



CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

July 29, 2008

Auditorium at City Hall

7:00 P.M.

Commissioners Present: Jack Bashar
 Steve Bellis
 Susan Coyle
 Paul DiMauro
 Chris Gallo
 Bob Lally
 Ken Nappi (arrived 7:20 pm)
 Irene Smith

Commissioners Absent: Michael Davis

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Paul DiMauro called the Public Hearing of the Charter Revision Commission to order at 7:03 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman DiMauro opened the Public Hearing. He advised the audience that the Commission will take comments but will not debate with the audience. He advised the audience that if there are specific questions we will take them and review them. There is a Special Meeting scheduled to follow immediately after the Public Hearing. He advised the speakers that when they approach the podium to please sign in before they speak.

Chairman DiMauro also advised the audience that there were two versions of the strikethrough on the website. The first was Revision # 11 (7-14-08) was put on after the July 14 the meeting and the other Chairman DiMauro forward it to the webmaster under the heading Draft for Public Hearing. There were no material changes to both versions other than for typographical or grammatical changes.

PUBLIC PORTION

8 Partridge Lane
Shelton, CT 06484
July 29, 2008

Dear Charter Revision Board:

I am a public school teacher. During 3 years of my career, was proud to teach United States History to fifth graders. They learned that our forefathers set up our democratic government with a system of checks and balances, so that our government would have fair representation from all sides.

I am not proud of the new charter revisions that you propose. The system of checks and balances you propose would be worse than it is now, in the current charter. Let me give you some examples:

5.1.4 Planning and Zoning Commission

You want a change from 6 to 7 Commissioners, by adding one more to the majority. How is that fair? If anything, you should be adding one more to the minority, so it is split 4 and 3, not 5 and 2.

I would go a step further and add to the Charter that 1 member from each Ward has to be included. For the last number of years, only Wards 1, 2 and 4 have been represented by the 6 Commissioners. Therefore, no voice has been representing the Third Ward.

In theory, the Commissioners are supposed to be representing all of Shelton. But they don't. Meeting after meeting I would listen to conversations among the P & Z Commissioners backing up their own Wards by saying something like, "Hey, that project you are proposing is in my Ward. You're not going to do that to my Ward!"

So as a result of this lack of representation, everything has been dumped upon the Third Ward and Old Bridgeport Ave.. I live in the over-developed Third Ward and we are the ones totally bearing the burden of lowering the taxes for the rest of the whole town with the majority of condominiums, cluster houses, corporations, restaurants, and stores in our neighborhood. I ask you, is that fair? NO!

5.2.4 Economic Development Commission

You want to change the split from 3 and 2, to 4 and 1. How is that democratic? I ask again. Why don't you want fair representation?

Then you add a big, long complicated sentence that needs to be clarified:
"The commission shall promote development of the economic resources of the City and shall have such duties and powers as are set forth in the Conn. Gen. Stat. or by relating to local Economic Development Commissions." Would you please clarify this in English?

5.5 General Provisions / Section C

Your change to the Charter about limiting the number of office positions a person can hold, clearly smacks discriminatory behavior against Alderman Jack Finn, and no one else. Where you list "elected municipal office", add a slash and the word state. Then your change doesn't look as favoritism towards Congressman Jason Perillo, as it does now. OR there should be NO CHANGE to the Charter to keep it fair. Either change it for all or none.

In conclusion, we live in a democracy. Please keep it that way!

Sincerely,
Joan Flannery
8 Partridge Lane
Shelton, CT 06484
H (203) 929-6873
C (203) 394-3951

Anthony Simonetti
6 Hayfield Drive

Good Evening. I'd like to first thank the Commission for the hours that they have put in and I know that they'll be putting in even more. You do a yeoman's task and a very difficult task. A lot of paperwork, a lot of things to go through and I appreciate everything that you've done so far. Thank you very much. On page 5 of the latest revision, paragraph f – Planning and Zoning consisting of 7 members, I believe you should keep it the same way, not change it at all. I don't think a change is necessary, the Planning and Zoning Commission has to go by the rules that are set. So changing it would not help at all, it might hinder trying to find that 7th person in many cases. At this time the P&Z works very well and to do it by ward would be a travesty because then you

would have people fighting over wards instead of looking at the rules and I feel that's the way to go. Again thank you for your time.

*Robert Araujo
140 Walnut Tree Hill Road*

I'd like to echo Alderman Simonetti's appreciation for the work that you folks do with. It's a very difficult job to go through the reams of documents and suggestions. Today I am here to talk about the Fire Department. I am also Chairman of the Board of Fire Commissioners. We met with you several times on the proposed changes. We went through the details and I'll spare the line by line and word by word summary. I'll provide you with a copy of our recommendations. The Board of Fire Commissioners has voted unanimously to reject your proposal. First of all, we don't feel the details and the details of job descriptions and the details of functions belong in a Charter. Many of the words were taken from our job descriptions or our policies. While that's fine, the task of a Charter should be a decade or a ten year sustainable document. We agree with some of the words but we don't agree it belongs in the Charter. The second thing is the separation of the Fire Marshal from the Fire Department and the reporting structure. We simplified the task, a lot of this can be handles by policy, again the Board does not believe that this belongs in a Charter. We believe it belongs in policy. This is how we presented it to you. As far as appointments, again the exact same thing occurred. The appointment process is detailed in a policy. You went through an Assistant Chief's appointment process, if you went back to the minutes, and I can appreciate the amount of work that you had to go through to research each one of these, so I can almost guarantee you didn't have the time to go back through each one of the minutes, the appointment process that you put in is a trial process for Assistant Chiefs by the Board and while we hope it will work, if there are any changes, we are all bound by this document and we're hoping that this is a sustainable document but it doesn't belong in a Charter. So what we want to re-present to you is a simplified version of the Charter, many of the changes are and will be made in policy and procedure and the question of operational head can easily be handled by a policy. Who is the operational head of the department. But I can ask that you back to the Fire Department study that occurred 5-7 years ago and one of the recommendations was that a Deputy Chief be appointed as operation head. While we're not suggesting that, we're just saying that within a decade, you want a document that is sustainable, that allows you to be flexible to make the changes so that the department can run and function as necessary to provide the proper protection for the department. Again thank you for your hard work, thank you for your effort, and I know that it was a very difficult task and as a resident I really appreciate your work. I'll present you with our recommendations.

