudible*

*Steve Bellis: We should just go back, we should have just one Commissioner*

*Paul DiMauro: The Mayor has the authority to appoint a Commissioner that has no affiliation with a Fire Department. Ken Nappy was that individual. I think he was Chairman of the Commissioners*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: The Mayor does have the authority to do that.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: We're asking for one more meeting with them together all in one room*

*Bob Lally: You know it is the responsibility of the Mayor to maintain the safety of the City. Believe me I'm not being political about this, he needs to be able to choose*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Quite honestly, when there is an emergency and the bell goes off, the Fire Chief reigns. The Commissioners have to back off. The Commissioners have no authority once that bell rings. None, at a fire.*

*Irving Steiner: One of the unique things that came out, and I didn't even think about was that they said whoever he is, he can't spend any time at one fire department than he can with any of the others. He can't stay here anymore than he can over here. He's got to rotate.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: We're going to talk to them, go ahead*

*Walter Sofian: Our position we made a decision whatever the fire department wants*

*Paul DiMauro: Good point, you learned that?*

*Walter Sofian: Next one deals with 6.9.5.1 head of EMS service, the maximum that we suggested should be 3 from one not 4*

*Paul DiMauro: There's five*

*Walter Sofian: Ok, our recommendation was that there should be a maximum of three from one*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Can someone check it? Charles you're in charge of checking that.*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: Recommendation 40 is just Marshals*

*Paul DiMauro: We changed that already.*

*Walter Sofian: We added a new section, recommendation 41 which you have not gotten yet.*

*Paul DiMauro: What section does it pertain to?*

*Walter Sofian: It would be under 5.1.4.1, a new section. It's an added section. This is the Planning and Zoning Plan Update. A ten year plan update basically it says the Planning and Zoning Commission shall on or before the end of the tenth year of the previous ten year plan form a committee to upgrade the ten year plan in accordance to section 8-23 (inaudible) We're basically saying that it should be in our Charter*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: The Split Rock application is in violation of the existing plan. They should upgrade the plan*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: It's an historical document is what I'm saying. It should reflect what the Board is supposed to do and not be a document that is converted by whim of a developer.*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: You can't be that much out of the box.*

*Irving Steiner: It's a document that deserves respect.*

*Paul DiMauro: So is the Zoning book itself.*

*Steve Bellis: You're trying to make it mandatory that every ten years they do an update*

*Walter Sofian: That'd be a great idea.*

*Steve Bellis: I thought that they did that anyway.*

*Bob Lally: I thought it was by State Statute*

*Irving Steiner: It is*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: When was that plan last updated?*

*Irving Steiner: In 1992, a and b section divided by*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I concur, but if you're claiming they've violated what the intent of the last study was done and they violated that what makes you think they'll listen to the new one? What's the difference?*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: They would have re-visited the issue years ago, and then at least it would have an update that*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: In my business, we're well over built now, why would you buy the property for office development if there's no market for office development in Shelton beyond what we have now.*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: Conforming to a publicly approved document quells the possibility of public initiative when you violate, in other words hey they've gone to court to something that the public looked at and we let it happen and there it goes.*

*Paul DiMauro: But we just did that. We just went against their last plan.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I didn't hear any outcry*

*Irving Steiner: Oh yes there was*

*Paul DiMauro: Not against going*

*Inaudible*

*Steve Bellis: They vote on it*

*Paul DiMauro: The Board of Aldermen don't vote on it at all? Just P&Z?*

*Irving Steiner: Well then it's given to the BOA and it gets a public review*

*Inaudible*

*Inaudible – cannot hear speaker addressing Commission*

*Paul DiMauro: I disagree to a certain extent, someone's going for Zone change and they're going to change R1 to R3, there has to be a public hearing, there's all kinds of noise on it, it's totally different than a plan development which is strictly under the authority of P&Z. So the problem I don't see is being is whether they change a zone because that gets enough publicity and it can be appealed most importantly in all and that type of thing. Plan development is where we're out of control. Because we've applied it in areas like in this particular instance on Split Rock and I have no problem with what they're doing, I think it's a great idea, it's good development fir the City, it's going to be beneficial to the City, but I didn't know personally that that property could be used for retail.*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: That's true but the problem is like anything else, once it's done it's done.*

