



# CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

## MEETING

**Tuesday, April 26, 2005**

The meeting for the Charter Revision Commission was called to order by Paul DiMauro at 7:06 P.M. in Room 303 at Shelton City Hall.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Attending: Paul DiMauro  
Michael Davis  
Joe Konner  
Bob Lally

Absent: Irene Smith  
Gary Cahill  
Steve Bellis  
Charles Carroll  
Sue Coyle  
Ann Dougherty

There was no one from the public that wanted to address the Commission. Chairman DiMauro concluded the public portion at 7:09 pm.

There was no quorum so the Commission could not accept the minutes from April 12, 2005.

Representatives from the Board of Fire Commissioners and Officers Council and Fire Chief John Millo were the invited guests at this evening's meeting

*Good Evening, Bruce Kosowsky, we have Merle Chase, he's one of the Commissioners from Company 3 and Dave Zokowsky, from Company 1.*

*James Tortora, Fire Marshal and Chairman of the Officers Council, Charter Revision Subcommittee.*

*Paul DiMauro: Ok, let me say that on the onset, all we're trying to accomplish is to give the Fire department the tools that they need to operate efficiently and quite*

*honestly to make sure that the rank in file understand what's being done and they are in favor. I really don't want to hear about personalities, I don't want to hear about individuals. We've all seen and we've all been around long enough to know we've seen changes. Let's talk about position and let's talk about the best way for the position. This is how it should be. Having said that, I've just received another copy from the Fire Commissioners replacing the copy that we got dated from your meeting of March 28. This has been revised and we're talking about this particular copy. Jim, the last copy received from the Officers Council, the letter was dated 4/15 remarks were dated April 12. Can I assume that this is the latest that your group has proposed?*

*Jim Tortora: Yes*

*Paul DiMauro: Can either of you summarize what the differences are between the two, because I have not had a chance of course to read Bruce your latest submission to know whether there are major differences.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Yes basically after being here the last time and listening to your comments, I'm looking at a forward direction for the next ten years. The Board met again, in fact we met at a work session and then we met last night and we looked at the present Charter and the present information that we already sent to you. We made a new change on the Fire Department side, you should have a copy of it, on that 6.9.3.1. and we labeled it Department Composition, Functions and Structure. Based on some of the talk that we heard from your members about structure, having some type of structure within the Fire Department, I also looked at the study that was done a few years ago and some of the recommendations that they had in there, and basically we came out with the City shall have a Fire Department with at minimum, the following divisions, an Administrative, Operational, Investigative and Safety. And then the next half would be the Fire Department headed by the Board of Fire Commissioners and consisting of such existing fire companies and such other fire companies and divisions as may be deemed necessary or convenient by the Board of Fire Commissioners and approved by the Board of Aldermen. That's something that is in the present language, you know approval for any more companies, you need to go through the Board of Aldermen for that nature. Basically what we tried to do is to break the fire department out into divisions so that whoever sits in this position as explained by members here have the opportunity through job descriptions in putting people in charge of those divisions rather than putting in the Charter saying that you will be this and for ten years that person will be this. We figured that this would give the Board the latitude to say operation divisions, if you look at the study it makes reference to the Deputy Chief of Operations, you know a full time position was even discussed in the study. Also administration you know with the size of the town and the thing that are happening. This would enable anybody in the next ten years to look at that. In other words, if you had a Deputy Fire Chief in charge of operations, for instance if it was a full time person if they decided that was the way to go and that person now would be in charge of the Fire Department say the full time employees, which has been discussed from time to time. So this is the reason why we came, in fact members of the Officers Council met with us at that work session, we discussed this with them, four*