6.9.3.1 Department Composition and Functions:

The City shall have a Fire department headed by the Board of Fire Commissioners and consisting of such existing fire companies and such other fire companies as may be deemed necessary or convenient by the Board of Fire Commissioners and approved by the Board of Alderman.

6.9.3.2 Board of Fire Commissioners:

The Board of Fire Commissioners shall consist of one commissioner appointed by the Mayor, who shall be the Chairman of the Board, and one commissioner from each volunteer fire company providing service to the department. Company commissioners shall be elected by the members of each individual company in such manner as may be provided in the bylaws thereof. The Commissioners shall be equal in rank and authority and may serve without compensation but may receive reimbursement for reasonable and necessary expenses. Each Commissioner shall serve for a term of two (2) years. The Commissioners shall have one (1) vote each in any matter before the board. If the total number of Commissioners including the Chairman is an even number, then the Chairman, in the event of a tie vote, shall have an additional vote to break the tie. The Board of Fire Commissioners shall be responsible for the Department Budget, long range planning, policies, capital improvement and appointments.

6.9.3.3 Appointments:

The Board of Fire Commissioners shall be the appointing authority of the Fire Department. The Board shall appoint and remove the Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Chiefs, Assistant Chiefs and all other officers and employees of the Department as the Commissioners may deem necessary or convenient to the operation of the Department. The Board shall also appoint and remove the Fire Marshal and Deputy Fire Marshals in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Connecticut General Statutes and in accordance with the procedures of the City Charter. All appointees are subject to the rules, regulations and the policies established by the Board of Fire Commissioners and in accordance with City Charter provisions.

6.9.3.4. Powers and Duties:

The Fire Department shall provide protection from fire and enforcement of all laws relating to the fire prevention and fire safety. The Department shall have such other related duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Fire Commissioners, Mayor or the Board of Alderman.

6.9.3.4 Officers Council:

The Fire Department shall have an officer's council, which will consist of the Fire Chief, Deputy Fire Chief, Assistant Fire Chiefs and the Captains and the Lieutenants from each company and the Fire Marshal. The council will elect a chairman applicable to the procedures of the charter. The officer's council will recommend standard operating procedures, standard operating guidelines and also recommend operational policies to the Board of Fire Commissioners. The officers Council will also resolve operational problems as well as to hear appeals within the Department per the policies and procedures of the Fire Department.

6.9.3.5 Fire Chief:

The power and duties of the Fire Chief, his assistants and deputies shall be defined by the Board of Fire Commissioners in accordance with applicable Connecticut General Statutes and City Charter provisions.

Mark Holden
275 Soundview Avenue

I am the Chairman of the Board of Apportionment and Taxation. As everyone else has said, I do appreciate all the work that you've put in to this. There are a couple, one major change and a couple of minor comments. Under section 7.1 dealing with the budget process. Currently you are calling for the budget process to start one month later and everything gets pushed back a month except for the final deadline for the Board of Aldermen. I would like you to look into changing that from 1 month to 3 weeks later and give the extra week to the segment from when the Mayor sends his budget to the Board of A&T and when the Board of A&T turns it over to the Board of Aldermen. This past year we had over 35 hours of meetings for interviews and workshops to go over the City Budget. That's more than a part time job and it's a lot to fill into the five weeks. And sadly it's not enough time because for every hours of meetings, we have an hour or more of prep time and we could have used more hours of meetings to delve a little bit deeper into the budget to try to see if we could tighten things up a little bit more. I assure you that if you can make this change, the Board of A&T will put that time to good use for the taxpayers of Shelton. A couple of other minor comments under the bidding process, section 7.14, there is a change in the process here on how the bids would be handled, they'd be opened during office hours and then either the Board of A&T or the Finance Committee would be responsible for determining the lowest responsible bidder. I don't have a problem with the bids being opened during office hours but it means that the people who are making the decision are going to have a little less background information to base their decision on. I am not an expert on all of the various things that the City purchases, and I am going to need to look at staff for recommendations and hopefully they are giving me good information, and I have no reason to doubt that they would, but as I see it my job is sort of a watchdog for the good of the citizens and the more I know about the bidding process for a particular item, the better position I'm in to make a good decision for the voters. Finally, under section 2 of that there is a process for items that cost more than \$1,000.00 and less than \$7,500.00. The glitch that I see on that is that you're mandating 3 bids for them to be able to make a purchase. I am not here on what the way around that is for items where you do not have the availability of 3 bidders. Sadly, there are many times when something goes out to bid and we only get 1 or 2 responses from people. So I think it would be a good idea to have something in place that's not too cumbersome for instances where perhaps there is only 1 supplier or 2 suppliers that would be interested in dealing with the City. Always thank you very much for all of your work.

*Marty Coughlin
10 Cayer Circle*

Good evening. I'm here to talk about section 17.4, a, b and c, but basically about c. I'm currently serving on the High School Renovation Building Committee and in part of our talks; we have heard that the State has changed its regulations about bidding or getting bids, competitive or proposals for professional services. I don't know when this part of the Charter was drafted but I would hope that you have recently vetted it with Corporation Counsel to make sure that the wording contained in here is in conformity with the State new regulations. For example, on section 2 which says "the evaluation shall be competitive or be it on a subjective basis" and yet you talk about lowest responsible bidder. Those two seem to me to be somewhat in conflict.

