



CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

August 18, 2008

Room 204

7:30 P.M.

Commissioners Present: Jack Bashar
Sue Coyle
Paul DiMauro
Chris Gallo
Ken Nappi
Irene Smith

Excused: Steve Bellis
Michael Davis
Bob Lally

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Paul DiMauro called the Special Meeting of the Charter Revision Commission to order at 7:43 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Commissioner Coyle motioned to recess until after the joint meeting of the Board of Aldermen and the Charter Revision Commission adjourns and a note to be left on door of Room 204 advising the public that the meeting will take place in the Auditorium. Commissioner Gallo seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman DiMauro recessed the meeting at 7:44 P.M.

Chairman DiMauro reconvened the Special Meeting of the Charter Revision Commission of Monday, August 18, 2008 at 7:57 P.M.

Discussion took place regarding the recommendations the Board of Aldermen had for the Charter Revision Commission regarding the draft that was submitted for review (please see minutes that follows from the Board of Aldermen Special Meeting of August 18, 2008 with the Charter Revision Commission regarding recommendations).



BOARD OF ALDERMEN SHELTON, CONNECTICUT

SPECIAL MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 18, 2008

Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Aldermanic President John Anglace called the meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7:05 p.m. All those present rose and pledged allegiance to the flag.

Roll Call

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President – present
 Alderman Lynne Farrell - absent
 Alderman John “Jack” Finn – present
 Alderman Stanley Kudej – absent
 Alderman Kenneth Olin - present
 Alderman John P. Papa – present
 Alderman Jason Perillo - present
 Alderman Anthony Simonetti – absent

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION:

Paul DiMauro, Chairman
 Jack Bashar - present
 Chris Gallo - present
 Irene Smith - present
 Sue Coyle – present
 Steve Bellis – absent
 Bob Lally – absent
 Ken Nappi – present
 Michael Davis - absent

1. Presentation of Board of Aldermen Charter Revision Recommendations

Alderman Anglace stated, the purpose of this meeting is for the Board of Aldermen to make a presentation to the Charter Revision Commission in accordance with Statutes, giving the Charter Revision Commission our recommendations on the Charter. First, I would like to invite all of the members of the Charter Revision Commission to come up and sit at the table with us, so you will feel comfortable, and make notes if you'd like.

We are going to give you our recommendations, and then our meeting will conclude. Then your meeting will begin and you, I understand, want to confer with us on our recommendations. We will go around to each of the Aldermen, and those that are not here, if they've given us any information, we'll pass it along to you.

First Ward Alderman Anthony Simonetti has one recommendation. That is that all of the Aldermen should live by the same standard and all of the Aldermen should be held to the same standard, and that is, nobody should be allowed to hold a second elected office. That is his recommendation. He has given me nothing in writing. The other Alderman in the First Ward is Alderman Finn.

First Ward Alderman John "Jack" Finn

At the public hearing that the Board of Aldermen had, two individuals got up pertaining to the Public Safety Council. Both of them recommended the Chairman of EMS Commission should be in the Public Safety Council. Right now it's just Highways and Bridges, Fire Department, Police Department. I also believe that only because they hold the PSA, Echo Hose Ambulance should be an ex-officio member of the Public Safety Council as well. Their information can be very vital to the City.

The other one was basically, the Board of Fire Commissioners and the Officers' Council met and came up with various recommendations for changes in 6.9 which deals with the Fire Department. I really don't want to go into them all, I have a copy of the minutes so I'll pass them down to you. There are some minor changes. When you get down to Appointments - there seems to be a better definition for Fire Chief, Deputy Chief and Assistant Chiefs as well. They also increased the term from three years to five years for the Fire Chief. They removed the Fire Marshal entirely from their recommendations, but again that's your decision in that area.

I'm in disagreement with Alderman Simonetti. He did bring a complaint against me in the last election on holding both offices with the Secretary of State's Office. He received the same information back from them, as you go up three times before the Secretary of State's office. I have to commend the Charter Revision Commission by stating it should be left up to the voters. If the voters decide a person's out of office, they're out of office. I think everybody would abide by that. There would be no question.