*Commissioners were there and there were some Officers there from the respective companies and that's where that comes from. The other parts of the Board of Fire Commissioners as you'll see is basically that the Chairman is appointed as you discussed about the Mayor, it leaves the volunteer Fire Commissioners, we added in a step in there, Chairman or Vice Chairman shall preside over the meetings because before it said that the Chairman shall preside over so we added a Vice Chairman just in case the Chairman is not there. That was the only thing that we made a difference there, we kept the same voting, same appointments. Powers and Duties that basically stayed the same and then we talked about the Officers Council and last night it was two options given, we discussed and looked at it and we came up with this recommendation on the Officers Council that's really the only change that we made in the Officers Council is this that the Fire Department shall have an Officers Council which shall consist and it was the opinion of everyone that it's the operational division so that would be the Fire Chief, Deputy Chief, that's one position that we'd like to create on the command side, we have a position by title only, Assistant Chiefs, the Captains and Lieutenants from each company, resolve operational problems as well as to hear appeals within the department and shall recommend policy to the Board of Fire Commissioners. It keeps in mind that this could be tied in with the operational division, there's nothing to say that the Officers Council is the chief body of the operational division where everything goes through that particular division. Fire Marshal's office goes on the Fire Safety Investigation side and we created a safety division, and the reason why we did that again through the study also by many many, there's NFPA 1500 which talks about fire fighter safety, health and wellness. We started a respiratory program, it's coming to a position where safety is very very important in the fire service. It's almost a job that's going to have to be held by someone to keep all those issues, and that's the reason why we created that division. Actually put a title on there and put someone in charge of that area because it really is a very very important item within the fire service.*

*Paul DiMauro: I agree with you but I don't know of it belongs in the Charter to set up divisions because you want to have flexibility.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Well we put that flexibility in there on other divisions*

*Paul DiMauro: We would normally just simply say that, you already have the power now under the current Charter under the language that we were proposing last time for the Charter to do exactly- that, to set up whatever departments you want. Can anyone think of anything that would prevent them from doing that? We don't want to dictate, but put something in here, you're going to have to live with for ten years, and it could end up being counterproductive. You might decide that you want to combine two of these for whatever reason and I just don't understand. Chic could we hear from you and your comments?*

*Jim Tortora: Yes, after your last meeting we did meet, on your recommendation, with the Fire Commissioners, we quickly got nowhere because they were going to submit the 1984 Charter with no changes, we had ours pretty much set so we really didn't go*

*anywhere. So this, I just got tonight as you did, the difference that I could see is number 1 the Mayor is not approving anybody. We have addressed the administrative and operational sections in our section under the Fire Chief and the Board of Fire Commissioners as a separate entity already. In other words, the Board of Fire Commissioners would be in charge of administration and the Fire Chief would be in charge of operations.*

*Paul DiMauro: Let me interrupt you, I think that there is a misconception about when something says subject to the Mayor. What that basically means is subject to “the City”, City Council, HR person etc. because they’re the ones that answer to OSHA when there’s a problem, not the Fire Commissioners, you can’t do that you know what I’m saying? They’re the ones that are directly responsible so that’s more of a legalistic thing than it is anything else. I mean I don’t know of the Mayor getting involved in reference to certain individuals other than the Commissioners or something like that. When you get down to you’re going to hire a new mechanic, the language of everything shall be approved by City Hall and we’re going to try and have Corporation Counsel come up with some language which is a catch all which explains that better than saying subject to the approval of the Mayor. Because everyone thinks your giving more power to the Mayor, you’re really not. But ultimately someone has to answer to it from a legal standpoint you have to have someone reviewing your every move. If you were to fire someone without just cause as a Fire Commissioner because you were in charge of it that way, who’s going to defend you, number one who’s going to review it and make sure it’s legitimate, it’s better to have the steps all the way through so that number 1 the person is protected and number 2 the individual is protected and then the City is ultimately protected so that they’re not defending suits and that type of thing. So unless there’s a particular reason why anyone’s is worried about “the City” and I’m saying it that way because I don’t know any better way of saying it, should approve and has to approve to make sure the person has proper qualifications, etc, etc and you could go on and on. A part time position cannot do that as much as they are dedicated and do all they want, I don’t believe that any commission, I’m not talking about just the Fire Commissioners, I’m talking about any commission, although others might disagree with me.*

*Bob Lally: Well, we’ve had other discussions in the past. Maybe instead of using the word approval, we could use the guidance or the assistance of the Human Resource department, rather than the approval of the Mayor.*