Commissioner Bellis asked for a point of order. Not sure what section is being addressed. There is no section 17.4 in the Charter.

Mr. Coughlin continued, 7-14 I'm sorry. Secondly, the reading of paragraph 3 where it talks about creating a committee of 5 members, I have several questions that I hope the Board will take into consideration. First of all, if you have a lot of projects going through at the same time, you'll have to create a lot of committees. It doesn't say that you're going to create 1; it suggests that you're going to create 1 for each 1. Secondly, there's no, since it's a citywide committee, there's no mention of minority representation which there should be. There's no term mentioned. Again most committees have, at least building committees, have mandates. Since this is specific project based I would think that we should have some concept of when this term should end or it is going to be ongoing, how often these people should be re-appointed. Thirdly, the representative from the bidding group, it should be clear that since it's a city wide committee, that person has to be an elector within the City of Shelton. For example, when you created the Civil War Monument Committee, Carolyn Ivanoff, who lives in Seymour, was put on the committee but as an Ex-Officio member that doesn't have any vote. The other part that concerns me is that the process could take a long time. By the time you get the specs, go to the Board of Aldermen, get these people appointed, it could take several months and slow down the process. But overall, to me this seems like it's an operational process, not necessarily something that should be in the Charter. My concern is that if this process does not work, the City will be stuck with it until the next Charter Revision. To me this should be better put, if you want to continue doing it, in an ordinance which the Board of Aldermen could change, if in fact it needs improvement later on. That would give the City much more flexibility than it would have now. The general principles are fine within the Charter, but the specifics of how it's going to operate, in my view, should be left to the Board of Aldermen and Corporation Counsel, etc. to go through because then they could change it. Thank you.

John "Jack" Finn
17 Princess Wenonah Drive

Good evening.

My name is John "Jack" Finn. I reside at 17 Princess Wenonah Drive. I am the Democratic Registrar of Voters and I represent the 1st Ward on the Board of Aldermen.

I am here to address the Commission regarding Section 5.5 (c) of the Shelton City Charter. Presently, the charter reads:

"Members shall hold no more than one (1) other elected office and/or two (2) other appointed offices in the city."

After listening to the taped session of your meeting on July 14, 2008, I felt it necessary to speak to the information that you were provided with and the discussion that followed.

You were referred to Section 9-210 of the Connecticut State Statutes: *Incompatible town offices* which states in part..."nor shall any town clerk or selectman be elected a registrar of voters...." In Shelton, our form of government is mayor, aldermen. The 6th edition of *Black's Law Dictionary* defines selectman as the name of certain municipal officers, in the New England States, elected by the towns to transact their general public business and possessing certain **executive** powers. Our city charter establishes the mayor as the chief **executive** officer of the city (section 3.1). *Black's Law Dictionary* defines alderman as a municipal officer; member of the **legislative** body of a municipality. In the Shelton city charter (section 4.1) aldermen are established as the legislative body of the city.

The 2 terms, alderman and selectman, are not interchangeable. The Secretary of the State's Office has ruled 3 times that an alderman can be a registrar of voters, the same ruling of the city's corporation council. Two of those rulings were made prior to my seeking the office of registrar.

Judith Boudreau, Election Administrator, Registrar of Voters has indicated that registrars of voters are elected in even years which is only for state or federal offices; it is in the constitution; registrars serve municipalities and are paid for by municipalities but are not town employees. Registrars are considered municipal offices by the Secretary of State's office. The association (ROVAC) is lobbying for the office to be under the state's umbrella.

Secretary of the State Susan Bysewicz considers changing the charter to prevent me from retaining my positions is discriminatory. In her opinion, if municipalities are considering any changes, they should reflect municipal and state. In Shelton, we have two elected officials holding 2 elected offices: Jason Perillo and myself. This discrimination is a failure to treat all persons equally where no reasonable distinction is found between those favored and not favored...other than political party.

To follow the rationale presented at your meeting would be ignoring the personal and political motivation behind it. I have 2 years of documentation of political harassment, including last week's, over issues that have been addressed by several different state and local attorneys as well as state election officials.

For example: Untrue statements

2006 :an elected member of the Board of Aldermen tries to get a paid position in Shelton government
.....Vote on his own paycheck
.....Political and financial opportunities
.....Conflict of interest in the offices
.....Prohibited from performing any of the duties of the Registrar during municipal elections
.....These offices are incompatible
.....What can the Republicans do to get a Republican alderman elected as a Republican registrar of voters?

2007:it is a loophole for the alderman and all the more reason why we need to change the charter
.....elected registrar is incompatible town office

It is obvious that this charter change will affect only me and would remain status quo for the Republican Aldermen. If there were any other intent, it did not surface in your discussion. In order for this change in the charter not to be one of discrimination I would ask this commission to reinsert the word **other** back into the charter.

Presently, the charter reads:

“Members shall hold no more than one (1) other elected office and/or two (2) other appointed offices in the city.”

This could read “Members shall hold no more than one (1) other elected office and /or one other appointed office in the city.”

I will continue to perform my duties legally and ethically as dictated by the voters in Shelton.

*Chris Panek
19 Megan Lane*

Shelton Charter Revision Public Hearing
July 29th 2008

Good evening Charter Revision Commission members and thank you for taking the time to hear my thoughts on the revisions you have proposed tonight. For many of you it is the 4th time around on this commission and I am sure you are anxious to take in the public comments, weigh their validity and then discuss them amongst yourselves.