Second Ward Alderman Jason Perillo

First, to comment on Alderman Finn's comments regarding the Public Safety Council. Just as an informational feature for you folks, it is not that simple to say Echo Hose

Ambulance should be ex officio because they are the Primary Service Area Responder – they hold the PSA. There are actually two PSA holders in the City of Shelton. Echo Hose at the ambulance transport level and Valley Emergency Medical Services at the medical end. So that does open a bit of a Pandora's Box as to should all PSAR's be on the Public Safety Council as ex-officio, or should they be on the Public Safety Council as voting members? There is a compelling argument to be heard from the Chairman of the EMS Commission Noreen McGorty that the EMS Commissioner should be on. I have heard from your own minutes in reading your minutes that there is a compelling argument on the other side. Having sat through many Public Safety Council meetings, it is an extraordinarily operational group. It is not necessarily reasonable to expect the EMS Commissioner who is not necessarily a provider of care be able to address operational questions and operational concerns. So I'm not necessarily recommending anything in either direction, I don't necessarily think it would be appropriate for me in my position to do that. I would suggest that the Charter Revision Commission go back and revisit the issue, have further discussion. Hear what was said by the Chair of the EMS Commission and hear what was said by those who differ with her opinion, and just rethink it. Whatever you come to, you come to, but give it a bit more thought.

I have a minor question, something for you folks to revisit. I see it in Section 4.9 – it makes reference to publication of ordinances on the City website. I believe there are other references to publication of office holders and such and appointments on the City website. I am just not sure that that is something that is Charter-worthy. It sounds like an administrative policy. I am not opposed to it by any stretch, and quite frankly I think that from a good City management perspective, those things should be published in a timely manner on the City website. I'm just not sure it's Charter-worthy. It's something to talk about.

The sections involving the Planning and Zoning Commission - I have a question for you, Mr. President. Are we going to be able to engage in discussion with the Charter Revision Commission?

Alderman Anglace replied, the purpose of our meeting at this point is for us to convey to them our recommendations. Following our meeting, the Chairman of the Charter Revision Commission will convene their meeting, which is called for the purpose of discussing our recommendations – conferring with us on those recommendations. Provided the Charter Revision Commission wishes to discuss that particular issue, there will be some give and take.

Alderman Perillo stated, then I will tee up the following discussion as it pertains to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Having spent almost three years as a member of it, and some may disagree, but I did not find the Planning and Zoning Commission to be a partisan commission. It may be political at times, but I did not find it to be partisan. I'm not sure what prompts the tremendous focus on party representation. I understand the importance of minority representation; I believe in it wholeheartedly. But I would advise not to focus your attention on how many Republicans and how many Democrats there are. I don't think that's the meat of the discussion. I would also further tee up for comment that Planning and Zoning Commission issues can be and often are extraordinarily complex and it can be very difficult for a large group of

people around a table to understand the core of the project or issue in front of them. While I hear that some people may have a desire to enlarge the Planning and Zoning Commission and get more people involved, there is another edge to that sword. It can be that much more difficult for those at the table to be able to get their questions in and get their questions answered and to be able to grasp exactly what it is they're looking at. So, in this situation before us, you have raised the number of individuals to seven, well, seven plus two which actually is nine. So now you have nine people around a table who need to "get it," and that can be a challenge. And though I mentioned earlier that party affiliation doesn't necessarily in my experience drive voting, what you have also done is diluted the influence of the minority in order to enlarge the commission. Quite frankly I don't necessarily think that is necessary.

99.99 percent of this Charter affects everyone in City of Shelton except for one section. It only affects two of us. We are in a fortunate situation that both of them are right here. Jack, I think we disagree on this. I just don't think it's right that you and I, together, Democrat and Republican together, get treated differently than anybody else. As I said at our meeting from last week, people already think elected officials get more than they should and have more advantages than John Q. Public. They already think we're special. I don't think we should be promoting that. I don't think we should be stressing that. I don't think we should be proving that, which we so often try not to prove. This document proves to people what they already suspect – that we're better and get treated better. We shouldn't. If somebody tomorrow shouldn't be able to hold two incompatible offices, then Jack Finn and Jason Perillo today shouldn't be able to hold two incompatible offices. My recommendation to the Charter Revision Commission is to do it or don't do it. You either can or you can't. Not a situation where you can't unless you're Jack or Jason, 'cause they're better – they're special. I just don't think it's right. I've got a real problem with that, so I only ask that you look at it.