*Paul DiMauro: That’s why I said I want to skip that until we talk to Corporation Counsel to find out how to really put that language, but I want you to understand, certain positions, yes the Mayor. Chairman of the Fire Commissioners is appointed by the Mayor, that’s clear because trying to put the four companies, you know what’s going to happen. We’re trying to keep you out of harms way, but yes, certain positions like that have to, but if you’re talking about, you already have a mechanic full time, you have a Fire marshal that’s full time, someone’s got to go around and check those things.*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *We have a full time Deputy Fire Marshal*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Full time Deputy Fire Marshal, you have a full time secretary, you're next step may or may not be an Administrative Assistant of some sorts to the Chief, call it what you want by name but someone that can run around and write out purchase orders because you guys can't do it on a part time basis. You're going to need someone, I recognize that, I got to believe you do. I read part of that report you were referring to and I guess that was the time that Ken Nappi was still in charge and you had somebody full time watching out for your stuff, taking care of things, that seemed to work out pretty well too. But we're not going to make that decision for you, someone else is going to make that decision how the thing is structured, so I don't necessarily go along with the breaking up of the divisions, not because I don't agree with it but because I don't believe it belongs in here, I think you as the Fire Commissioners could set up whatever division or whatever you want to call them, from time to time you might want another committee, I don't know*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *I understand you, you're entitled to your opinion, there's no question about it*

**Paul DiMauro:** *No I'm saying you still have the power anyway*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *What we did is we listened to everyone and there's been always this gray areas of who's in charge of this and who's in charge of that, so we figured very simple words, we're not tying any individual to any of these positions because it's the latitude to hire an administrator as you said*

**Paul DiMauro:** *And that's fine, but once your meeting is over, and the next morning something has to be done, someone has to run operations on a day-to-day. Separate that issue out, someone has to run operations. I don't care what department it is and I know there are some in the room that want it to be the Fire Commissioners, if you had Fire Commissioners it would be the same thing, the responsibilities get turned over to the Chief once their meeting is over, they set policy or review or whatever. But once the meeting is over, the department is handed over to the head of operations, call it what you want, in our city here it would be Chief Millo, it would be the Chief of Police, it would be the Superintendent of Highways running it or whatever, but you have a department head that runs the day-to-day operational parts so you could set the policies by which they operate but you can't be in charge of the day-to-day operations, you just can't do it as a Commissioner. Then you'd have five bosses, that's a problem that comes up and you're not there and you're not expected to be there on call all the time. That's not your responsibility that's the responsibility of your Chief or his delegate. So if you have someone that he delegates to and that's the person who's in charge etc, etc.*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *We are looking at that through the study because it was very particular on that on the volunteer aspects. I think one of the topics was that the Chief, was to keep it as a stipend part time position and then it was talked about I believe on the study to create a Deputy Chief of Operation as a full time position.*

**Paul DiMauro:** *And that's something right now*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *But that's something that we have to look at because as you're fully aware of we're trying to maintain a volunteer service and that's something that you have to balance very carefully*

**Paul DiMauro:** *How long have we had a mechanic down there? We've had a mechanic down there for twenty somewhat years*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *Well there's a difference between a mechanic*

**Paul DiMauro:** *I know that, but he's in charge of the vehicles and that type of thing, nobody took offense to that. But you had Ken in charge of the whole thing, I don't think anyone took offense to that. He was paid full time, but you gentlemen can put together in your budget next year if you want, something called Deputy Administrative Assistant to the Chief or whatever, but that's a matter of a budget process. You create whatever positions you want to create*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *Well we might want to be administrator to the Board*

**Paul DiMauro:** *That's a problem, there's your administrator to the Board, not Chief Millo but the position of Chief. He's the one that works for you; you set the policy and tell him go.*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *We're not sure where that should fall though. We need to look at that carefully*

**Paul DiMauro:** *But you could never have someone in the number 2 position answering to the Commission and then the other guy is hanging*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *We're not saying that, we're looking at how you are going to disperse your employees, that are what you're talking about. You could have someone as a divisional person that reports to the Chief, and the Chief reports to the Board*