I am hopeful that my comments tonight are on the correct version of the charter. After seeing the public notice in the newspaper last week I went to the city clerk's office to obtain a copy of the charter. At that time they did not have a copy on hand but I was emailed a copy with the header "Draft #1 Revision #11". I spent hours reviewing this version only then to find one on the city website yesterday with the header "draft for public hearing 7-29-08". I am under the assumption that this is the correct version.

As you know I have been in attendance at every charter revision meeting for the past 7 months. Taking notes and keeping track of the many important issues you have discussed. Yes, some CRC members may call me and others who attend city meetings malcontents but the truth is the real reason we take time out of our personal schedules to come to city hall and watch our local government in action is that we care about the future of our city. No, we will all never agree on every issue. I learned during my two years on the board of alderman that we must put personalities aside and on some issue agree to disagree. Everyone is entitled to their opinion and to be heard.

I am not speaking to you tonight to demand that every one of my suggestions be incorporated into the charter but for you to discuss and consider them. For me personally my decision to support or not support this charter will be determined by comparing the previous three failed revisions and seeing what changes were made to this version that have made an improvement that the entire city can live with for the next ten years. The public has spoken by opposing the last 3 charter revisions, now you have the ball back in your court to propose a better version with more changes that city residents can support and hopefully approve in November.

I believe there are many areas you have changed that merit consideration and are very positive including changes to the Ethics Board, changes in the bidding procedures including the public opening of bids at a designated time during normal business hours, the filling of vacancies on boards and commissions, public disclosure of conflicts of interest and the posting of new ordinances on the city website.

I will submit to you tonight one document that I will not read which details some grammar and spelling items that may need to be addressed. I also will submit a second list that I will go over briefly which details some of the areas of the charter I feel could still be further improved.

Chris Panek
19 Meghan Lane
Shelton, CT 06494

Shelton Charter Revision Public Hearing
July 29th 2008

Content Changes/Suggestions

1. Section 3.3.3 Mayor Succession to Office

Suggestion: change “next mayoral election” to “at a special election to be held within 60 days” unless the next mayoral election is within 60 days.”

Reason: The Board of Alderman President is elected by Ward and therefore should only take over as mayor if the next mayoral election is within 60 days. If not a Special election should be held. This will avoid a newly elected mayor from stepping down immediately after an Election and then having a ward elected alderman serve out a 2 year mayoral term.

2. Section 4.7 Ordinances

Suggestion: Leave the charter as it is currently written which requires all ordinances to go to the proper committee of the BOA.

Reason: The proposed changes allow by a majority vote of the BOA to bypass committee review on ordinances. The majority party on the BOA can push ordinances through in 30 days while the minority party could be forced by majority vote to have their ordinances held up for 90 to 120 days.

3. Section 5.1.1 Board of Apportionment & Taxation

Suggestion: Clarify what is meant by “The board from time to time delegate to the finance committee of the board such authority”.

Reason: Authority to do what?

Chris Panek
19 Meghan Lane
Shelton, CT 06484

Shelton Charter Revision Public Hearing
July 29th 2008

4. Section 5.1.4 Planning and Zoning

Suggestion: Keep minority representation at 3. It appears that Conn. Gen. Stat. 9-167a was selectively applied to this section of the charter and not applied to other boards and commissions in the charter.

Reason: It defeats the purpose of increasing membership and then decreasing minority representation. If the intent to increase membership was get more viewpoints on the commission then why politicize it by changing minority representation? Other commissions such as Conservation have 7 members and you left minority representation at 3 but changed it on P&Z which is as important of a commission as any.

5. Section 5.2.4 Economic Development Commission

Suggestion: Maintain minority representation at 2. Again, selective application of Conn. Gen. Stat. 9-167a.

Reason: Same as above.

6. Section 5.2.5 Inland Wetlands Commission

Suggestion: I was in support of an elected IW commission during the last charter revision and still am. But if you are going to leave it as appointed by the mayor the proposal by Commissioner Lally to have IW members approved by the BOA was an opportunity to reach a middle ground. It is unfortunate that the consensus vote on this item fell along party lines.

Reason: As an important land use board it creates a check and balance to have these mayoral appointed members approved by the BOA.

Chris Panek
19 Meghan Lane
Shelton, CT 06484

Shelton Charter Revision Public Hearing
July 29th 2008

7. Section 5.5 (c) General Provisions

Suggestion: Leave the charter as it is now or change it to prohibit people from holding more than one elected or one appointed position or include "State" as well as "municipal" offices.

Reason: I believe the intention of the changes you have proposed are to allow more people to serve on city boards and commissions instead of allowing the same people to serve in many positions. If that is the case then the changes you have proposed do not achieve that. Instead, the changes you have proposed only affect one person currently serving our city.

8. Section 5.5 (g) General Provisions

Suggestion: Robert's Rules of Order should be the procedures followed by all boards and commissions.

Reason: City boards and commissions should not be allowed to create their own rules of procedure.

9. Section 7.14 (C) Professional Services

Suggestion: A. In section 1b clarify who will determine this?
B. Clarify is this will be applied to the city and Board of education?
C. In section 3 clarify if a committee will need to be appointed every time a professional service is needed?

10. Section 7.14 (D) Professional Services

Suggestion: Clarify the first sentence which reads "The Board of Aldermen shall establish by resolution those services which are considered as professional and as to which selection by bidding to determine the lowest responsible provider is not required".

Reason: This appear to conflict with the new section above?