My final comment as far as the Fire Department, the primary concern that I did hear from Mike Ullrich, Assistant Chief of the Department, at our last meeting, does make quite a bit a sense. You've got assistant chiefs, they're all officers. They should all be on the Officers' Council. I just think that's common sense. I don't know if it was left off accidentally, or if there was a specific reason, but I think you should look at that as well. That's it for now.

Second Ward Alderman Stan Kudej is at the Little League World Series.

Third Ward Alderman Lynne Farrell is attending a wake but plans to be here later.

Fourth Ward Alderman John Papa relayed the following comments on behalf of himself and Fourth Ward Alderman Ken Olin

Alderman Papa stated, we did talk and these are our joint comments. I feel strongly also that nobody should have two elected offices. Without a doubt. It just makes it fair and the way you have it in the Charter right now, grandfathering, I don't think that's appropriate – definitely that should be changed. That's my opinion, that's Kenny's opinion.

The Planning and Zoning Commission – I don't agree with increasing any more members to the Planning and Zoning. The way it's set right now, I think they've done a very good job. I think having more people involved would make it more cumbersome.

I don't know if there was any discussion on the Inland-Wetlands Commission, if that was ever discussed about being elected or appointed – I think that's an area you should look into. It's a critical commission and anything that passes Inland-Wetlands Commission – Planning and Zoning would have a difficult time not accepting what Inland-Wetlands Commission approved. So I think you should look into that, if you've had any discussion about that. I talked to Stan Kudej when we were down in Williamsport and he agrees with the Inland-Wetlands Commission. That's all.

Alderman Jason Perillo stated, I have another comment. In Section 7.14 as to Bidding. I have to be honest, I don't have the solution to this. I'm asking for more discussion and actually some clarity on the record as to intent. We have had situations in the past where certain services have not been bid by the Board of Education because they are deemed by the Board of Education to be professional in nature. I guess I want to be very clear that that doesn't loop in services that aren't necessarily ones that fit that description. I think there are a lot of things that can be bid, and just because you happen to know one person who does it, doesn't mean they're the only one who does it. I think it's important to convey that message in the Charter. I'm sorry to raise a problem and not have an answer to it. But, I mean, "*The Board of Education shall be permitted to establish a list of professional services in the areas of instruction, student assessment, counseling or related special...*" There seems not to be any oversight over that. I think despite the fact that the Board of Education does a yeoman's job, sometimes when you're a hammer, everything looks like a nail. That list of services that is identified as professional in nature could grow and there is no check on that. I just want to make sure that if we're going to not be bidding, if we're going to be spending taxpayer dollars without a bid, it better be for something that really can't be bid. Again, I just wanted to raise a flag and generate some additional discussion.

Third Ward Alderman John Anglace distributed a summary of his comments to the attendees.

2.4.1 (f) P&Z

The Charter Revision Commission proposal to increase the number of Planning and Zoning Commissioners from six to seven – that's what you've got on the table. It also increases minority representation from 4/2 to 5/2. Two speakers addressed the issue at your Public Hearing, both were members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. One speaker found no practical or compelling reason to change the current six-member Commission. She also noted that P&Z Regulations affect zoning throughout the entire City and electing Commissioners by Ward runs contrary to the long held "at-large" representation theory. A minority party Planning and Zoning member questioned the difference between the Board of Education's nine-member, 5-4 minority representation and a seven board, 4-3 minority representation Planning and Zoning Board. "What's the difference?" he asked.

Planning and Zoning members are elected “at large” to plan and zone on a City wide basis – not by Ward, but City wide. Voters cast their votes city wide for those they wish to serve. Currently the four top vote getters are seated and two minority representatives are given seats on the board per State Statute, even though they may not have won more votes than the two remaining majority party candidates. Voter choice is compromised in favor of applying minority representation. These are facts. Consequently, the will of the people should not be changed further by changing the Charter. When the minority party asks for a seven-person Commission with 4-3 minority representation they are asking the Charter Revision Commission to give them something the voters refused to give them at the polls.

I think we can live with a six (4-2) or seven (5-2) member commission but a seven member Commission requires a five-member vote majority for a zoning regulation or Planned Development District change if a “protest petition” has been filed thus making the seven-member Commission a change worthy of support. I don’t think I had time, because this I found as a result of, Richard Widomski submitted at our public hearing a request asking that Corporation Counsel Welch give us a defined opinion. I have one copy of it and I’ll be glad to give it to you, but let me read it into the record. Here’s what Counsel said. He asked us to verify the number of affirmative votes needed to approve a zone change or a Planned Development District. We asked that to Counsel. Counsel said: *“Zoning regulations shall be established, changed or repealed only by a majority vote of all the members of the Zoning Commission. However, if a protest petition against the proposed change is filed at or before the hearing with the Zoning Commission, signed by owners of 25 percent or more of the area of the lots included in such proposed change, or the lots within 500 feet in all directions of the property included in the proposed change, such change shall not be adopted except by vote of 2/3 of all members of the commission.”* Now, this is significant because first, notification is paramount. Notification to property owners is paramount. It is required now by Planning and Zoning. When they come in they have to prove that they notified everybody. People are on notice. Once people get on notice and they know about this protest petition, they can file it. If you’ve got a seven-member board, they need five votes to pass a Planned Development District or zone change. That’s significant. That’s worthy. I’ll give you this, to the Chairman.

3.4 SUCCESSION TO OFFICE

Why this came up is difficult to understand since the succession clause has only happened once in the last 50 years.

It is not practical to hold a Special Election within 60 days for the following reasons:

- Cost (\$30,000 +)
- Voters do not come out to vote at Special elections (historically less than 20%)
- Impractical to select candidates, get ballots printed, etc. within 60 days thereby curtailing absentee balloting, etc.

If it is not broken, leave it alone. That’s my recommendation.

5.2 MAYOR

Requires that the Mayor must provide notification to the Clerk of the Board of Aldermen on all appointments at least fifteen (15) days prior to the appointment. I can see no practical reason for requiring this. However, it would make sense for the Mayor to notify the Clerk after the appointment is made. This might be the intent, so I'm asking, was this the intent? If he, and the reason that notification, somebody has to notify so you can update the City Directory. People rely on that, and you update the website as well, so everybody's current, including the public.

5.3.3 PUBLIC EMPLOYEES APPEALS BOARD

The title now reads "Public Employees." My recommendation is to change the title from "Public Employees" to "Public Employees Appeals Board."

The second recommendation on this is, the Public Employees Appeals Board should only cover Merit System employees. It now gives collective bargaining units the opportunity to opt for the PEAB which, on a practical basis, will never be done so why include it. Bargaining units have their grievance procedure spelled out in their contract. Not changing this section allows bargaining units a choice of where to seek grievance adjustment. If they don't get what they want in their collective bargaining agreement, then they can go to PEAB. I don't think we want to give them that. I don't think we want to be that benevolent.

5.3.4 WPCA

There is no reference to minority representation on this Board. Do we want to spell it out? Do the State Statutes spell it out?

5.5 (k) OBVIOUS TYPO

This appears to be an obvious typographical error. It says, "If not appointed ..." I think it should say, "If not reappointed ..."

6.9.1 PUBLIC SAFETY COUNCIL

Noreen McGorty said that the Public Safety Council does not include Emergency Medical Services. I cannot find any reference to Public Safety Council in the revised Charter. It appears to have been eliminated. If it is in the proposed Charter, you might want to consider adding the EMS Chairman to it as a voting member and the Ambulance provider as an ex-officio member. However, you should also note that current members are operating administrators, and not planners or policy makers, and consider if that makes a difference in who serves. The Public Safety Council, I'm not sure if it's a planning council or an emergency-type council. I don't know.

6.9.3 FIRE DEPARTMENT

I think I support the Charter Revision Commission's version.

I think I would ask you to consider adding the four Assistant Chiefs to the Officers Council as requested.

Here's my rationale for it. All successful business organizations have a CEO to run the day-to-day operations and a Board of Directors to make policy. This separation is necessary to ensure optimum performance. The part-time Board of Fire

Commissioners cannot be present on a day-to-day basis to dictate fire suppression no more than the part-time Board of Aldermen can be present on a day-to-day basis to dictate how to clean City Hall or the Planning & Zoning Commission can be present on a day-to-day basis to do site plan walks and reviews. Consequently, the Board of Fire Commissioners, the Board of Aldermen and Planning and Zoning must accept their roles as administrators and legislators. The Charter Revision Commission has correctly recognized the operational and administrative/legislative roles of all Fire Department entities and this approach should be put to the voters for their approval.

I would like to read into the record parts of an e-mail I received from Captain Justin Sabatino of the Pine Rock Park Fire Company #4, a duly chartered participating independent company and member of the Shelton Fire Department.

With respect to the Fire Department, I'm going to read you excerpts, okay? "The sections regarding the Fire Department should be left the way it was written by the Charter Revision Commission. The document written by the Charter Revision Commission is the way the Fire Department should go forward in the future. If you recall, this is what happened the last time. The Board of Fire Commissioners attempted to get the firefighters to reverse the document, thereby failing the Charter change. The Fire Department needs the commissioners to be the administrative body only. They need to be eliminated from running the operations of the department. That should be left to the Fire Chief, who should not have interference from the commissioners. The Board needs to be eliminated from controlling operations, and the recommendations of the Charter Revision Commission is the right way to go. Let the Board of Fire Commissioners run the administrative side and the Fire Chief run the operational side."

Captain Sabatino explains in here that his fire company took an active part throughout your deliberations with representatives being present at your meetings and they met and they reviewed, and this is the consensus.

With respect to the Fire Marshal. "I highly recommend that this section be left as written by the Charter Revision Commission. With the document by the Charter Commission, the Fire Marshal's office is still part of the Fire Department and always will be. The Fire Marshal's office will be run by the Fire Marshal just as the Fire Chief runs the fire suppression side."

With respect to the Officers' Council. "To eliminate the deputy Fire Marshals from the Officers' Council does not serve any purpose. The Officers' Council should be made up as written by the Charter Revision Commission." Please forward this to all your fellow Aldermen and women.

Alderman Anglace continued, it's the only copy I have. I'll give it to the Clerk for inclusion.

6.9.6 ADVISORY COUNCIL

Is this a new paragraph? Is this necessary?

If we have an Office of Emergency Management and their duties and responsibilities are in accordance with State Civil Preparedness plans and provisions, why do we need an Advisory Council?

7.6 CITY BUDGET

The Board of Apportionment and Taxation and the Board of Aldermen receive the Mayor's recommendation no later than March 22nd.

Then, the Board of Aldermen receives the Apportionment and Taxation Budget no later than May 1st.

The Board of Aldermen holds a Public Hearing no later than May 10th.

Mr. Nappi interjected, it is now 7:30 and the Charter Revision Commission meeting is posted at this time in a different room. We have to go up there, start it and adjourn it, or recess until we finish here, otherwise we'll be in violation.

[Alderman Anglace called for a five-minute recess]

My point on 7.6 was that the Board of Aldermen has to hold a public hearing on the 10th, and you need some time to get the minutes done. State law gives you seven days to do that. If we have to set a budget mill rate by May 15th, it's two days before the minutes even come in. Maybe, there's no compelling reason why we cannot extend the Board of Aldermen setting the budget mill rate to May 30th. That would work and there should be enough time.

9.6.1 ELECTED OFFICE

Alderman Anglace stated, of course, you've heard a couple of times from Alderman Perillo and you got his comments. I believe he made them at our public hearing. I'll call that to your attention if you'd like to take a look at them.

My recommendation is to leave this language as recommended by the Charter Revision Commission - that an Alderman may not hold any other elected position - but change it to reflect that those currently affected will hold office only until the next election. Clarify that this applies to all elected positions (local and state).

By grandfathering Alderman Finn and allowing him to run for Registrar of Voters as many times as he is elected, gives him an advantage over every other sitting Alderman. Why not grandfather each of the currently sitting Aldermen allowing them all to run for one other elected/paying office at some time in the future? Why deprive me of that opportunity?

The best approach is to eliminate all Aldermen from holding any other elected office. If the Charter restricts other office holders from holding other elected office, why not do the same for the Aldermen. Alderman Finn wants to portray himself as the victim in this situation when, in fact, if you stay with the language you currently have, Finn becomes the favorite son and the only ones impacted by such a Charter change would be the remaining members of the current Board of Aldermen. Quite frankly,

I'm surprised that Alderman Finn took part in this discussion, and I feel uncomfortable myself. I guess it affects him personally and financially and that raises ethical questions. It affects each of us, it could affect each of us personally and financially. Just us merely talking about it raises ethical questions for all of us. I turn it back to you and say, give it your final thought and whatever you decide, you decide.

9.6.1 (b) ELECTED OFFICE VACANCY

If not covered by law or Charter, remaining party members have 45 days to fill the opening. If no remaining members of same political party, it then gives the affected body 30 days to fill the opening.

The concern here is that this language takes away the appointing authority's "right to appoint" without giving the appointing authority "notice". If the appointment or reappointment is not made within 45 days from the expiration, the person responsible for keeping the City Directory current should notify the appointing authority that they are in default and then give them another 30 days to make the appointment. Also, if they fail to make the appointment within the extended time, they still retain their right to appoint until such time as the appointment is made by the affected body.

In other words, I don't want to see the appointing authority lost because they didn't do it in a timely manner. The Mayor's comments – I don't have them in writing, but...

Mr. DiMauro stated, I think they're pretty much consistent with yours, John. There might have been a couple more. I'll look through them again and make sure we don't miss any of them.

Alderman Anglace stated, that pretty much concludes our recommendations and that would...

Alderman Finn stated, one last comment. First of all, John, I'm surprised you did speak up on the Alderman Registrar of Voters. Back in 2007 you brought it to the media's attention and several newspapers throughout the year, and you also brought it up before the Ethics Board when we were discussing the ethics. At that time you indicated what do the Republicans have to do, elect an alderman registrar of voters to be equal to the Democrats? You also said, this is the reason we should have a Charter change and you said it yourself. Those comments are in black and white. At the Ethics Board you also said there was nothing wrong with holding the two offices if you can find in the State Statutes or the City Charter at that time. If you think I'm being unethical, don't discuss it in public, just file an ethics complaint and let them decide.

Alderman Anglace stated, that pretty much summarizes our recommendations to the Charter Revision Commission. A motion to adjourn would be in order.

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman Papa MOVED to adjourn; SECONDED by Alderman Perillo. A voice vote was taken and the MOTION PASSED 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:55 p.m.

Discussion took place with the Board of Aldermen regarding their recommendations. Regarding the timeline, the Board of Aldermen is scheduled to vote on the proposed Charter on August 26, 2008. The Charter Revision Commission will need to schedule another Special Meeting for this Thursday, August 21, 2008 to finalize all the recommendations and should there be any changes or items that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Nappi read into the minutes the comments from Assistant Chief Mike Ullrich at the Board of Aldermen of August 14, 2008.

*Mike Ullrich, 9 Allyndale Court
Assistant Fire Chief*

I spoke Tuesday night at the Public Hearing, and that was as the Chairman of the Officers' Council. Today I'd like to give you a small letter; I'd like to put it into the file so that you have this for when you have your special meeting with the Charter Revision Commission.

First of all, I'd like to express my displeasure with the latest Officers' Council and Board of Fire Commissioners joint meeting in regard to Charter Revision changes. The Officers' Council subcommittee worked closely with a subcommittee of Charter Revision in developing the most recent proposal that went to public hearing. A lot of hard work and time was put in by both the Officers and the Charter Revision Subcommittees to find a workable solution that would bring structure and efficiency to the Fire Department.

Up until this joint meeting, the Officers and Commissioners felt that most Officers were comfortable with the changes. However, I was wrong. The newest changes proposed by Officers and Commissioners still leaves a lot of gray areas that may cause confusion as to how to interpret these areas, and takes authority away from the Fire Chief.

I strongly suggest that you keep the Charter as proposed by the Charter Revision Commission with as little minimal changes as possible. However, as far as changes go, I would like to suggest that you re-do 6.9.3.3.1 which is Additional Appointments, for clarification purposes. This is in regard to the Assistant Chiefs. Currently the Charter Revision proposed that the companies will appoint their own Assistant Chiefs as long as they meet the Board of Fire Commissioners requirements. I don't feel that's fair. There is an ordinance that they get paid \$7,500 and I think they should at least be appointed by the Board of Fire Commissioners. Whether or not the Mayor is included or not, that's up to you. But I really feel they should be appointed by somebody and not just appointed by

their individual fire companies. I feel they should be appointed by the Board of Fire Commissioners.

Secondly, the current proposal under Section 6.9.4.3 says the Fire Marshal shall make quarterly reports to the Board of Fire Commissioners. I'd also like to see in there under that section, a report to the Fire Chief also. A monthly report stating the status of site and plan reviews for the purposes of our pre-planning. Currently, it's always delayed. By the time we receive the information and we're scrambling to play catch up to get to the buildings that are already occupied. It's more difficult for us to get in there and do our site pre-plan reviews. So if we could get at least a report monthly as to what's coming in and he's reviewing, we can work side by side with the Fire Marshal's office in getting our pre-plans done in a more efficient manner while it's all open. If there's anything that we see that might be a problem we could work with him in getting that done faster than waiting until the building is already built and occupied, and the changes are going to be a wash – you're not going to get them. If we could do that, I'd like to see that.

I'd like to thank you for your consideration of these changes.

Discussion on recommendations:

Planning and Zoning - it is confirmed that seven (7) is the number we are proposing; the reason being that there would be a requirement of five (5) votes for zone change and for PDD. That is a requirement of State Statute as has been confirmed by Corporation Counsel. This only pertains to areas where there is out-cry and problems with a development. One thing that is needed for correction, the CRC is not limiting minority representation to two (2). The public could vote 2, 3, or 4 of any party. Three (3) of one (1) party can be elected. This allows the public more input. - Closed

WPCA – why minority representation is not spelled out. There are a few Boards that are not spelled out in regards to minority representation. State Statute dictates that if you do not delineate or designate how many, then you go by State Statute in that section. - Closed

Succession to Office – there is a certain time frame that the public should be given the opportunity to elect. - Language needs to be added.

Appointments by Mayor – the idea of this was more for the disclosure prior to an individual being put into an appointment. – Closed

Public Employee – suggestion to have title changed to Public Employees Appeals Board and also to delete reference to collective bargaining. – Closed

General Provisions (k) – change “appointed” to “reappointed”. – Closed

Public Safety Council – Discussion needed to possibly leave language as is in current Charter.

Fire Department – Address the issue of the Assistant Chiefs. – Discussion needed.

Advisory Council – This is a Statute provision. – Discussion to possibly reference State Statute.

Budget – change date of finalizing budget to May 30. – Verify date, discussion needed.

Elected Office – Further discussion needed.

Appointing Authority – Requiring the City/Town Clerk to have a list of appointments for the next 30-45 days. The list is available to the appointing authority. The purpose is to not have someone sit in the seat indefinitely. – Discussion needed.

END SIDE A, TAPE 1

Website – The website is being utilized at this time. Someone needs to be responsible to maintain the website. It's a tremendous service to the public. The Finance Director shall maintain the City website. – Closed

Inland Wetlands Commission – Discussed at length. This is best left to the Mayor to appoint a certain qualified individual. – Closed

Holding on to one (1) elected office – Discussion needs to continue for finalizing decision.

The Charter Revision Commission will schedule a Special Meeting for Thursday, August 21, 2008 at 7:00 pm in Room 204 at City Hall to finalize all recommendations and open items. The Final Draft of the Proposed Charter will be then ready to be submitted to the Board of Aldermen for approval.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Bashar motioned to adjourn the Special Meeting of the Charter Revision of August 18, 2008. Commissioner Coyle seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman DiMauro adjourned the meeting at 9:21 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade

Sophia V. Belade
Charter Revision Clerk

TAPE IS AVAILABLE IN THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE

**ALL ATTACHMENTS MAY NOT BE AVAILABE ON THE WEB, FULL
COPIES AVAILABLE IN CITY/TOWN CLERK OFFICE**