**Paul DiMauro:** *The Board should be dealing with one person*

**Bob Lally:** *May I make a suggestion that we not decide on who reports to who*

**Paul DiMauro:** *We can but we've heard Mr. Kosowsky, now we're hearing from Chic.*

**Jim Tortora:** *As far as I can see, their 6.9.3.2. section is the same of what we submitted. They didn't address appointments where we did, where we talked about appointing the assistant chiefs from each volunteer fire company on their own. We submitted that, they didn't address that. Our Powers and Duties are the same, the*

*Officers Council, the only thing that changed that I'm concerned about is that the Fire Marshal and the Deputies have been taken out of the Officers Council*

*Paul DiMauro: Who's been taken out?*

*Jim Tortora: The Fire Marshal and the Deputy have been taken out of the Officers Council for what reason I don't know. I think that's a big mistake, I've been a member of it for 28 years and it's worked very well, I believe that office is an asset to the Officers Council and it would just break the lines of communications and make it worse. I'm concerned if that's taken out from their proposal. We didn't meet on these two yet, so this is news to me also*

*Paul DiMauro: That's fine*

*Jim Tortora: The Fire Chief we separated the Fire Chief as the Operational Head of the Department, they did not address it, that's basically about it. The only concern is the difference of the Officers Council.*

*Paul DiMauro: I have a question there then, because the Fire Chief and the Fire Marshal are operational people involved in operations day to day. It seems to me that they are the line people along with the Officers and the Fire Chief to talk about what's happening operationally. Am I right or wrong? Tell me how it works, I mean do they? It's got to be everyone or no one.*

*Merle Chase: The discussion that we had with some of the members of the Officers Council was that they were looking for the line options themselves. All firemen are more than welcome to attend and give reports to the Officers Council at any time. The training officer is not, he's not an official member of the Officers Council. The Fire Marshal can still go there*

*Paul DiMauro: Why exclude him? Really the whole point is why exclude him? Why specifically exclude him when he's always been part of it? It's like telling him not to stay, I mean it really is*

*Merle Chase: Then at what point do you stop him? You should be naming the training officer and any other officers that we appoint there.*

*Jim Tortora: Not necessarily, they could put that in there if they wanted to.*

*Inaudible*

*Bruce Kosowsky: I think what he's trying to say is that the Officers Council, the operational side is what everybody's talking about, stays the operational side, the Fire the Safety is another, don't forget we looked at it as a division, we didn't say, what I look at is as divisions, there's nothing to say that they can't be part of the Officers Council. That has to be something that you could put that if it's necessary, yeas you*

*are part of it, preplanning and the issues on that part of it, there's nothing to say the Officers Council can't come back and say yes they're part of that. This was a last thing that we*

*Paul DiMauro: I understand, and I understand that this was last minute*

*Bruce Kosowsky: And we didn't touch the Assistant Chiefs positions because we didn't think anything wrong with that, we only looked at the things we thought needed to be changed, there was no discussion on the Assistant Chiefs as far from the companies because we had no issue with that*

*Paul DiMauro: The more I read that paragraph, the less it bothers me because you've already down below said that the Fire Chief will be the head of operation, so he's the head of that group. This is why it doesn't make sense. Administratively you're already in charge administratively, so that's no problem. Investigative and Safety is half of Chic's job and the other half is whoever your safety officer is that you're saying they're going to work in divisions so, is the safety officer going to be in charge of him? I don't care about that, that's your own business to do that, all I'm saying that everything that you're doing here you already have the power to do under what is done over here. There's no difference. Does anybody read that differently? Chief Millo, you had something to say, I'm sorry go ahead.*