Chris Panek
19 Meghan Lane
Shelton, CT 06484

Spelling & Grammar Suggestions

1. Section 5.1.4 (b) – add “Conn.” Before General Statutes in the last sentence.
2. Section 5.2.3 – third sentence change “Commissioners” to “Commission”.
3. Section 5.2.4 – clarify meaning of last sentence “or by relating to local Economic Development Commissions.”
4. Section 5.5 (k) – “If not appointed” should read “If not reappointed”.
5. Section 6.9.3.2 – “Each commissioner shall serve for a term of two years” is repeated at the end of the first and second paragraphs.
6. Section 7.14 (c) – In section 1a remove the parenthesis around engineers.

*Chris Panek - Reading letter into record for Rich Widomski
49 Christine Drive*

49 Christine Drive
Shelton, Connecticut 06484
July 27, 2008

Charter Revision Commission
City of Shelton
54 Hill Street
Shelton, Connecticut 06484

Dear Commission Members,

I am taking this opportunity to comment on the proposed 2008 Shelton Charter Revision. At first glance it appears that the motive for the revision is to more evenly balance the rights of the citizens to those of the political leadership, however, the truth is that the political system is strengthened at the expense of the general public at large. The appearance that there is something for everyone soon dissipates when one studies the proposed revisions.

Take for instance the proposed revision to the makeup of the Planning and Zoning Commission. This commission presently has 6 members and 2 alternates with a maximum of 6 voting members at a meeting. With 6 members it takes a simple majority of 4 votes to approve zone changes and applications. Majority representation on a 6 member commission is no more than 4 with a minority representation of 2 members. With a 7 member commission as proposed by the Charter Revision Commission it will still require a simple majority of 4 votes to approve zone changes and applications. Majority representation on a 7 member commission is no more than 5 with a minority representation of 2 members. In this instance of a 7 member commission majority representation increases while the minority representation remains the same. At the same time the number of votes needed to approve changes to land use remains the same. The percentage of votes needed to pass a zone change actually decreases when the membership increases to 7 members. Where 67 per cent of the commission is needed to approve a zone change with a 6 member board only 57 percent of the commission is needed to approve a zone change with a 7 member commission. On a 7- member board the majority representation increases in percentage as compared to a 6- member board and the minority representation decreases.

When Chapter 124, Section 8-3b of the Connecticut General Statutes is taken into consideration, and there is a citizen petition signed by the owners of twenty per cent or more of the area of the lots included in such proposed change, or of the lots within five hundred feet in all directions of the property included in the zone change, such change will not be adopted except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members of the commission. In this case the number of votes needed for a zone change increases from 4 votes on a 6-member commission to 5 votes on a 7-member commission -- an increase from 67 per cent to 71 per cent. As seen in Table 1-3 an 8 member commission requires a 6 member vote of approval equal to a 75 per cent approval.

I ask you to consider increasing the membership of the Planning and Zoning Commission not to 7 members but to 8 members. If you look at table 1-1, 2 and 3 an 8-member commission makes the most sense for a city the size of Shelton. The number of votes needed to approve a zone change increases when membership increases from 7 to 8. Minority percentage as well as the percentage of votes needed to pass a zone change in the event of a petition increases. An 8-member commission surpasses the benefits of a 6- or 7-member commission.

As seen in the tables, an 8-member commission makes the most sense for the City of Shelton. An 8-member commission protects the general public and makes for a fairer means for all. The existing 6-member and proposed 7-member commission favors the applicant and a segment of society that usually fosters a financial or personal interest in land use. The tables indicate that the 6- or 7-member commission is not generally public-friendly, especially when Connecticut Chapter 124, Section 8-3b is used for citizen petitions.

The Charter Revision Commission Chairman in the past has expressed concern that it may be difficult to find qualified candidates to run for the office of Planning and Zoning. If some thought is given to what I believe is an exaggeration, a solution can be found. Perhaps the two alternate positions can be eliminated, thereby maintaining the number of candidates needed to run for the commission. This keeps the number of candidates as it presently exists.

Based on the information presented, I believe that the Charter Revision Commission is recommending a 7-member so as to give the impression that it benefits the general public when in fact it is nothing more than smoke and mirrors. We are led to believe that since a 6-member Planning and Zoning Commission with 2 alternates is not working, then a 7-member commission is the answer.

A closer look shows that 6-member and 7-member commissions are one and the same. It smacks of favoritism toward the applicant and continues to hinder adjoining property owners in their quest to be heard. To not take a serious look at an 8-member commission would be to ignore the Charter Revision Commission Chairman when he said, "Now, if I am the chair, I only have to convince three others to go along with me. This makes it a little more difficult and adds a little more scrutiny when you increase the number."

Presently the number of votes required to approve a zone change is 4 whether it is a 6-member or 7-member commission. To increase the number of votes to 5 for zoning approval the commission must be increased to 8 members. Take a second look at the facts and adjoining tables. Increase the Planning and Zoning Commission to 8 members. It makes sense and all will be better off because of it.

Very truly yours,



Richard Widomski

Table 1-1

<u>Members</u>	<u>Votes to approve</u>	<u>Majority party Members</u>	<u>Minority party Members</u>
6	4	4	2
7	4	5	2
8	5	5	3
9	5	6	3

Table 1-2

<u>Member's</u>	<u>% to approve</u>	<u>% of Majority Members</u>	<u>% of Minority Members</u>
6	67	67	33
7	57	71	29
8	63	63	38
9	56	67	33

Table 1-3 (By Citizen Petition)

<u>Members</u>	<u>Votes to Approve</u>	<u>% of Votes to Approve</u>
6	4	67
7	5	71
8	6	75
9	6	67

Chairman DiMauro wanted to interject because he was directly quoted in the response. My understanding is, and we have attorneys here, that it takes 2/3 of the vote for zone change or PDD development. We have Mr. Ozak in the audience who can verify it or not. He knows more about P&Z than anyone else. For the record, the reason why I went with 7 members was because it would increase the vote to pass a zone change or a PDD required application from 4 to 5. That was the reason, it is a drastic change, it is a big change.

