



**CITY OF SHELTON**  
**CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION**  
**MINUTES**  
*April 27, 2020*  
*Virtual*

*Chapman & Pappas*  
2020 APR 28 A 5:54  
CITY OF SHELTON  
TOWN CLERK

Commissioners Present: Dan Debicella  
Gary DeFilippo  
Ruth Ann Dunford  
Ruth Parkins  
David Presutto  
Darlissa Ritter  
Donald Sheehy

Also present: John Anglace via conference call

- CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Debicella called the workshop to order at 7:03 pm. The meeting was held on Zoom by Executive Order of Governor Ned Lamont 7(b) and being broadcast live on YouTube and will be uploaded to the City Website.

- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- GENERAL DISCUSSION

The Commission invited John Anglace, Chairman of the Board of Aldermen to discuss some questions that the Commission had and to discuss comments that Mr. Anglace addressed. (attached)

The Charter Commission discussed open items that were on the List for Discussion and will continue to address each item that is open or needing more discussion. New items have been added and will be looked at in the coming workshops.

The Commission will continue to meet virtually for the month of May. Attached is also an email sent by Peggy Camp to the Commission and was forward to the Commission for their review..

Next workshop is scheduled for Monday, May 4, 2020 at 7:00 pm via Zoom and live on YouTube.

Commissioner Dunford motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Ritter second the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Debicella adjourned the workshop at 9:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sophia V Belade*

Sophia V. Belade  
Charter Revision Clerk

# **CHARTER REVISION VIRTUAL MEETING**

MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2020 @ 7:00 PM

**CALL: 1-646-558-8656**

**ENTER MEETING I.D.: 566 842 1976**

(Dan's cell: 203-912-1948)

## **ISSUES:**

### **INCREASING BOA MEMBERSHIP FROM 8 TO 9 OR 10 WITH**

**(a) INCREASED NUMBER BEING ELECTED AT-LARGE**

**(b) WITH BOA PRESIDENT ELECTED AT-LARGE**

- What is the rationale offered for this suggestion? Unless the proposer can make a compelling case for change, I suggest it not be changed. The burden to prove the need for change rests with the author...not the C. R. Committee.
- I don't see how such a change will benefit the City, each Ward of the City or the people.
- Offering change without benefit to the people is nothing more than an attempt to circumvent the system for possible political representation.
- We have had the current system in place now for over 30 years during which time we have seen various Board configurations (an 8-0 "R" Board, a 8-0 "D" Board, a 5 "R" - 5 "D" Board and others). The present system is understood, it is workable and it is effective. All previous configurations have worked. "If it ain't broken, don't fix it!"
- Whether the people elect an "R" or a "D" that person is held responsible to that Ward.
- When I first was elected to the BOA it was me and Ann Dougherty in Ward 3. As a "D" and an "R" we had to work together to get things done for our Ward and the City and we had no problem doing it.
- I would not recommend changing the current makeup of the BOA.

## **TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE**

### **WHY THE NEED?**

This pandemic has changed the way we live and work. It has also raised questions about how we provide City services going forward. This is an excellent time for us to engage in post pandemic planning and taking advantage of the available technology to provide the improved and increased services expected by our citizens.

Also, our BOE and other school districts have adopted the chrome book learning approach. Their plan calls for a build out of this system from fifth grade forward. Some of us believe the cost of this system will escalate going forward. The technology committee would be an excellent body to oversee student results, measure the system's value and plan for its ongoing funding.

Technology is here to stay. We need to embrace it in all aspects of government going forward and since it will cost money not now available to the fiscal authority through the current provisions of the City Charter, the Technology Committee approach appears to be our best way forward.

My thought was to build on our previous Technology Committee success but take it a step further by looking at all aspects of City services.

### **RECOMMENDED MAKEUP OF TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE:**

3 members appointed by the BOA (1 or 2 from business/industry sector)  
3 members appointed by the BOE (1 from teaching/administrative community)  
1 member appointed by Mayor  
1 City IT Director  
1 BOE IT Director  
(9 voting members – 5 votes required majority)  
Mayor and Superintendent to serve as Ex-Officio members.