*John Millo: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is the first time I'm seeing this as well and the point on the Assistant Chief, let's address that first. The way the system is now is that the Assistant Chiefs don't have to come from each company, there might be a time that the Assistant Chief doesn't come from that particular company and I could see the logic of the Assistant Chief coming from each company so they all have an equal say and work along with their company officers, but they have to be representatives of the City. So the Assistant Chiefs coming from each company the way the Officers Council make sense. The section here where it says that the Fire Marshal and his deputies are not a part of the Council troubles me because on a day-to-day basis, the Fire Chief and the Assistant Chiefs, the Fire Marshal and the Deputy Fire Marshal work hand in hand on any issues and I think by excluding them from the Council, although anyone could come to these meetings, they could only address the Council under the public portion. If it came to an operational issue or there had to be a motion made for discussion, I chair the Officers Council and I do allow the Superintendent of Apparatus which is our mechanic and he reports to the entire council, I also ask the training officer who reports to the Board of Fire Commissioners to come and give a report. I don't understand removing the Fire Marshal and his deputy from the Officers Council, I don't know if it's meant to put him in a different division, you can't operate the department in different divisions, it all has to operate as one department. And certainly, if the Fire Marshal has the opportunity to do his job properly with his deputies, he's going to put my department out of business because there won't be any fires and on a day-to-day basis, things might occur in town that require interaction. If the suppression side and the Fire Prevention and the Safety side*



*don't speak, we're going to have worse problems. I just don't see the logic in taking him out where he wouldn't have a voice, a vote or a say in that public forum.*

*Paul DiMauro: Let's make one thing clear, they still only make recommendations and you set the policy.*

*John Millo: The policies are set by the Commissioners usually upon recommendations of the Chief and the standard operating procedures of the department are set by the Chief. So our procedures are what we want to do when we arrive at an emergency situation set by the council and the Chief. The policies of the department of who's going to have the use of this vehicle or etc certainly comes from the commissioners and the document that was put forth by the Officers Council, I know it's been discussed at many of meetings. I've kept a back seat through it all to let the council do their job and I think they've done a great job. As far as the appointment, you know a couple of things come to mind, if you cut the City out of background check etc, it doesn't have to be (inaudible) you could end up with a problem, because after all if something goes wrong in the fire department the person that's held accountable is the chief of the department by statute. If there is a problem or something happens, the Chief ultimately is held accountable. So the document that the council has put forth seems to be pretty much on the money.*

*Paul DiMauro: It looks like there are only three issues.*

*Joe Konner: Let's recap this, we're at the point where we have now a proposal from the Fire Commissioners and we have a proposal from the Officers Council and there still are differences between the two. And that's where we were a year ago or six months ago*

*Michael Davis: That's where we were three years ago*

*Joe Konner: I'm suggesting, I don't think that there's anything more that we can get discussed out of these guys, I think that it's up to us to sit down and look at both documents and decide on what we're going to do*

*Michael Davis: I just want to say that it's sad that we have to sit, you guys can't get on this, I mean three years, you can't get on the same page. You can't agree to disagree? Why can't they agree to disagree and compromise somewhere and put one document together, and you want us to do that? You prefer this Commission to make that decision versus yourselves?*

*Bruce Kosowsky: No, I think we've put something up that makes sense, we went by a study that the City paid for, we looked at that study, we saw the recommendations from that study, so that's there. If you don't like it that's your opinion.*

*Michael Davis: It's not that I don't like it*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *That's the way it is*

**Michael Davis:** *Don't take it personally, what I don't understand is that in an environment where you function as a team, it seems like we can't get a team document and I'm not saying one document is better than the other, I'm not saying someone didn't do their homework, and I'm not saying they're not very good, why can't they come back as a group and have one and have compromise and say this is what we're behind, because what we're going to end up doing is that we're going to annoy somebody here and then we're going to hear about it the day after the commission votes on it and a certain amount of people from the fire department are not going to be in favor of it and we're going to go right back to where we were 2 Charters ago.*

**Paul DiMauro:** *Let me try to see what the differences are. As far as who appoints and who selects, Mayor, City or whatever, everybody is on board with that, seems that who appoints the Assistant Chiefs is an issue, where most everybody wants each company to be represented with an Assistant Chief rather than being a political type thing I guess is what we're saying and have it done else wise. That way you're assured having one from each company and each company represented, I don't know why there would be any objection to that, I really don't, if someone can tell me why I'd love it explained to me*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *I don't think that there is any objection to that*

**Paul DiMauro:** *There's no objection to that, then that's done*

**Merle Chase:** *Just realize that within the system there's certain qualifications*

**Paul DiMauro:** *It says that, meeting the requirements of the Board of Fire Commissioners, you guys set the requirements*