END SIDE A, TAPE 1

The other as far as the minority representation, by going with the way we have offered it, allows more individuals to be scrutinized by the public and not appointed by the Town Committee. That we should all understand.

Irving Steiner
23 Partridge Lane
Co-founder of WeRI, but speaking as a private citizen

Charter Speech 7-29-08 – Irving N. Steiner

- **Paragraph 2.4.1.f P&Z – The P&Z should be made up of eight members. Two Commissioners residing and elected from each of the four wards such as exists with the BOA. Term Limits must also be considered.**
- **4.11 Powers of Initiative – I have chosen to single out Section 4.11 because of a past experience that I have had with powers of initiative. Some years ago there were petitions circulated and submitted to the Town Clerk for a referendum on the issue of term limits. Due to the submittal of the petitions a Charter Revision Commission was formed with basically the same members as are on today's commission. However, when all was said and done the term limit issue did not appear in the proposed charter and the charter was soundly defeated.**
- **The action or non-action taken by the Board of Aldermen and the members of that former Charter Revision Commission became a burning issue when the term limit issue was eliminated and not included as a referendum question. Does Section 4.11 correct this situation where a charter revision commission could be created thereby bypassing the original intent of the term limit petitions or any other issue?**
- **Section 4.11 Powers of Initiative includes in its body an exception that is a reminder of that term limit issue. Section 4.11 says that Chapter 7 Proposed Budget does not fall under Charter Section 4.11 Powers of Initiative. Elimination of the power to question the budget and the fiscal policy of the city by petition takes away a role that**

could be beneficial to the city and its taxpayers. Perhaps some day the general population may want a larger voice in the fiscal matters of the city. The elimination of Chapter 7 from Section 4.11 Powers of Initiative virtually denies the public of the right to petition its government.

- **5.1.4 P&Z** – Again, there should be eight Commissioners with no alternates. Two each residing in the four wards and representing those wards.
- **5.3.5 Board of Ethics** - The actual Connecticut General Statute should be added as a convenience to the public.
- **5.5.c – General Provisions** – Elected positions should not be limited by charter as is being done here unless a conflict of interest or time exists. These conditions do not exist to warrant the inclusion of this paragraph and if they do, I would like the Commission to give the public examples of such conflicts. It also limits the public's right as electorate to vote for candidates of their choice.
- This paragraph, if the audience studies it closely, has been so surgically written with sufficient and very specific conditions so as to effect only one individual who happens to be the only Democratic alderman serving in this administration as both an Alderman and the Democratic Registrar of voters. By coincidence, the previous Democratic Registrar of voters is presently serving on the Charter Revision Commission.
- **5.5.(k)** No appointed position should be allowed to remain vacant more than 30 days. All Commissioners, appointed by the Mayor should tender their resignations for his consideration for replacement or renewal following each Mayoral election. At present, when terms expire, the Mayor allows Commissioners with expired terms to serve on a day by day basis at the pleasure of the Mayor.
- **6.7.3 Powers and Duties** – The department of public works - This should not be changed for the following

reasons: Decisions by the City Engineer must remain with such an expert who bears the necessary background and credentials to remain creditable and minimize future liability to the city. The Director of Public Works must have such credentials if he is to assume the responsibility of overruling the City Engineer. This requested change to this section is only being made to legitimize past actions taken by the Director of Public Works who, by coincidence, is also the Chairman of the Charter Revision Commission. I'm sure that he and others on the CRC did not recuse themselves when conflicts of interest occurred while revising the Charter.

- **9.6.2. Appointed Office – “Any vacancy shall be filled within thirty (30) days of the vacancy by the appointing authority” is sufficient and “In the event that the appointing authority fails to do so” should be stricken from this paragraph. The appointing authority must retain the responsibility for his/her appointments.**

In closing, I would like to note that none of the major changes to the charter were voted on by the Commission members. Motions were not made or seconded and no record of polling by Commissioners was kept and the minutes confirm this. The Charter of the City of Shelton should be treated as a noble document and not in such a cavalier manner. It should also not be used as a political weapon for momentary punitive purposes. Once approved, such paragraphs as 5.5.c which might apply at the moment could seriously impinge on future administrations. After all, the citizens of Shelton will have to live with this document for the next ten years and it is proving to be a very difficult document to change.

*Al Cameron
307 Meadowridge Road*

Good evening ladies and gentlemen of the Charter Revision Commission. At the risk of being redundant I'd like to thank you for your services. I've looked at the minutes; you've been meeting twice a month since January. A lot of volunteered time and in reading things like this; it has to be a lot of tedious volunteer time. Tonight I want to make sure that everyone understands that I'm speaking as a citizen and not as the Finance Director of the Board of Ed. or on behalf of the Board of Ed. because this is something that the Board of Ed has not addressed as a body as yet. However, what I'd like to talk about is the Charter section that Mr. Coughlin addressed earlier, section 7.14, particularly in the new Charter page 45, it's professional services underneath paragraph c and d. In the old Charter, or the current Charter I should say, it is section 7.14 and I'm going to start with paragraph 3, subsection 3, second paragraph. I'll just read to you.. 'The Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education for it's purchases shall establish by resolution those services which are considered as professional and as to which bidding is not required. The Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education respectively, made by such resolution establish such procedures with regard thereto as each deems reasonable.' In the new section, I think what is comparable to that is section 7./14 (d) but it just says.. 'The Board of Aldermen shall establish by resolution those services which are considered as professional and as to which selection by bidding to determine the lowest responsible provider is not required.' Usually, throughout this document when a change was made to existing language it was typed in blue and there was a strikethrough.

Chairman DiMauro interjected, there was a typo, and we apologize for that. When it was copied over so many times it might have been omitted inadvertently. We will rectify that.

Mr. Cameron continued, so I wasn't sure whether or not that was a conscious thing or not. Then the next one is on the whole subject of professional services, I looked at our professional services and we spend about 1% of our budget in professional services. About half of that are in Special Education. As I look here, it says.. 'professional services are defined as those that meet the following tasks, work requiring knowledge of an advanced type or field of science such as engineers, appraisers, attorneys, auditors, medical services or work that is original and creative in character in a recognized field or artistic endeavor and that the result of which depends on a person's invention, imagination or talent.' For those types of people which I think that's like Corporation Counsel, that would be Assistant Corporation Counsel, the City Planner on the City side. For Board of Ed is would be the Board of Ed Counsel, it would be the school physician, I'm not sure but I'm interpreting those are the people that would be covered. If they are, the requesting authority which would be each City department, shall develop specifications for use and request for proposal form to enable the purchasing agent to seek multiple proposals for evaluation which shall be competitive while be it at a subjective basis and then apparently the group that will evaluate, this is the Board of Aldermen shall appoint a committee, consisting of five members, of which a minimum of

one shall be selected. Again, the concern I have is that most of what we spend is in Special Ed. and most of that is subject to time horizons. We don't know at the start of the school year, what services are going to have to be provided to what kid necessarily. The types of services that end up in our professional services bucket are speech pathologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, future's planners, hearing interpreters, \$41,000 a year for a hearing interpreters, bi-lingual, sign language interpreters, and others. MD's and PhD's that do evaluations, both primary at the districts request and then independent evaluations. Federal law requires that most of this be done either the services be provided within 45 days, soup to nuts, from the time you know that a service has to be provided and reports have to be completed in 45 days, or if the services have to be provided as a result of an IEP, it's an even shorter timeline. And when I read the piece about developing an RFP to turn over to the City's Purchasing Agent, which we don't even have one at the moment, we have a part-timer who's filling in, to go out to bid for probably ten days and then to get it evaluated by a committee so on and so forth, I'm concerned that we may not be able to comply. I just felt that's something you folks should be aware of, that these requirements may be difficult for us to comply with. I guess the final thing that I'd like to leave you with is, I'm not sure why the change had to be made. In my time with the Board of Ed, I haven't been aware of issues that would have required such a significant change. Whatever they are, I hope that you can understand that the biggest piece of it is time sensitive and that's the reason decisions are made. The next biggest piece of it is for the payroll services which we in the City are joined at the hip with the same one, and the next largest one is attorney fees. With that I would like to say thank you for your consideration.

*Virginia Harger
26 Meadowridge Road*

Good evening. I'm in my second term as a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I'm here tonight just to make some comments about section 2.4.1. (f) and 5.1.4. In reviewing the material I find no practical or compelling reasons to change the number of commissioners on the board. There has not been an incidence since I began serving on the Board where a meeting has had to be cancelled due to a lack of quorum. But needing one more person to fulfill the requirements of a quorum might open the board to that possibility and delay the process for an applicant who is before the board on a simple matter as getting approval for a home office. Zoning regulations are written to apply to the whole City and an additional person might bring perspective, but can't change the regulations that we have to follow as a board. A minority representation will not change per section 9.167A of the Connecticut General Statutes, where the maximum from one party is still 2 less from the total membership and the comments regarding board representation I would respectively ask the board to not include that as well because as I said before the regulations that we have to follow apply to the whole town as a whole. Thank you very much and thank you for your services.

*Frank Ozak
7 Windy Acres Road*

I have one comment, I had an experience a couple of months ago which peaked my interest in one absent section of the Charter. I asked for an audit report for the last fiscal year and I received it. I read the 40-50 pages that came and I was looking for the main document which was the opinion letter from the auditors, and it was there and much to my surprise there was not an unqualified opinion, there was some serious qualifications in the opinion letter which was really not very good. I don't know if I received the management letter which is what the auditor gives to the management for the problems they find and the management then responding to the auditors, which eventually leads to the opinion letter. Well, I was dismayed by that, when the Charter changes came out, I got myself a copy and I read through the Charter and no where do I see a prescription in the Charter on hoe the audit functions are to be carried out. Maybe it exists in an ordinance someplace or in some major policy document that is in City Hall, I don't know. But let me remind you about the year 2000-2001, the business community on this country went through a wrenching experience with the name of ENRON. You all remember that and I think a couple of gentlemen in the telecommunications industry and a lot of people went to jail because the audit function failed. The oversight of those companies failed because of the audit function failed. In fact it was so bad that the big five accounting firms was dwindled down to four. One was chased out of the business. This is a serious situation. There's nothing on auditing in the Charter. If it's someplace else, then fine, but it's something that has to be considered. I think it is something that you should consider. The federal government through its congress enacted something that's called Siblain's Oxley (?) sometime in 2003. That was an attempt to patch up the failings of the past two years with ENRON and the cable television companies and the people that went to jail doing bad things. Siblain's Oxley exempts non-profit and governmental agencies from the rules but for all publicly owned corporations which they have to fulfill their requirements and in it is a prescribed auditing procedure. Now, if it was in place in the year 2000 or just before ENRON wouldn't have happened and all the others wouldn't have happened. I would ask you to take a look at this one thing. If it's not someplace, then it should be in the Charter. I think it belongs with the Board of Aldermen who really act as the Board of Directors for the shareholders, the shareholders being the voters and tax payers of the company. They are the oversight body to see that management does what it is supposed to do. I would ask you to consider putting that kind of language in the Charter, actually and to put language in the Charter that would seek some remedies when an audit opinion letter essentially has some problems with it, some remedies have to be found for that. Thank you.