- Suggest a 2-year member appointment term.
- Suggest that if recommended as part of the Charter Revision and approved by the voters that a referendum be held to provide the funding of \$2.5 million and the Technology Committee then be given the authority as a Building Committee by the BOA to make expenditures.
- Charge the Technology Committee with responsibility to examine ways to provide public with service enhancements utilizing IT platforms.
- Charge the Technology Committee with responsibility to develop a five-year IT plan
- Charge the Technology Committee with IT security system responsibility.
- Provide the Technology Committee with the authority to examine any aspect of City government for possible IT improvement.
- Charge the Technology Committee to find ways to “DO MORE FOR LESS.”

**JOHN F. ANGLACE, JR.**

# Shelton Charter Revision 2020

## Full List of Ideas – 4/27/20

### Appointments

Idea	Relevant Charter Section(s)	Early Commission Discussion
1) The Board of Ethics should consist of people chosen from a pool approved by civic organizations (e.g., Chamber of Commerce, L WV, United Way)	Section 5.3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
2) Boards should have the power to fill vacancies in the event the Mayor or Aldermen fail to do so in a reasonable time (e.g. 60 or 90 days).	Section 9.6.2(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept</li> <li>• Give Mayor 90 days to appoint with BOA approval at next regular meeting.</li> <li>• After 90 days, if there is no nomination from the Mayor, the remaining Commissions members can nominate a candidate for consideration by BOA. BOA still has to approve.</li> </ul>
3) P&Z and Inland Wetlands should not be involved with Administrator selection, which should be left to the Mayor.	Section 5.1.4(a) Section 5.2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept</li> <li>• Mayor is the hiring authority, and the City should be the hiring agent.</li> <li>• No formal role for P&amp;Z and Inland Wetlands (up to Mayor to extend as courtesy)</li> <li>• Ensure this is true for all full-time employees working with Appointed Boards</li> </ul>
4) For all appointed Boards and Commissions, the Mayor shall nominate and the Board of Aldermen shall confirm all members.	Section 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept</li> </ul>

**Term Lengths**

<b>Idea</b>	<b>Relevant Charter Section(s)</b>	<b>Early Commission Discussion</b>
1) P&Z Alternatives should be 4 year terms rather than 2 years.	Section 2.4.1(f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject (Eliminate Alternates)</li> </ul>
2) Board of Education terms should be 4 years staggered.	Section 2.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Need to discuss in the context of structural suggestions for the Board of Education</li> </ul>
3) ZBA has no terms, and should.	Section 5.2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept (move from Ordinance to Charter)</li> </ul>
4) Terms of various appointed boards should be standardized (e.g., 2 years or 4 years)	Section 5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• However, need to understand if there is a logic to why there are different term lengths. In absence of logic, we will standardize – but if there is good reason for different terms we will maintain as-is</li> <li>• Dan to create list of current terms</li> </ul>
5) Should we consider any term limits?	Various (depends on position)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
6) Change the term of the Mayor from 2 to 4 years	Section 2.4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
7) Library Board terms should be reduced from 6 years to 4 years	Section 5.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dan to call Steve Bellis to discuss</li> </ul>
8) P&Z should be 2 year terms	Section 2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely against State Statutes. Need to get the Statutes to review.</li> </ul>

**Voting**

<b>Idea</b>	<b>Relevant Charter Section(s)</b>	<b>Early Commission Discussion</b>
1) We should clarify whether Board members need to be present to vote, or can vote over the phone.	New (Probably Section 5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Board of Alderman Ordinance in line with state statutes</li> <li>• Executive Sessions must be live and present</li> </ul>
2) Charter should define what consists a quorum for various Boards and Commissions	New (Probably Section 5.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Need to discuss specifically what this would look like.</li> </ul>
3) Board of Aldermen should be able to pass with majority of those present and voting, not absolute majority	Section 4.3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Should make this align with any quorum definition we have for all Boards</li> </ul>
4) Voters may choose up to 5 candidates for the Board of Education (rather than current up to 9).	Section 2.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition (mixed views)</li> <li>• Dan to provide some examples from other towns</li> </ul>

**Budget**

Idea	Relevant Charter Section(s)	Early Commission Discussion
1) We should have a formal reserve requirement.	New (Probably Section 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
2) The Board of Aldermen may establish standards for budget submissions that all departments (including Board of Education) must adhere to.	Section 7.1(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Creates standardization in the budget process</li> </ul>
3) Increase the amount before Purchasing Agent must go out to bid (based on inflation and benchmarking other towns)  Purchasing Agent Proposal: \$1-5k needs one quote, \$5-25 needs 3 quotes, more than \$25 out to bid	Section 7.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Possibly leaving it to Board of Aldermen to set levels</li> <li>• Want more information on what other towns do</li> </ul>
4) Should we change “least cost, most responsible” to “most responsible” or give a check-and-balance way around it (i.e., Aldermanic approval)?	Section 7.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Should get more visibility in how we do it now</li> <li>• Where did “most responsible” come from – legal term or did we make it up?</li> <li>• Split goods (lowest cost) and services (most responsible)?</li> <li>• Appeal to the Board of Aldermen</li> </ul>
5) Should we change the notice requirements for quotes and bids (i.e., on the website rather than published in paper)?	Section 7.14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Who is forcing us to do this and what are our degrees of freedom?</li> </ul>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any case law or example from other towns doing this? FOI Requirement? Affirmation?</li> <li>• Transition period of doing both?</li> </ul>
6) Is 2% the right level to trigger a referendum to approve bonding (want to benchmark other towns)?	Section 7.15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Want more information on what other towns do</li> <li>• Discussion with BOA President</li> </ul>
7) Separate out bonding trigger for roads versus anything else	Section 7.15		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Do any other towns do this?</li> <li>• Needs further discussion</li> <li>• Can BOA go out to bond? Should it be increased or should roads be exclusive?</li> <li>• Need discussion on town financing</li> <li>• Possible discussion with Mayor/Finance Director</li> </ul>
8) Add in a State of Emergency clause where the Mayor and Aldermen can borrow more without referendum	Section 7.15 (New)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• What powers? Bonding? Closing schools? Stay in place? Does State Statute allow this?</li> <li>• Is this really necessary?</li> <li>• Do other towns have this?</li> <li>• Ask the Mayor what he can or can't do?</li> </ul>
9) Allow the Board of Education more time to submit their budget (as most complex)	Section 7.1(a)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Need to determine what is workable within the budget timeline</li> </ul>
10) Shift the City's fiscal year start to later in the year (Oct or Jan), and shift budgeting process until after General Assembly finalizes state budget	TBD		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>

<p>11) Board of A&amp;T Operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All departmental budget requests go forthwith to A&amp;T.</li> <li>• On all A&amp;T meeting cancellations to the city clerk, the finance director will state that no further requests are pending.</li> <li>• All A&amp;T mtg. materials will be supplied 48 hours in advance to a++ members.</li> <li>• Dept. heads will appear before A&amp;T to support transfer</li> </ul>	<p>Section 7.10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
---	---------------------	--

**Board Structure & Composition**

<b>Idea</b>	<b>Relevant Charter Section(s)</b>	<b>Early Commission Discussion</b>
1) The Board of Aldermen should have minority representation and either be increased from 8 to 12 (no more than 2 from one party per Ward) or have At-Large aldermen.	Section 2.2.1 Section 2.2.4(f) Section 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
2) We should increase the number of wards to 5, and increase the number of Aldermen to 10.	Section 2.2.1 Section 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Requires further discussion and analysis</li> </ul>
3) We should have both geographic wards and at-large Aldermen	Section 2.2.1 Section 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Requires further discussion and analysis</li> </ul>
4) The Board of Education should be elected in a non-partisan manner (no parties listed).	Section 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Requires further discussion and analysis</li> </ul>
5) The Board of Education should have a maximum of 6 members from any political party.	Section 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Requires further discussion and analysis</li> </ul>
6) The Board of Education should be elected by Ward, with 2 from each Ward and one at-large. (All from any party)	Section 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Requires further discussion and analysis</li> </ul>
7) The Board of Education should be expanded to 12, with 3 elected by Ward (no more than 2 from any party)	Section 5.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>

<p>8) The Board of Planning and Zoning should be changed from six members to seven.</p>	<p>Section 2.2.1 Section 5.1.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve increase to 7</li> <li>• No more than 5 from any political party</li> <li>• Eliminate Alternates</li> </ul>
<p>9) Eliminate the Board of A&amp;T (and transfer line-item transfer power to the Finance Committee of the Board of Aldermen)</p>	<p>Section 2.2.1 Section 5.1.1 (Various others where Board of A&amp;T is mentioned)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve</li> </ul>
<p>10) Give the Board A&amp;T more budgetary authority (similar to a Board of Finance) and expand to seven members</p>	<p>Section 2.2.1 Section 5.1.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reject</li> </ul>
<p>11) Add requirement that Fire Commissioners be electors of the City of Shelton. (Says it in Section 5 for other Boards and Commissions)</p>	<p>Section 6.9.3.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable disposition</li> <li>• Letter opposing from one of the Commissioners</li> <li>• Does this impact any Commissioner right now?</li> </ul>
<p>12) Delete wording that “The Commissioners shall be equal in rank and authority”</p>	<p>Section 6.9.3.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No disposition</li> <li>• Ask Fire Marshall what he means by taking out these words (and what effect it will have)</li> </ul>
<p>13) Move appointment of Fire Marshall from “Commission, subject to approval of the Mayor” to by the Mayor. Transfer all other department appointments from Commission to Fire Marshall</p>	<p>Section 6.9.3.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Favorable Disposition</li> <li>• On the surface, this is just like the head of any other fully paid department (Mayor appoints, BOA approves)</li> <li>• Check with Chief and Marshall around practical implications and if there is anything we not seeing</li> </ul>
<p>14) Create a new Technology Committee for the City (including BOE)</p>	<p>NEW</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New idea</li> </ul>

15) Create an Architectural Review Committee as an adjunct to P&Z	NEW	• New idea
---	-----	------------

**General**

<b>Idea</b>	<b>Relevant Charter Section(s)</b>	<b>Early Commission Discussion</b>
1) The Aldermen shall call another Charter revision no later than April 1, 2030.	Section 2.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approve</li></ul>
2) Change “Administrative Assistant” to “Chief Administrative Officer” or other title (e.g., Chief of Staff, City Administrator, etc.)	Section 6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Favorable disposition to change the title, but need to think harder about what to change it to.</li><li>• What do other towns do?</li></ul>
3) Can there be a limitation of certain types of development by Ward?	New Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reject</li></ul>
4) Add a Preamble	New Section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Favorable Disposition</li></ul>

Decided -- 18

Open - 28



Shelton Charter 2020 1 &lt;sheltoncharter2020@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Suggestions

1 message

---

**peggy camp** <camppeggy@sbcglobal.net>  
To: sheltoncharter2020@gmail.com

Sun, Apr 26, 2020 at 3:07 PM

Good afternoon.

I hope everyone is safe and well during this crazy time. I also want to thank you for sitting on the committee and taking on this responsibility.

My hope for this committee is to create a charter that allows our City boards and commissions to be more balanced, more transparent and be a reflection of the citizens highest desires and expectations.

I, as I'm sure many of you are, am

disheartened and simply tired of the conflicts between the City and the BOE. I know at your last meeting you discussed the BOE and possible changes to its make up. So my first suggestion is an even member board, with no party holding more than three seats. This will eliminate politics and encourage compromise. Something that is desperately missing.

I believe with the 2/3 needed on certain votes, having an even number of members would encourage them to work together to accomplish their goal. If a majority or 2/3 vote doesn't pass you would want them to discuss the matter more thoroughly and get consensus on the decision rather than pass something through because it won by one vote.

I also feel that the ability for the appointing authority to remove committee members who fail to attend at least half of a committee's meetings should be included for all boards.

And lastly, I also strongly believe in term limits, for all elected officials. We already have term limits for our president, governor, cabinet, state legislature shouldn't the same be expected at the local level?

Term limits will offer the benefit of adjusting board membership to adapt quickly to changing needs. A static board can lead to unhealthy attitudes, which can cause board members to act out of self-interest and contempt rather than community interest. It would create a healthy and natural way of providing change and necessary transformation for the board.

Term limits for all elected positions I believe should be allowed to be re-elected for two terms for offices with two-year terms.

This would simplify the town's ballots and allow members to serve without constant campaigning.

I believe this should be in staggered form for all boards and commissions to eliminate the effects of a completely new board.

It's time to stop playing the us versus you game. Let's move forward and work together for what is best for our City.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Peggy Camp

Sent from my iPhone