**Merle Chase:** *But what I'm saying is that maybe a year when someone isn't eligible from that particular company, so we may have to appoint someone from 2 company.*

**Paul DiMauro:** *That's a valid point that if there is no one from the department that is willing to serve or can serve in that capacity, then the commissioners may select from another company. That's fine, that's the kind of input that we'd like to hear, that makes sense to me.*

**Bruce Kosowsky:** *I think that's in there isn't it?*

**Inaudible**

**Paul DiMauro:** *So it would seem to me that issue we are all on board with to put some language and fill that position because you can appoint other Assistant Chiefs as you deem necessary which is a different issue, you can do that, you already have that latitude, so I think we're ok there. I'm only down to one issue that I see any real*

*contention, but the board division issue I don't believe belongs in the Charter, I think you already have the authority to set up divisions, you're already set up technically like that and you could do all that yourself anyways so we need not put it in the Charter. Every Commissioner can do what they want to do on that. The only other issue would be the make up of the Officers Council and excluding the Fire Marshal, I think that's the only issue we're down to now, that there's a disagreement between the two parties, if we agree on the two other items. Am I wrong? No I don't know if the rank in file feel that strongly about it, but the Fire Chief is saying that the way they work together works, why wouldn't you want to get more recommendations rather than less. I mean you would want to get as much input I would imagine as you can get from everybody involved in the fire, before, after the investigation. I'm sure Jim must report back to the Officers Council, it's got to be helpful. Having said my speech does anyone have anything to say? We're not that far off.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: The only thing that I know we discussed is that we just didn't want to see anything in the Charter that specifically assigned a particular job to any one person*

*Paul DiMauro: But you did that by having divisions*

*Bruce Kosowsky: No, not really*

*Paul DiMauro: If you have divisions, you have to have heads of those divisions*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Yes, but it gives you the latitude of putting who want in that*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: We are, we're naming all of them the Fire Chief, we're saying the assistants, we're saying the officers, we're saying the Fire Marshal, we took out some of their assistants and said just them, the officers and then said they could put their assistants in their place I believe is the way we worded it. Tell us who else you want to add to it. I'd rather see more than taking away any of it that we have now.*

*John Millo: You know the Fire Marshal's position is not just investigation, you have and Assistant Chief that reports to the Fire Marshal that goes to every school in this City and does an education program, it's a great program and they also have inspections. So you have prevention, fire prevention, you have fire investigation and you have several issues that are currently being handled by the Fire Marshal. I just don't see any rime or reason for it*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Let's take a closer look at that. Right now the way they have it they want the Fire Chief, Fire Marshal, Captain of each company and the Fire Marshal may designate his Deputy Marshal, there's no mention of the Assistant Fire Prevention Chief. Under Assistant Chiefs he is covered under the Officers Council, you see we*

*have an Assistant Chief of Fire Prevention, we also have inspectors, you'll notice those inspectors are not noticed*

*Inaudible*

*Bruce Kosowsky: So the point is on the divisions we included all those people in the divisions. In other words, the Fire Marshal has his division, the Fire Chief has a division, this has been a struggle over operations, investigations all those kinds of things, safety is a brand new thing, it's not to be interpreted as the Fire Marshal safety this is a safety for the fire department, safety officer type*

*Inaudible*

*Bruce Kosowsky: The safety part of the Fire Marshal is something different, that is fire prevention*

*Paul DiMauro: Personnel?*

*John Millo: That would be done by job description not by Charter very simply, if you wanted to make a separate division*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: If you did create someone like that though, shouldn't he be involved in the Officers Council for operations, because he's going to be involved in that*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: That's ok guys, that's not a problem. The point is if you put together another department head of sorts, if we do something like that he should become part of the Officers Council*

*Bruce Kosowsky: We're not saying he can't be*

*Paul DiMauro: And such other heads such as, we can do that but you don't want to get back to 18 or 20*