*Steve Bellis: Why don't you give us your recommendation.*

*Paul DiMauro: I do agree like things on the P&Z, maybe the idea is eliminate the alternates. I don't know if we could legislate or to put in the Charter that there's a minimal amount of vote for an affirmative action that has to be taken*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Board of Aldermen have a lot of major issues that they have to vote. It might 6 out of 8. So I don't know if legally we could do it here, but I would love on those important issues that it would take more than a simple majority because I'll tell you why majority on a board can all be in one party with the same thinking. Like it or not. So if you've got seven, there's four and three. If you've got 9, it's five and four*

*Inaudible*

*Irving Steiner: Paul, there's a case over here where a developer by Tree land, close enough to the border of Stratford won a case because they only had these certain percentages of approval and by State Statute they had to have a higher amount because it was within 500 feet of a neighboring town.*

*Inaudible*

*Richard Widomski: The other thing that is happening, there's only 6 members on the Board of Aldermen and I see more and more people starting to recuse themselves (inaudible-cannot hear speaker), so you have 4 or 5 people that have to recuse themselves*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I don't know how you do it but there has to be some kind of mechanism to be able to bring in someone to hear that because you can't stop the City.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Well number 1, if someone has to recuse themselves that many times, he probably shouldn't be sitting on the Board in the first place.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: about the term limits, which I am not in favor of because I don't know when someone gets too cozy to the developer or anybody else. I think they're cozy before they go in, in some cases so they should have no term.*

*Inaudible*

*Walter Sofian: yeah, but Michael Davis said pick a situation, would you rather have immediate relief by bringing more people on the board or you have to wait 6 years down the road. Our answer is, we really think that for our land use boards we probably do need term limits. We could be generous, you could say four terms whatever, but there should be no one sitting on a land use board forever. Like guys that are sitting there for two decades. We have that. Leon's been there for 26 years, Pagliaro was there for two decades, it's a long time.*

*Paul DiMauro: I will admit that you do pick up a certain amount of power*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I'm trying to be nice about it, you know when that person's been around he's the go to person, he's the one you call. My opinion is like I said before, somehow the Town Committees have to find a way to be able to get rid of people, I think minority representation has hurt us in this instance, because not everybody's running*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Well the Town Committee should be forced to put up the entire compliment of candidates and if they don't then anyone should be able to sign up*

*Inaudible*

*Bob Lally: In some town Boar dof Eduication is voted on a non political basis intentionally so that there ios no politics*

*Paul DiMauro: Can you do that uinder our State Statutes?*

*Bob Lally: It's done in Connecticut.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: There's an audit and a report published every year.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: I'd like to thank everyone here tonight and we will look over everything.*

*Thank you.*

The meeting with the CARE Group concluded at 8:44 pm.

There are still open items of the proposed Charter that will have to be addressed at a later time. Many of the open items are due to reviewing other chapters of the Charter as well as awaiting responses. A consensus will be taken at a later date.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, April 12. Mr. Bob Araujo and Mr. Jim Tortora will be re-invited to sit with the Commission to finalize their proposals to the Fire Department section of the Charter.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Bob Lally motioned to adjourn. Steve Bellis second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Paul DiMauro adjourned the meeting of the Charter Revision Commission at 8:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade

Sophia V. Belade

Clerk-Charter Revision Commission

***\* ATTACHMENTS WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE ON THE WEB. COPIES OF MINUTES WITH ATTACHMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE CITY/TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE***

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED FROM TAPE WHICH IS ON FILE IN THE CITY/TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE