

* REVISION



CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

Tuesday, June 21, 2005

The Public Hearing for the Charter Revision Commission was called to order by Paul DiMauro at 7:07 P.M. in Room 104 at Shelton City Hall.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Attending: Paul DiMauro
Irene Smith
Sue Coyle
Bob Lally
Gary Cahill
Charles Carroll

Absent: Michael Davis
Steve Bellis
Joe Konner
Ann Dougherty

Paul DiMauro: Before we start there are a couple of things that maybe some other members want to bring up. I know Bob has something. I do want to bring up one thing. I want to thank Sophia for getting the minutes from the last meeting in the City Town Clerk's office by Friday am, which was a great job, absolutely fantastic. Took a lot of abuse from one individual who said they weren't in there and that was bs. The minutes were there first thing in the morning on Friday. Two individuals in this room picked them up and that was not a problem at all. I apologize for whoever puts the stuff on the web that they didn't get on the web until yesterday, because I looked for it all weekend myself. We have no control of what goes on the web. I can't call and complain about it but Sophia did a great job of getting in. I also would like to make a quick comment because I had gotten a call from the CT Post and answered questions for a half an hour, didn't see any of the comments back, but one of the things that I want to make clear was that we did listen to everyone and will listen to everyone tonight. We sat for two nights, an unprecedented move, we sat for two nights with the CARE group, I believe it's called,

and went over each issue that they were bringing up. We did not agree on all of them, we did incorporate the ones that we thought were good, we modified others, but we did spend two nights. We did have a public portion the entire time during our meetings which was unprecedented again, so to say we didn't listen or to say that we shut everybody off and let them go off on their merry way. The gentlemen and the ladies on this group are probably some of the most experienced that I've served with on a Charter Revision. They've had experience from Aldermen to Board of Education to every facet from every city. An individual here works in a larger city with a larger administration. So we have a lot of wealth of experience here and to think that we're just fluffing you off, we're listening to the people. Do we know what all the people want? No, we don't know and we don't think that any group of people can sit here tonight or anytime and say they know what all the people want. Sure people will get upset, a zone change in their neighborhood and you go up to them and say let's get term limits and get these people out, they're going to jump on the bandwagon and sign a petition. That's a normal reaction, it's not the way to put government together. What we've put together here I think is good. Are we flexible to make further changes if we hear something that makes sense? Absolutely. I for one will always do that. I moved a long way in recommending that Inland Wetlands be elected, a lot of people won't like that. I'm in favor of it. I'm in favor of increasing Planning and Zoning, I'm not in favor of term limits because I think it's a fallacy to think that you're going to get a better board because you throw out the Osac's of the world and the Jack Finn's of the world just to get at the one you want. You want to get at the individuals that you think is doing a bad job, get your butt out of your couch and go run for the office and knock them out. There are plenty of seats that go unfilled in the election every year. Both Town Committees under endorse their slots for both Planning & Zoning, Board of Education and others. Get out there and get your people involved. Get people involved to run for those offices and find out where the individuals that are doing bad are etc. I've had my say. I'd like to turn it over to Bob Lally who would like to make a correction on what was on Ethics.

Bob Lally: Mr. Chairman, in regards to 5.4 Board of Ethics, I failed to add a sentence that as suggested by Commissioner Konner adding "Without prejudice, the Board may request the services of a third party, i.e.: a mediator, a retired judge, an arbitrator, in the event they are unable to reach a conclusion. It was my omission.

Paul DiMauro: That was the whole crux of what we were talking about, was to say that there are instances where they're better off having, because we can't put everything here, but to be able to give this to the Board of Aldermen. But number one what you did is force the Board of Aldermen to make a stand and come up with an ordinance that covers it, and number two to have a means to go to a third party when you get something that's a real stickler, and it's really beyond their realm of understanding. I'd love to be able to put in here that you go to just retired judges, but I don't know how you do that mechanism. This at least gives them the time over time to develop it and get it done.

Bob Lally: And it has to be without prejudice.

Paul DiMauro: We have that part, without prejudice. OK thank you very much. Having done ours, anyone from the Commission want to say anything before we start? If not, we'll open it up to the public and listen to the comments from the public.

Walter Sofian: Good evening Commissioners, Walter Sofian. Once again I'd like to thank you very much for the patience and diligence in which you've shown and forbearance. My comments are not too long. As previously pointed out

Paul DiMauro: I'm sorry Mr. Sofian, I know who you are

Walter Sofian: I'm sorry, I'm Walter Sofian and I live at 7 Andrew Drive, in Shelton. As previously pointed out, the Charter Action Review Effort known as CARE consists of independent or unaffiliated voters, members of the Republican, Democratic and Citizens United parties; and members of the grassroots group WeR-1. Specifically, the CARE group members are: Judson Crawford, Joan Flannery, Gregory Kodz, Pati Kodz, Tom LaTulipe, Michael Pacowta, Chris Panek, Walter Sofian, Irving Steiner, Nancy Steiner, Rich Widomski and Randy York. CARE has been meeting every other week for the past ten months and had put forth forty six recommendations to the Charter Revision during that time. CARE therefore represents a spectrum of Shelton citizenry that is very concerned about the future of the City and still hopes that the latest charter revisions, currently being undertaken by the CRC, reflect the needs of the citizens of Shelton.

As spokesperson for CARE, I would like to take this opportunity to offer a few suggestions, dealing with five topics, that would significantly improve the current CRC draft of the City Charter revisions, enhance the probability of voter acceptance, and produce a document that would be more responsive to the taxpayers and citizens of this City.

- Ward Representation: Much has been said with regard to "term limits" for the Planning and Zoning Commission, and it is now abundantly clear that the final CRC draft of the Charter revisions will ignore the will of the more than 2,200 registered Shelton voters that signed a petition requesting such limits. However, in the spirit of compromise, CARE respectfully requests that the proposed membership of the P&Z be increased from seven to eight members to allow for two members to be elected from each of the four wards, while maintaining the two alternate at large. Such a move would ensure that all four City wards are represented on the P&Z. CARE believes this is far more important than considerations of minority representation and would bring about a refreshing and much needed change in the make up of the P&Z.
- Ordinances: With respect to referral of ordinances to committee, the CRC draft retains language that is very similar to the previously failed April 2004 revision. As is stand the Board of Aldermen may or may not refer a proposed ordinance to a Committee of the Board for review prior to going to Public Hearing. CARE believes that the rules and laws governing the City are too important to "fast track". CARE feels that all ordinances being considered should go through a Committee of the Board so that all the issues surrounding

the proposed ordinance can be thoroughly investigated before reporting back to the full Board.

- **Ethics:** With respect to the section titled Boar of Ethics, the CRC draft is far too vague. Simply stating that “The City shall have a Code of Ethics promulgated by the Board of Aldermen” is disrespectful to the electorate. It says, in effect, trust me I will take care of you. CARE, responding to a previous request by Michael Davis, has furnished the CRC with the Ethics Section of the Charter for the Town of Manchester. Additionally, two versions of Substitute House Bill No. 5023 from the State of Connecticut General Assembly, that were raised in the February 2004 session, but not enacted into law were also forwarded to the CRC. Therefore, the language for a meaningful Code of Ethics is already in place. The Board of Aldermen was pout on notice prior to the failed Charter Revision of November 2003, that the voters expected a meaningful Ethics Code with definitive standards for establishment and enforcement of a Municipal Code of Ethics. Yet, here we are a year and a half later and we still do not have one.
- **Administrative Reporting Responsibilities for Board and/or Commission Employees:** With respect to Section 5.3.4. Water Pollution Control Authority, and Section 6.13 (d), General Provisions, the CRC draft is yet another case of the stubborn adherence to the rhetoric of the failed April 2004 Charter revision effort. CARE believes that having language that says “All City employees who report to a Board and/or Commission will have administrative reporting responsibility to the Administrative Assistant on a day-to-day basis” is a blatant attempt to further consolidate the power of the office of the Mayor in the City of Shelton. Considering that the City of Shelton has a Human resources Department, it is not clear why administrative reporting responsibilities fro Boards and/or Commissions should be placed under the Executive branch of the City of Shelton.
- **City Planner:** Lastly, the CRC should give some very serious consideration to establishing a position of City Planner for the City of Shelton. This would allow for continual updating of the ten-year plan for the City of Shelton, as required by Section 8-23 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The City Planner would be a dedicated employee that would become an integral part of the administration for the city of Shelton. The City Planner would oversee Shelton’s land use boards and commission and provide access for public input from the community. A more detailed explanation of the job qualifications and requirements has already been presented to the Charter Revision Commission. The salary for the City Planner would be somewhat offset by eliminating the Planning and Zoning consultant and not requiring the periodic contracting of a City planning firm like Planimetrics.

Conclusion: In the final analysis, CARE can say with pride that we have provided for a free exchange of ideas with CRC to make known the will of the people. The latest draft of the Charter revision does not reflect a willingness on the part of the CRC to bring about some positive changes. The possibility of a future elected Inland/Wetlands Commission, increasing the membership of Boards and/or Commissions to a minimum of

five members, and a Public Initiative requiring only ten percent (10%) of the electorate, are certainly worthwhile. However, as stated above, CARE feels that the Charter revision can and should be so much more. In summary, although we have come down to the final hour, after almost a year of effort on the part of CARE and the CRC, it is still not too late. There can and should be some movement on the part of the Charter Revision Commission to establish some additional meaningful reform and/or update, on the abovementioned issues, for the Charter of the City of Shelton. CARE certainly does not want to be here a year from now having the same discussion with the Charter Revision Commission. However, CARE is prepared to do just that, if that is what it takes. The citizens of the City of Shelton deserve the best City Charter possible to guide us over the next ten years.

Respectfully, again I'm Walter Sofian. Thank you very much.

Paul DiMauro: Thank you very much. I want to make a couple of comments. Let's see if there is anyone else on the Board that would like to say something

Bob Lally: Could you establish the rules for this evening?

Paul DiMauro: There aren't that many people here that we have to be overly concerned about it. I don't care, if the rest of the Commissioners want to tell me how they want to handle it, as to whether we want to respond at the end, sometimes it gets old by the time we get to the end. If you see something that's worth asking a question of why or how. The first thing that jumped out at me was the issue of Planning and Zoning, I'd like one thing please, Sir, can we please have one conversation at a time. We had a hell of a time at the last meeting with noise in the background, I really don't want to get on anybody but I would appreciate it if you'd let us get through one conversation at a time. And I'm sorry for getting on your case young man.

Bob Lally: May I suggest to have everyone speak first?

Paul DiMauro: We can.

Gary Cahill: It's hard to tell how many people are going to speak

Paul DiMauro: Can I have a show of hands of how many are going to speak? Four.

Gary Cahill: We just have to remember what questions we have for whom.

Sue Coyle: It would almost be easier to answer right away

Paul DiMauro: Because that might stop someone from re-iterating something.

Gary Cahill: We're not getting into a dialogue

Paul DiMauro: I'm not going to get into a dialogue, I'm only going to ask that. No decision has been made tonight, what I'm going to do is ask on the first issue was a request for more information. I don't really have a strong position on Planning and Zoning of whether they are elected by wards or by City or whatever. I don't. If it's a better representation to the public to have it elected by wards, so be it. Going from seven to eight is not a big push. I don't like going to nine, then you have eleven with the alternates. I don't mind that type of thing and I'm open to that suggestion. The help we would need then, I've gone through, as everybody knows the State Statutes inside and out on most of these issues. How do we get around minority representation? We can because it's by jurisdiction. We're ok. I answered my own question. If it's by ward, we don't have to. I would say that's one issue I'd like to look at closer. I don't have a problem looking at that closer. I don't know how everyone else feels and they'll all talk about it later. I don't want to get in to a dialogue.

Walter Sofian: I just want to say although our strongest goal was term limits, we feel that if you make this change

Paul DiMauro: I don't want to hear that, I don't want to hear threats, I don't want to hear compromise, I'm not here making deals. We're not making a deal and there are no threats here. Believe me, I've been through this too many times and it may be my last, but I'm not going to give into compromises or answer to threats. So let's get that clear. Bring up a good suggestion we will listen and I'll work like hell for it. But no way. I don't want that language please. I would consider that, I think it's a good suggestion, just like Bob Lally at the last meeting, when we talked about how the Inland/Wetland should be appointed, we had a big controversy whether it should start with the Mayor, start with the Board of Aldermen, who ratifies and finally said what I really want is to have them elected. I said I'm for that. So in going from position where we thought we were on opposite sides of the table we agreed that maybe we should go elected. Everyone else here hasn't had the chance to talk about it, but the two of us were in agreement with that and I think Gary you were also. So, I mean we are open to that dialogue. So that takes care of that as far as ordinance, I think it's a mute point. The suggestion came from the Aldermen. The Aldermen felt that in the case where in many, in some instances an ordinance comes from a committee, it's kind of silly to send it back to them and they have up to 60 days to vote on it. I think that Alderman Anglace is here tonight and can probably address that with more experience and I wish Alderman Finn was here also so he could explain it. We are not circumventing it, we are not fast-tracking it, it takes the majority of the members of the Board of Aldermen to not go to committee, and they only do that for just cause when they have sufficient reasons not to and they've got all the whatever, so I think that thing is being blown out way out of proportion in my opinion. Do I care either way, it's up to the Board of Aldermen to tell me whether it's that important or not, but they're not trying to bypass a committee, they're only saying that at certain times it's more advantageous and it will be faster and the other language that was added to it that people are missing is that they can't kill an ordinance, it's got to come to a vote of the full Board of Aldermen and the public will always have input at a public hearing, hopefully whoever submitted it, or they've done it as a group or as a committee have done their research. And if they haven't it's going to come up at the public hearing

and it's going to be forced up or down. So I don't think that's a big issue, and I don't think that we should be involved in a confrontation about an issue like that. As far as Board of Ethics, there are others here that could address that better than me. I'm bypassing it. We're going to ride on the State Statute eventually. They're going to pass something that 's going to tell the Cities how to run. It's a matter of time. We know that the Board of Aldermen are currently working on an ordinance that is very similar to what the State Statutes wording that are being offered right now. Is that correct Alderman Anglace?

John Anglace: Alderman Finn, Corporation Counsel Tom Welch and myself are working on it and we've just met with the Board of Ethics the other night. We were waiting for months, they didn't want to meet until they concluded the case they were on.

Paul DiMauro: Now, when would you anticipate that the Board of Aldermen would be voting on an ordinance for Ethics?

John Anglace: We have to submit it to everybody for comment, we have a number of comments now, and then we have to put them together and give it to the full Board.

Paul DiMauro: So, it's going to go in a form of an ordinance correct?

John Anglace: Absolutely

Paul DiMauro: And you'll have a public hearing?

John Anglace: Absolutely there will be a public hearing.

Paul DiMauro: So I'm saying again our language in here is to allow them to do their job and it's also added a little more language to go with the other. They may have an ordinance in place before this comes to the people, so guess what, it may solve it's own problem.

Bob Lally: It's not to allow them, it's to force them

Paul DiMauro: Force them to. I'm sorry I meant the second

Bob Lally: If we were to put the Code of Ethics into the Charter, that would prohibit any changes to be made in that during the ten years that this Charter is going to be in effect and we don't want that. Eight of the Aldermen that are elected make a decision as to what a Code of Ethics should be. That should not be decided by a Charter. The fact that there is a Code of Ethics, is enough for the Charter to force, the rest of it belongs to the elected officials of the City. There was a long discussion on that, about that and to force that the same way of the bidding process, and force specifics on the bidding process is very very difficult later on when you have to change things. This way the bidding process is in place, how it's regulated is by ordinance by public hearing by the Board of Aldermen.

Paul DiMauro: The next issue I believe is about the Administrative Assistant. I think that by Charter and past Charters the Administrative Assistant is basically in charge of personnel, etc throughout the City by his/her responsibility and that's why everything has to funnel there. That's strictly for punching the clock, making sure people are there, making sure they've gotten directed correctly and carry out the policy of their respective or instructions of their respective boards or commissions, who by the way are part-time and are not there on a day-to-day basis just to give instruction, but to carry out their own instructions. So it's the responsibility of "the Administration" that is their job. That is the job of the Administrative Assistant to give daily instructions, to make sure people are getting their jobs done the way they have to, etc, and if not report back to the commission or whatever. That's their responsibility. It's not a matter of making the Mayor stronger, this is the way it works right now, this is the way it has worked. In fact, we took away some authority from the Mayor in that we now allow the Planning and Zoning etc to hire directly without the Mayor's approval per se. So we took the language out about that approval, we did not put it in the Library Board, this is an administrative function, not a power function for the Mayor. So I don't know how to explain it any better, if someone can put a better twist on it fine.

Bob Lally: I'd like to add to that. What we're trying to do here is be consistent with what is elected and what is appointed and who it is appointed by. If the electorate chooses a Planning and Zoning Commission, Library Board, an Inland/Wetlands Commission it is the responsibility of that Commission given to them by an electorate to hire and fire and do what it's suppose to do. If it's appointed by the Board of Aldermen or the Mayor, it is then the responsibility of that appointed authority to make sure that they're responsible for this, it's their responsibility to make sure that Board functions the way they're supposed to and you can't do that unless you have responsibility for that. And to establish the policy and direction of the employees. So in order to be consistent, we removed it from the P&Z Commission we did not allow it on the Library Board and will not allow it on the Inland/Wetlands Commission if they are an elected board. If they're appointed, it's a whole different story. We can change some of those Commissions, maybe not this time but in the future.

Paul DiMauro: We can delete it. I think it was our intention to delete specific language from each of the sections but to leave the one catch all for the administrative functions report to the Administrative Assistant which is the way it is supposed to be and I think we should make that correction which is minor in nature but get rid of it in Parks and Rec. You don't need it to be re-stated in every place else, so it's a clear definition of what it really is. We understand what it is, we understand how they've been using it, it's not a matter of the Administrative Assistant calling the Boards and saying I want you to do this. It's a matter of relaying the duties of the various commissions. The only other issue that was brought up by Mr. Sofian is the idea of a Planner. We don't list every position here that's hired. The City has the right and the responsibility and more important the Planning & Zoning has the right to hire a City Planner if they see so fit. And the Board of Aldermen can ok the budget, etc. We had a City Planner before, I don't see it working any different. I've worked with it both ways. We now have a consultant of sort who's

very good and very experienced, and probably knows the City better than any other individual in the City, and I don't care whether we have him or whether we hire a City Planner, but it's the responsibility of P&Z when they see a need to develop the need. We don't force positions on unless they are absolutely necessary. We try not to in the Charter, so it's up to them to do it.

Bob Lally: If I may suggest, the Commission on Plan Development is in session right now. That's where you should put your efforts in, in that Commission to ask for a City Planner. In the last proposal, it's worded differently but it's in there

Walter Sofian: Basically, you're saying it's a good idea but not a function of the Charter.

Bob Lally: Absolutely.

Walter Sofian: Who do we talk to?

Bob Lally: The two Chairman, it's in session right now.

Paul DiMauro: Let me explain one thing, one of the things that you said you wanted the Planner for is to come up with a ten-year plan. There is no way that a City Planner is going to be able to do that. It's the P&Z Commission that has to do it by State Statute, not the City Planner. They can hire anyone to do a plan, they've done it in the past. It's them doing their job, it's not a matter of having a City Planner. A City Planner, he doesn't do a City Plan. That individual is not going to do that. It's a name, you have an administrator right now upstairs Rick Shultz who is probably acting in what you would call a City Planner if there were such a thing as a City Planner, it's just a matter of a name. I don't think it adds anything to it, in any event I think it's the responsibility of P&Z to take care of that.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Next person please.

Joan Flannery: Joan Flannery, 8 Partridge Lane, Shelton, CT. I'd like to thank all of you for listening to us. I am a member of CARE and have been heavily involved in this and I've also been the person who typed up all the recommendations that you have in your hand all 46 of them. My main concern is Planning and Zoning. I'm on my way right now to the Intermediate School, I have my speech in hand. I've been going two times a month for the last four years, and I've been speaking out and speaking out, you've seen my editorials, the letters to the Editor. But I'm just one person and there is no one on the P&Z that is in the 3rd Ward where I live. And the 3rd Ward is where everything is being dumped. We had Split Rock dumped on us, we had Wells Spring Estates dumped on us, and now we have two Avalons being dumped. They are all in the 3rd Ward. And as much as we come and talk, and no one on P&Z has their heart in it because they're not in the 3rd Ward and that's why we need representation. I plan on running for P&Z this Fall but will I have a good chance, no, because the Ward are uneven in population in voters

and the 3rd Ward is the smallest and everyone is going to vote for whoever is in their Ward. So these are the reasons why we really need to have the 8 people, 2 from each Ward. I thank you.

Paul DiMauro: One thing that OI would like to point out, and I'm glad that you're going to run and I imagine you'll run through a party, because if you go to 2 elected from each party, and I'm only saying this to my opinion, if you go 2 from each Ward, you could bet your life that the parties will endorse 2 from each Ward. So be ready for a primary. Because the way it is now at 7, elected the way they are, they only run 5. So there is always 2 and 2 that are open slots. Just wanted to let you know that, so maybe there's a combination of elected and citywide that works there, maybe 1 from each Ward, and 3 with minority, but they'll fill both slots. They will fill it that way, so if you're going to run, under a primary or a third party.

Sue Coyle: I have a question for you, if you talk to the Editor, why was that thumbs down on the Charter Revision?

Joan Flannery: I had nothing to do with that. My letters to the Editor have to do with Planning and Zoning.

Sue Coyle: I'm asking you because you do a lot of the correspondence, that was terrible. It was an insult to every single person on this Board.

Joan Flannery: I've had letters about P&Z and one on Board of Ed.

Sue Coyle: First of all it wasn't true.

Joan Flannery: I can't control the CT Post and Ed Harris back here is my friend and he only published my letters in the Huntington Herald. I rarely get into the CT Post.

Sue Coyle: I was just curious when you said you have had communication with the papers.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Thank you very much.

Bob Lally: Let me say one thing, we had a discussion here about the Board of Aldermen going from a Geographic Ward to an At-large Board for very good reason. In order to have minority representation on the Board of Aldermen, we have a political representation based on Wards and to me that's an important thing. To me you don't have a balanced representation on the Board of Aldermen

Paul DiMauro: But you know who to blame if there is a problem. I don't believe in minority representation, I don't see it in the State, I don't see where the State legislature has it, State Senate doesn't have it, Congress doesn't have it, why does the State of

Connecticut force this? Why can't we have our own choice? We can't. The State says we must have minority representation. It's the Board of Education. So when you get one you give up something else. I don't have a problem by Ward, but understand if you go that route, you are giving up minority representation. Which I don't think is so bad. If you don't get elected why the hell should you be there. Your representation is to be at the meeting, get out there and work for it. We've got a Democrat that's been elected in spite of or in favor of Laretti's landslide for how many years, and Jack Finn keeps getting elected in a Ward against all odds. It's the individual folks, it's the individual getting out there working his butt off. Bob Lally got elected in what we used to call a Republican Ward. Bob was there.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Anyone else from the public?

Chris Panek: Chris Panek. Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Charter Revision Commission. My name is Chris Panek and I'm Chairman of the Citizens United Party and also I've been a member of CARE. About a year ago the Board of Aldermen empowered you once again for a third time to update the City Charter. At that time several members of Citizens United asked the Board of Aldermen to be included in this Commission. I thought it would be a great opportunity at that time for administration to show their concern over the two previously failed revisions by allowing new residency to the commission, who may be able to bring about different views on certain issues. It was disappointing at the time not being given this opportunity. Shortly thereafter, I received a phone call from the former Mayor Gene Hope asking if I would be interested in joining an ad-hoc group to review the Charter. Being that Gene was a former Republican Mayor my first thought was surprise but after our first meeting it was clear to me that Gene's motives were to bring together a group of City residents regardless of what affiliation to review every section of this Charter and to offer our recommendations to the Charter Revision Commission for discussion. The Board of Alderman John Anglace asked concerned residents at a meeting last year to bring on a debate during this revision process. That's exactly what CARE did by placing 46 recommendations before you. I stand here tonight as a resident of this community to continue not only what Gene started a year ago when he formed CARE but to make this Charter the best it can be for all City residents. I feel that the draft that you provided to the public here tonight fails in this regard. While you have dedicated many hours over the past three revisions processes the attendance of some Charter Revision Commission members during this revision was a bit weak. I've kept my own tabulations and 5 members of the Commission missed between 40 and 55 percent of the 18 meetings in this revision process. I would like to commend Chairman DiMauro and Mr. Lally for their very good attendance record having missed only 3 and 2 meetings. There are several areas of the Charter that I'd like to comment on. Some you've already spoken on. I'll try to go in order. The first one I think is just a typographical error or accidental strikethrough under Section 2.4.1. where section (b) on Board of Education, but I believe it should say for a term of two years. It's struck through.

Paul DiMauro: That would sound right. You're correct thank you very much.

Chris Panek: Under the same section, under (f), increasing to 7 members, while I feel this is a small step to a much publicized issue of term limits, in my eyes it's not a big enough step. The Shelton residents cannot turn a blank eye at the development and growth issue the City has been facing in recent years. There has been obvious opposition to term limits by this Commission and for various reasons, Chairman DiMauro made a comment last week that we had term limits for our President, so it shouldn't come as a shock to some CRC members that concerned residents would call for term limits on such an active Board as P&Z. Yes you may lose some very good individuals with experience but you will also provide the opportunity for a new and equally qualified individual who wants to participate in our local government. There was a comment that political parties have a hard time finding people to run for office, some lack of interest. Some members felt that term limits may hurt parties from putting up P&Z candidates. This argument simply does not hold true based on the fact that our party, Citizens United as a third party is going to run candidates in this years election on P&Z. Charter Revision Commission members must not ignore the fact that P&Z development issues are at the top of most residents concerns of the future of Shelton. With all this being said, I do not personally feel that term limits have to be in the Charter but I do feel that anything less than an increase in P&Z membership to at least 8 members and 2 alternates with Ward representation, anything less than that would be considered unacceptable. Next section 4.7 Ordinances, and I know that you already touched on this briefly. I'm a bit confused by 4.7.1 because they seem to contradict themselves. The end of 4.7.1. "The Clerk shall refer the ordinance without the requirement of a vote" but when you go to section 4.7.2, it reads "should the Board determine the ordinance" I don't know.

Paul DiMauro: You're absolutely correct.

Chris Panek: They're two opposite things

Paul DiMauro: One change was made without looking back at the other. Originally that's the way it was. It was sent directly to a committee, that was the problem it would sit at committee forever. The idea now is to have it go directly to the Board of Aldermen and let them decide whether or not it need go to a committee and then go on. We should delete proper committee of. The proper committee of should be deleted from the first paragraph which is 4.7.1. Then it would read correctly and it would force the issue not to just go to a committee where it could linger forever without an official movement and it should go directly to the Board of Aldermen and that was the intent. Thank you for that correction.

Chris Panek: There has been much comment by some on this Commission that Shelton's strong form of Mayoral governing is key to running this City, and this maybe true but allowing the Board of Aldermen to bypass the committee process is definitely not the (inaudible). During numerous Charter Revision Commission meetings it has been said that if it's not broke then why try to change it in the Charter? I would ask then why are we changing the Ordinance to Committee process of the City? Who said it was broken

and who said empowering the Board of Aldermen bypassing the committee process would fix it? Section 5.4, you already talked about. One final area that was proposed but was not a high priority to the CARE group was a Police Commission. During our CARE deliberation we did have the opportunity to listen to a presentation by the President of the Police Commissioners Association of Connecticut. It was very educating to listen to the positive things that a Police Commission could do to the public, the Police Department and the police Officers themselves. Yes they are having problems with Commissions in some towns, but the fact I that the system that's governed by State Statute based on Shelton's population and the building growth, I think that Police Commission at least deserved some public discussion. By the Charter Revision Commission. If the arguments against term limits is used and not many municipalities have them, then the same argument can be used that most municipalities do have Police Commissions. In fact 65 municipalities have Police Commissioners. Again is it a high priority, no but I felt that it definitely warranted some discussion by the Charter Revision Commission. After reviewing the entire draft, it seems quite apparent to me that it's a carbon copy in many areas as the failed revision. I took the time a couple of days ago to match up the failed 2004 revision line by line. Compared to the current draft, besides grammar and text changes, there were maybe five sentences changes with any substance that are different in this draft versus 2004 failed draft. This lack of substance change does nothing to promote a better run City for the next 10 years and fails the needs of the residents of this community. In closing I would like to go on record requesting that the Charter Revision Commission not take the final vote tonight on this draft and that the Charter Revision Commission reconvene at a later meeting date with all members present to discuss all the ideas and suggestions that were made over the past year and those made tonight. To rush into a final vote tonight without giving some very good issues any thought is a mistake (inaudible), we are all hopeful this does not occur, but the possibility must be realized by you who have the power in their hands to do what is best for the Shelton residents. I thank you for your time and would be happy to answer any questions.

Paul DiMauro: I'd like to respond to a couple of things. Number 1, as the Editor of the Huntington Herald will attest, I spoke to you yesterday or the day before and I told that under no way would we take a vote tonight if we didn't have full membership and full representation and that if any of the members felt uncomfortable with the language, we will take whatever time is necessary to come out with a document that we feel comfortable with. As far as saying there are not a lot of changes from the last one, you know why? Because most of them were pretty damn good. We made some improvements to the other ones, there was no reason to go much beyond what we did, one of the reasons it went down last time because one of your members misrepresented one of the sections of the Charter.

(End Side 1 – Tape 1)

Let me give you some suggestions, under the current Charter, the Board of Aldermen can borrow up to \$6.6 Million Dollars under the current Budget and Grand List the way it is today. It was represented using the same numbers that they can borrow and appropriate for subsequent appropriation is \$66 Million Dollars. Both numbers are wrong. What we have proposed is to make them both consistent, both subsequent appropriations and the ability of the Board of Aldermen to bond or get notes, which is very important, take notes

for an amount more than 2% of the current year Budget. Which amounts to this year \$1.8 Million Dollars. Pretty substantial amount of money, but it's not hard to roll up a lot of 500 or 600's and all of a sudden have a bunch of notes out there for \$4 or \$5 Million which is what happens some 12 14 years ago. So let me tell you, this group did do a good job in curtailing that, we are making a great stride there in controlling the Board of Aldermen and not allowing them to take on big debt without the public knowing about it. That was a big thing that was done last time and is continuing to be done this time. There were many of the changes that were asked for the last time that were good changes. And I have to say that the group took a bad wrap last time because of some misinformation given to the public, and guess what? As I said to the Editor of the Huntington Herald, why do I bother talking. Everything is about from the controversial side. Nothing about what we're trying to promote. We put a lot of time in this, this is a good group. We're willing to listen and we have listened. We listened to a lot of your recommendations, when we sat here for two nights, I've got to get this out of my system. When we sat here for two nights going over the items with CARE, many of the items that were brought up were already changes that were being instituted, correct Walter?

Walter Sofian: Correct.

Paul DiMauro: Is that fair? So we're down to a few issues that we disagree on. But you know what, we're gone a long way in saying we're going to listen to you. No other group has come forward by the way. Not City elected officials, no one has come forward other than this group

Walter Sofian: That shouldn't surprise you

Paul DiMauro: It does, I've served on two other Commissions back when and at both of those Charter Revisions, you were on one of them, Irene was on. When we met for a Public Hearing it had to be met in the Auditorium, not in this room. And Gene Hope was here at the podium talking. I'm not going to get into personalities of why people get involved in different things, I think we all know that. If you can't read through it, one thing we're not going to allow it to have this railroad through, none of us here on the Commission want that to happen, nor do we want this to become a political football which some people would like to see it become. Does anyone have a problem with that?

Bob Lally: I just have a couple of comments to Mr. Panek. I too went over some of the changes since the last Charter Revision failed. We looked at the recall section of the Charter, we removed the annual report to avoid it being a political document, we removed the Mayor from the approval process on the P&Z Commission, the Library Board which it never got in there, we took the Board of Ethics which had not been touched by the previous Commission and established a Code of Ethics and put some teeth into the Board of Ethics, that was overlooked. We increased the P&Z members, perhaps not to the liking of the group, but we did that. We protected the Commission of the Parks and Rec who manage a fund without any audit. Now there is an audit to protect them. We also passed a part of the Charter that says "No member of any of the appointed or elected Commission can serve on any other elected or appointed Commission. That is

very significant, and that was overlooked in this editorial. Which I also took exception to. We corrected the amounts of the bonding issue. I think we did a significant amount of upgrading the problems of the previous 2 Commissions. We didn't touch the Fire Department because I think the Fire Department was satisfied with what we had on the second go around. I think there were significant changes. As well as the representation of the Mayor on elected Boards. So I beg to differ with you that there were no significant changes.

Paul DiMauro: Bob, there's one more issue that I'm not sure you brought up, I know it wasn't me. We added a new sub paragraph to the General Provisions which basically states, no appointee shall serve beyond his designated term. Is that important? Currently we have, it was brought to my attention that we have many members of some very critical Commissions that are basically serving on a month-to-month basis. We now have put language in here that says when your term is over, if you were appointed for three years, and by the way, we reduced if it's 8 appointed, we were going to reduce the Inland/Wetlands to a three year term rather than a five year appointed, if it becomes elected it would have to be a two year term. So we did reduce it from last time from 5 to 3 and possibly to 2 if we go elected. But more importantly we said if you get appointed for a 2-year term, you serve 2 years and you go home unless you've been reappointed. You do not serve forever until someone gets around, whether it's the Board of Aldermen or the Mayor because both of them have appointing powers, and if they don't appoint someone else, they're not going to let someone just sit there and vote without being answerable. So there were some very substantial changes. I think we made a lot of changes since last time and we may still make more changes.

Bob Lally: In addition to all of this, the editorial that appeared in the Post tends to trash the work that has been done and the influence that your group has, and it is significant, by saying that this is going to, it is not acceptable to you, it turns around and says that all of the other things that are in here, that are very good and significant changes, are going to go down because of one or two other issues that are not acceptable to your group. It bothers me a great deal.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Bob, another real strong point and I know that you've got 12 members whatever, we're also hearing from 1 member of this Commission saying, Town Committee. Town Committee is how strong? 75? How many people? They're a fairly substantial group. They're very large voter base. So if they to us hey guys, that's not what the public wants, we represent a certain percentage of the votes, we have a right to have a say. Some of the changes that we've made, I've had flack on why are you doing that? One of them was increasing P&Z, but then as it turns out the majority of the communities in the State of CT have approximately 7, some have 9, some have less. But the average seems to be right in that 7 range. So people can take back on their objections, there were other objections that were brought up by other members of the Commission saying Town Committees won't accept that. We didn't look at Town Committees for support, we tried to do what we thought was best. We've all been on Town Committees,

a lot of us here, we've been through this, I'm not a member any longer, I'm not involved in politics on a day-to-day basis. Bob I believe is still involved. They have a large group so who are we supposed to listen to? I want to listen to what the people really want and what we think is best. Collectively, not as individuals.

Sue Coyle: My point, and at every meeting that I was at, is that we listened, we listened to what you had to say. We didn't ignore your recommendations. I know you didn't write it but

Walter Sofian: I had nothing to do with it. Nothing whatsoever to do with it.

Sue Coyle: But the outcome of it. The people read

Walter Sofian: We have no control

Sue Coyle: But they quoted your Mr. Steiner as saying that.

Walter Sofian: I have no control over him

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Let me go on, anyone else from the public?

Tom LaTulipe: I'm Tom LaTulipe, 91 Toas Street. I got involved with CARE because I was perturbed about the Charter. And I also got involved with the Citizens United party, which I am a member of because I'm concerned about Shelton. You say the Democrats put up so many people, the Republicans put up so many people, what do we go to the voting booth for if they are automatically elected. So we're starting a third party, getting someone else involved, we're going to have an election. Because that's what this country is all about. Freedom. I have the greatest respect for the Aldermen, although they always don't agree with me and I don't agree with what they say. But one of the things that really bugs me is the Police Commissioners. When you have the Chief of Police and the Union President coming out saying they are happy reporting to 1 man. They don't work for 1 man, they're supposed to be working for this community. And I believe that deep down in my heart and I have no animosity, no vendettas at all, and at my age, I probably won't need any Commissioners. But the City of Shelton sure does because you have your unions that have contact with other unions to get information, you have your Chiefs of Connecticut, you have your National Chiefs, that's a wealth of knowledge for the Chief. But for the public, there is nothing. But with the Commissioners, I forget how many there are now in the State of Connecticut, but that's a wealth of knowledge for people in Shelton. We can get information free. They don't get paid. This information is free to us if we want it by associating ourselves with them. Commissioners can be elected. They can be appointed, but there was no consideration on what type of Commissioners we should have here in Shelton. I feel that it is a necessity to have them. The wealth of knowledge that we will get by having Commissioners, and they're not going to interfere with the day-to-day operation of the Chief of Police. Now we had a

Public Hearing sponsored by the Democratic Party two years ago. And the Democratic Party came out in support of Police Commissioners because, I'm not the authority on this, I can't give you information on how they operate, or the advantage of being a Police Commissioner. But, they had one of their members, the President of the Commissioners Association come down and talk at the Democratic Party, and they weren't all Democrats there. And the Republican Party was having a meeting at the same time and we offered to come. Their reply was no. They didn't come. Now we have CARE. So again I contacted them, the Commissioners Association. They sent another representative to come to talk to CARE. CARE came out supporting Police Commissioners. But nobody has talked to you and the only thing that I can say is I don't want to see any one have a lawsuit against the city or something that can be stopped by having something like that. And like I say they don't interfere with the day-to-day operations. And if you would like to have somebody come down and talk to you and make a presentation of what the advantages are, I'd be happy to get someone. Thank you very much for your time.

Paul DiMauro: Thank you. Any other input from the public?

Terrance Gallagher: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to be brief. My name is Terrance Gallagher, I live at 42 Judson Street. I normally don't get involved in Town politics but my comments refer to Chapter 5 of the Charter. I'm a registered Democrat, but can care less if the person is Republican or not, it's the best for the job. There has been considerable controversy about various aspects of land use regulation in Shelton, particularly during the last year. There have been several comments directed toward the City Charter by a number of people who are unhappy with the current system, and I can understand their discontent, but I do not think that all of the comments have been reported in the newspapers will necessarily result in improved land use regulation. I would like to offer some options for the Commission to consider that I think might result in a better system for our town.

- I am not in favor of term limits for commissioners
- I am not in favor of voting for Planning and Zoning Commissioners by Ward
- I am in favor of more transparent and open government, and increasing the number of people involved in land use decisions in Shelton.
- The Planning & Zoning Commission should be split into two commissions; a Planning Commission for subdivisions, and a Zoning Commission for commercial site plans
- The number of full time members on each commission should be expanded to 7 or 9 members
- The members of each expanding commission should be appointed by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen, not elected
- The number of members on the Inland Wetlands Commission should be expanded to 9 members, and should be appointed, not elected,
- There should be a periodic review of each commissioner's fitness, abilities, and conflicts of interest prior to being reappointed.
- Shelton should consider having a Capital Facilities Plan and possibly a separate commission for planning for the City's long-term capital needs

- Shelton should consider having an advisory Architectural Review Board

For the record, I am a Civil Engineer with 24 years of experience permitting site development before much commission across the State, including Shelton's commissions. I also want to state that these opinions are my own and do not have anything to do with my firm, our clients, or any group.

Many Shelton residents that I talk to would like to see the City take a firmer grip on moderating the pace and scale of development that is has been. I do not think our current land-use system is adequate for this task without some major overhauling. We're fortunate to have some very good people in some of our departments and commission, and I think that they should be supported in areas where they are doing a good job. If we can make some major changes to de-politicize some of the land-use commission, and combine that with bringing in independents and other people who would like to help the town, but may not be involved with traditional party politics, it would do a lot to improve land-use here in our town.

These are hopefully some suggestions, you may use them or not use them, thank you.

Paul DiMauro: I appreciate your comments, I think they are well thought out and well presented. I work for a developer so I sympathize to some of your comments. I've been to the Architectural Review Boards and are helpful to a certain extent. But in your opinion, doesn't the Plan Development District cause more work for P&Z rather than appearance to Zoning in many areas that have strict zoning?

Terrance Gallagher: Shelton has chosen to use the Plan Development District approach on a lot of its applications because I'm sure Tony Panico can give you a long dissertation, other towns get the same if not (inaudible), that's one mechanism, I don't know about the legal issues

Inaudible

Bob Lally: Like I suggested to Mr. Sofian, there is a long-term plan commission in effect right now and they certainly could use the support on some of these issues.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public? Alderman Anglace.

John Anglace: I want to share some comments with you. I have to applaud the work of the Commission, some people talk about your attendance, you could talk about anyone's attendance, but the results are what count. I know the work that goes on behind the scenes when you submit the minutes, the strikethrough and so forth, at every meeting I know that each of you spends more time than just being at the meetings and that's what counts. The consideration to listening to what's being said and also you have to

recognize CARE and applaud their diligence that they have put into this. We may or may not agree on various issues, but let me share a few thoughts on some of the issues. Term limits, I vehemently oppose term limits because I think term limits degrade the democratic process. They take away from the people their right to choose and that's wrong. This is all about people, governing themselves, deciding who's going to represent them and if they want somebody, every two years or whatever you say the term is up, that's a term limit. The people decide whether you're in or out. That's the way I see it. Planning & Zoning increase to 8 by Ward, I think that the number you went to is 7 and that's an odd number and it's a good number. I don't think you can elect P&Z representatives by Ward because their job is to represent the entire City. Their job is to represent structure of the community. We talk about A City Planner. We've had a City Planner. Do we want 1 person planning our growth for the City? We've got Plan Update Committee. It's a representative group of citizens that sit down in accordance with State Statutes periodically put together a plan for our continued growth. Now, sometimes it goes on too long and I think that's one of the problems. But a Planner, we don't need someone to sit there and think and plan wherever this community is going. That's the committee's job. We need somebody to get it done and administer. You take away the consultant, the consultant is an advisor. He gets \$30, \$35,000.00 a year. You bring a City Planner in what are you talking about. He's not going to give you the same kind of advise that the consultant is. This consultant has been with us for the past thirty years. Tony Panico has been with the City of Shelton, he knows the history, he's got documents, you lose that you lose a valuable piece of history. An elected Inlands Wetlands Commission seems like a good idea. I don't have a problem with that. I wanted to recommend, I want to go over, Sophia showed before the meeting, what I'd like to suggest is that you keep this Public Hearing open for one week to receive written comments, because there are other Public Hearings tonight and there are other people I'm sure that wanted to be here or wanted to submit their thoughts and I think it would be a good idea if you gave them the opportunity. The Board of Aldermen, I'm going to jump around a little bit, the Board of Aldermen election by Ward versus minority representation, I don't know how that would work by Ward and we've had Wards for the past fourteen years where we've been 5 and 4 (inaudible), we've had 5-2, 7-1, this is something what the people want. Let them choose who they want. Police Commissioners, I'm a firm believer as a former labor negotiator in respecting the rights of the rank of file to negotiate a contract and to have the City live up to that contract and the police live up to that contract. If you bring in a Police Commissioner to second guess the union and if the Police Commissioner was in effect here in this town, with nothing more than political football, (inaudible). There is no place, in my opinion in this City, for a Police Commission. I just can't see any purpose to having one. Now, one might say well, how do the average citizen raise an issue if they've been wronged by a police officer? Go do they do that? I think personally with the manager of the department who is the Police Chief ore with the Mayor or the Board of Aldermen. If people don't want to bring their issues out to the public, then this is the public's business, local government is the public's business. (Inaudible), no talking behind the scenes. The State provides that we can go into Executive Session on certain things. The public business has to be discussed before the public in a public forum. People want to hide, many people want to hide, they want to call me, you're my Alderman, you do this for me, you put in this

complaint, you do it. They don't want to put their names on the line. I'm sorry, that's the way it is. If you have a Police Commission, you can't hide, you have to put your name on it. I can't see any reason that a Police Commission can serve this community better than the Chief of Police and having him be responsible for his department. I think the other thing that we haven't talked about and that's technology. We have been working in the citywide technology committee and that Citywide Technology Committee Has put in a wide area network, a local area network and now we're , tomorrow night we're going to the Board of Education and we're going to explain to them how to implement their technology plan for the school system. The Library and

Paul DiMauro: Excuse me Alderman, you don't want us to put it in the Charter do you?

John Anglace: No, my point is technology is going to change the way we do business in the City. It's going to change the structure. So much more is available today than there was a year ago or two years ago to the public. So much information on the City website that you use. It may impact some of the things that you're working on.

Paul DiMauro: I understand

John Anglace: I just want to be sure that the structure of where we go from here that if you're going to put together a recommendation and then the Board of Aldermen will get that recommendation, that we will comment as a Board to you, and then you will make the final choice, and then it will come back to us, and the only thing that we will decide is whether or not to bring it to referendum.

Paul DiMauro: And whether or not to make any particular issue a separate vote.

John Anglace: It should be noted, the Board of Aldermen is not empowered by a State Law to make any changes to the Charter. The last time if you recall, we were asked in a public hearing to change the Charter, and if we didn't change the Charter, we were told that it wouldn't be supported. Be that as it may, if this Charter is not supported, I only ask that they tell the truth when they put the facts out.

Paul DiMauro: Alderman Anglace, one thing I'd like to bring up that you touched on is Police Commissioners. We discussed it twelve years ago and it's 20 somewhat years ago that we made the change to the Police Chief. One of the things that was changed that maybe helped that situation is that we longer have a lifetime Police Chief. He's hired by contract, up to five years, so that the City has a little bit more control in that opposition. When we did it at that Charter, we were told it was illegal. Now I understand, many towns have adopted the same procedure to have the Police Chief by contract. The other point is that John brought up, so that everybody doesn't think that this is being jammed down anybody's throats, we had a public hearing, we went through I don't know how many meetings so far, we had this public hearing which on the recommendation from Alderman Anglace, we try to extend it, although you have to understand John it's been advertised as everything must be in tonight. But I'm sure there's a way to re-advertise

and open it up again. We will keep it open, but understand this, once we've decided on a final document, we give it to the Board of Aldermen, they must hold at least one public hearing, after that they will make a recommendation to us. If they want they can confer with us to amend and reject or recommend us to make the changes. So they have that opportunity again. After that, that meeting or whatever, we enter back 30 days later we can give back a final report, then they have to take their full vote and give it back to us and then they've got 15 months. This is not a fast track deal being rammed down anyone's throats by a long shot.

John Anglace: One thing I forgot to mention and it goes back to John Welch. John Welch came before you, John Welch has got tremendous experience with eh Charter Revision. One of the things that I believe John Welch mentioned to me and I want to pass along to you in case he didn't, that is, on P&Z and you should consider what we used to have was staggered terms. Staggered terms gave continuity to the Commission and back in the day they had staggered terms. Let me go out there to see who's trying to call me.

Paul DiMauro: Thank you very much Alderman Anglace. Anyone else?

Walter Sofian: One of the things that disturbed me Alderman Anglace said

Paul DiMauro: Stop one second, if you're going to make a comment about Alderman Anglace as to something he said, I'd rather wait until he comes back in, just as a courtesy.

Walter Sofian: That's fine, I didn't expect

Paul DiMauro: I know that, I think it's only fair to do it that way. You've been waiting for quite a while.

Judson Crawford: Good Evening Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, Judson Crawford, 8 Jordan Avenue. Also a member of CARE and also a representative of the Board of A&T. Number 1: I want to commend the Commission for one to changing the dates of the City Budget. Right now it is a six-month process. This way here we're cutting out one month and I think it will be in the best interest of the Boards of Apportionment and Taxation, also where we are meeting with the Board of Aldermen jointly, we take care of a lot of legwork. Then we'll be able to take care of appropriation by the 15th of May. The only other thing that I would like to say to the Commission is that, will go under the Bidding process. Section 7.14, The Purchasing Agent will send out a bid and will put in the newspaper that has the most circulation in the City. How do you substantiate?

Paul DiMauro: Where are you reading from, I want to get the right wording.

(Inaudible)

Paul DiMauro: Having substantial circulation in the City. Substantial, I think everyone can recognize what substantial would be. I think we have three papers that cover that in the City of Shelton. One being a weekly, and two being daily. I don't know we've ever gotten a problem, what I'm concerned with Judson, quite honestly is I wish the City or the Board of Aldermen would designate which newspaper they are going to advertise in and use one newspaper. I don't care if they rotate every year, but I think the public should know that every Board and Commission, every advertisement or anything that's going to show up, be at least in this particular newspaper all the time so they know where to look. Because otherwise, I happen to get the CT Post and the Register, I live downtown so once in a while I get the Huntington Herald, but I read both papers every day. Many people don't. A lot of the people in the Huntington area only read the CT Post, many in this area are oriented toward New Haven or the Valley, so they'll read the New Haven paper. Yeah, it gets confusing, but that's an administrative function, we can't label something in here that falls into one or the other, it's just common sense.

Judson Crawford: That's something that should be adopted by the Board of Aldermen.

Paul DiMauro: It should be by the Board of Aldermen as far as I'm concerned.

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: We discussed it before and we were going to tell the Board of Aldermen to get all the Commissions and Boards on the same page. I'm not saying to get it in one paper over the other

Judson Crawford: I am reading Bids that are put in the paper, either in the CT Post also in the New Haven Register.

Paul DiMauro: I don't think he puts it in both. Do they?

Judson Crawford: Yes

Paul DiMauro: That's ok, the more coverage the better. I have no problem with that.

Inaudible

Judson Crawford: the Purchasing Agent puts out all bids that go out onto the Internet

Paul DiMauro: And that's fine. But Judson, I wasn't speaking on just bidding, that's an issue, but more importantly our issues concerning zoning issue concerning other, those are most than anything else that people don't see on a regular basis. Legal notices more importantly than just bidding notices.

Judson Crawford: Number 2: I agree with the Commission that you have increased the amounts from \$5,000 to \$7,500. The amount that is needed to go out to bid, this is going to cut down on a lot of bids and today's economy costs are going up.

(End Side 2 – Tape 1)

Paul DiMauro: Go ahead Judson.

Judson Crawford: I would hope that this Board would give due process onto the bidding process. We have a system in place right now that is working to the best interest of the City of Shelton. Taking the changes you have so proposed into the Charter I feel will be not an advantageous system for the City of Shelton. Power to one person, opening everything,

Paul DiMauro: I'm sorry; I have to correct you there.

Judson Crawford: And then to also, the Finance Committee of the Board of A&T determine the lowest bidder but as it states right now, we are waiting for the department that is requesting the bid to come back with a letter of recommendation from them. So we have that in black and white. So it's in on the records. And I wish that John was sitting here right now and he would back me up on the reference to the budget making process. I hope that you will hear also to try to hold this meeting open for another week.

Paul DiMauro: I think that we've already stated that Judson. Judson let me clarify one thing, so you don't go away thinking we did wrong. The Purchasing Agent and a representative of the entity requesting the purchase will open the bids during regular working hours, when you open them during regular working hours, the great part about it is any substantial bids, it's a public bid. Those individuals that submit bids are allowed to be in the room during the bid opening and also what we put in here, whoever asks for it whether its Public Works or the Police Department asking for cars, their representative must be in the room along with the Purchasing Agent. He has no authority. The Department Head that makes the request always has made the recommendation to the Board of A&T based on these criteria. It's still your decision to make the recommendation and try to figure out who the lowest bidders are. You never have or you never did have the right to sign the contract or to sign the purchase order. So that goes onto the Board of Aldermen, the Mayor signs off on contracts. So we've taken nothing away from the Board of A&T, what we did was clarify and correct an error that was there for many years.

Judson Crawford: I agree with what you say Mr. Chairman, but it is awarding of the contracts which can be sent on to the Board of Aldermen, what if there is a situation that is happening right now that has to do with Sunnyside's roof. There is a letter being sent to our Board from the Building Commission. They need to have this awarded and the funding put in place instead of waiting for that meeting of the Board of Aldermen.

Paul DiMauro: If you can award it that's a matter of the Agent signing the purchase order and he can authorize it. It's got nothing to do with this. It's not relevant to this. I don't want to cut you off Judson but it's nothing to do with this.

Bob Lally: One more thing and I'd like to put it on the record while Mr. Sofian is here, in regards to the Ethics Board, one of the things that we cannot put in the Charter but the Commission will make a recommendation to the Board of Aldermen and that is every appointed or elected employee of the City will be given a copy of the Code of Ethics. They'll have to sign for it (inaudible)

Inaudible

Paul DiMauro: The other item that we discussed at length and it was felt that we needed to make a recommendation, the Board of Aldermen can change bidding procedures or purchasing procedures to an extent and beyond. The other issue Bob was major contracts that are given to the City should have full disclosure also to say whether or not, but that's an administrative policy and we're making that recommendation to them. (inaudible) but we're also making that recommendation which covers two areas, both purchasing procedures and also the part about Ethics. OK, is there anyone else from the public that wishes to speak? If not, I'd like to entertain a motion to extend the public portion to receive written comments only for a period of, I'm not going to rush this. Let's go to the 12th.

Gary Cahill made a motion to extend the Public Hearing for any additional comments to be submitted in writing to the Charter Revision Commission by Monday, July 11, 2005. It was second by Bob Lally. The motion passed unanimously.

Bob Lally made a motion to cancel the meeting that was to follow the Public Hearing. Sue Coyle second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Charles Carroll made a motion to cancel the Special Meeting scheduled for Thursday, July 7, 2005 for voting purposes and to have the regular scheduled meeting on Tuesday, July 12. Sue Coyle second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Gary Cahill motioned to adjourn. Irene Smith second the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Paul DiMauro adjourned the meeting of the Charter Revision Commission at 9:18 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

- **minutes were re-submitted due to some grammatical errors: (a) the date in the header was incorrect, (b) page 6 – Mr. Osac was misspelled.**