*Inaudible*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Now the way I understand it, when there are quorums, their quorums are done by their bylaws correct? So just because you have a lot of people that belong to the organization when you get down to the quorum, what*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: Everybody that's in here is going to be a voting member and I see the idea of adding one more position because you're going to have a Director of Personnel Safety or something of that nature, so if we come up with some ambiguous language that refers to a position like that, that gives you the other person on there, done.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: But remember they're only there to give you guys recommendations and whatever. They're there to talk about what's happened and then go back to you so that you'll set the right policy for them to adhere to. You're not that far off.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: What we're looking at too is the backbone of the fire department is the fire companies and that's why we wanted them to have their say and I know a lot of people don't understand that but they are the people*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: That's why you don't have three commissioners from each company, you could say that then why don't you have three commissioners?*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: See once you get to the Officers Council I kind of see it as the heads of each area getting together to talk about it*

*Inaudible*

*Jim Tortora: I still haven't heard anything logical that after 28 years I've been on*

*Inaudible*

*Merle Chase: There's one other issue on that 6.9.3.3, and that's on the term limits, we're recommending to remove that from the Charter and leave that in the job description.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: We're working on that with Corporation Council, not to have any terms in the Charter*

*Merle Chase: because it's been a continuous definition on interpretation*

*Bruce Kosowsky: With our appointing authority which is only 2 years, we're elected to a two-year term, so there was question on a two-year term committee appointing somebody above two years*

*Paul DiMauro: Ok, I see what you're saying, but by the same token you're saying that an individual can stay in that position as long as he gets re-appointed*

*Bruce Kosowsky: That's correct*

*Paul DiMauro: I like that better*

*Bruce Kosowsky: By contract, we're looking at a contract type of thing with the*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: With a term of x amount of years and it could be more than two years. I don't agree with that other deal about longer than your term because the Board of Aldermen are elected for two years and they sign the contract for the Chief of Police which is five years.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: It was a discussion, how far we could go.*

*Paul DiMauro: Right, but I'm saying that the Board of Aldermen who are elected for two years do sign a contract for five years for the Police Chief. Up to five years.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Is that through ordinance?*

*Paul DiMauro: In the Charter it says up to five years. We did that Joe 12 years ago and we were starting to talk about that type of thing with your position back in the day which would be up to x years to give you flexibility, rather than setting is as a particular term. I'm not in favor of term limitations in any area. You're better off by contract.*

*John Millo: Other cities have term limits on Chiefs, I'm on my 7<sup>th</sup> year and I'm still learning things about the town. If you put a Chief in and limit his term to 2 years, he never gets his feet wet and can't really be effective.*

*Inaudible*

*Michael Davis: The bigger point too is that you might not attract somebody that you really want knowing that it's only a 2 year term.*

*Paul DiMauro: Why wouldn't you want the ability to set the years when you appoint somebody? If you were given the authority of saying look, we could bring in a guy for one, two, three or whatever we want, it would still allow you Bruce to bring in someone for two but it wouldn't hold your wrist down*

*Bruce Kosowky: We discussed that. It's a matter of finding that question out.*

*Inaudible*

*Paul DiMauro: If we could find out from Corporation Counsel, maybe in your situation, we'll find out, we're saying to you if you want to appoint somebody for two years be my guest or you could say for any period from 2 to 5 years, if Corporation Counsel blesses it, it gives you more latitude*

*Inaudible*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Because even with the Assistant Chiefs, two years, we looked at that and tried to figure it with the companies, you know they vote the person in, maybe they might not get voted in so that's another reason why we were looking at all of that.*

*Michael Davis: The Charter is going to be addressing more than ever some of these conditions. Corporation Counsel will be here next meeting*

*Paul DiMauro: If we can get something that works for everybody. Anything else from anyone? If not, someone move to adjourn. Thank you very much for coming here and speaking with us.*

*Bruce Kosowsky: Thank you.*

The meeting with Chief John Millo, Commissioners Bruce Kosowsky and Merle Chase and Fire Marshal Jim Tortora concluded at 8:05 P.M.

Our next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 2005. Corporation Counsel will be invited to attend.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Michael Davis motioned to adjourn. Joe Konner second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Paul DiMauro adjourned the meeting of the Charter Revision Commission at 8:07 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