*Mike Ullrich
9 Allendale Court*

For those of you that don't know, I'm an Assistant Fire Chief with the Shelton Fire Department for the last 7 1/2 years, 20 years with the Department. We just want to re-iterate the fact that we as the officers of the department sat together and are in

unanimous favor through a voting decision, along with sitting with your sub-committee of the changes that were presented; we still are in favor of that. I know that the Board has submitted changes to you that the Officers have not seen as of yet or discussed as the Officers' Council. The changes that we submitted to you several months ago that have been enacted and for the most part have been put in the Charter, the new one, the officers were well represented. All 4 fire companies were represented, the Fire Marshal's office was represented along with the Chief's office. So it's equal representation through the department, there were members of each station, each office and we feel it was a workable document and we wanted to show our support and say thank you for the changes that were submitted. Again, any of those changes that were submitted by the Board, we have not seen them, so the officers and the individual companies have not had a say on it, so if you act on any of those changes, you may feel, there may be an uproar from the fire companies that haven't had a chance to digest any of those. Thank you, I'll get them to the Officers' Council which meets in two weeks. Thank you.

*James Tortora
28 Matilda Lane*

Good evening. I am the Fire Marshal for the City of Shelton and I have been for 22 years. I just want to lend my support to the document that you proposed regarding the new section that deals for Fire Marshal. I support it 100% and my staff supports it. It's long over due. It will not separate us from the Fire Department; we are currently not separated from the Fire Department as you're being told. I don't think that the Board of Fire Commissioners policies and procedures role be able to adopt us as well as can be done by the City Charter. On the Fire Department side, I called for an abolishment of the Board of Fire Commissioners at the beginning of this Committee's form, I still agree to that but I also support the document that you proposed, your written proposal tonight on the Fire Department. It finally defines something that is long overdue in the department as far as who runs the Fire Department operational wise and who administers the department. Thank you for your time and I support the document of the Fire Department and the Fire Marshal office as you have written it.

*John Milo
15 Coral Drive*

Good evening, I'm the Fire Chief for the City of Shelton for the last 11 years and 35 year member of the department. First of all I'd like to thank the Commission for all your time that you have put into this. As you know, I've kind of kept a back seat on the revision stead for obvious reasons as I am the sitting Chief. As you know, we are in the process of hiring a new Chief. I'll finally get my chance to step down after 11 years. I have reviewed your document and for the first time I can say that you have made the attempt to define the role of the Board of Fire Commissioners and the role of the Fire Chief. I think you've done a tremendous job at doing that. You've given the Commissioners their

authority to control the long range planning, the capital improvements and the department budget and you gave them the authority to make them the appointments to the positions of Chief, Deputy Chief and Assistant Chiefs. As you know we've just hired 4 new Assistant Chiefs which have lightened the load on the current staff that they were in support of. As a matter of fact they abdicated and got the job done. You have also trimmed down the Officers' Council just a bit so that it's not overloaded with Fire Marshals and Fire Chiefs, but it gives a well representation to the 4 individual companies that make up the City by including their Captains and Lieutenants. It gives them much more say without being influenced by department brass. It gives them the opportunity and it's a style that I've adopted a long time ago to recommend operational policies to the Chief so that these policies can be discussed in staff meetings and enacted. You defined the Chief as the operational head of the Fire Department. In 11 years I've probably responded to about 7,500 alarms and I have never reported to a Fire Commission. I've always reported to a Chief or his designee. On a day to day basis there isn't time to poll 5 members of the Fire Commissioners to make some decisions that have to be made. Of course it's always been the case on the fire ground that the Chief has that control, but the Chief really needs to exercise the authority to operate the department on a day to day basis. All the surrounding departments around us both career and volunteer do that. Shelton has the largest volunteer fire department in the Northeast. You have 217 dedicated members that serve on a volunteer basis, they're well equipped, they're well trained and it's the Chief's responsibility to make sure that the day to day decisions that are made that affect their responses do not jeopardize the safety to themselves or the general public at large. You've done a great job on defining the Chief's role, you've also given him the authority to submit an operational budget and act on an operational budget once it's approved by the Board of Fire Commissioners which is very important. We have daily things that need to take place, such as the breakdown of fire apparatus which some of you are familiar with that require decisions to be made instantly and not a week or two down the road. The Fire Marshal's office, I see that you've kind of defined the division of the Marshal who runs his division and works very closely with the Fire Chief and any of the situations like prevention, investigation or safety. I can tell you that we've adopted some procedures in the department where the Fire Marshals and the Fire Chiefs have staff meeting on a bi-weekly basis and everyone is at the table from the department brass standpoint that makes a very good atmosphere to work out operational problems without them festering. Again I commend you for your work, I think you finally got this down to something that 99% of the department is in agreement with and I thank you very much.

*Remy Kocurek
15 Partridge Lane*

I wanted to say after listening to all the comments tonight that I strongly agree with the sound comments expressed so professionally and logically by Chris Panek. However, the decision I lament the most is not contained within these pages or made by this

Commission and that was the decision to exclude Mr. Panek from this Commission based on the fact that he lost an election. I see others before me that have both won and lost elections in primaries. Having said this, and the reason I did, is to highlight the fact that this Commission, through no fault of its own, or the parties before me, has become a political tool from it's inception and also not to discredit some of the good changes made and the very hard work that was done. But for you to understand why changes that affect, for example, one person seem politically motivated and as Mr. Steiner stated the Charter is a noble document and should be handled as such. Do we really want to do this all over again? I don't think we do. Thank you.

*Chris Jones
42 Crescent Street*

I am also a member of the Planning and Zoning Board. I just wanted some clarification. The Board of Education has a 9 member, 5-4 minority representation. What's the difference of the Planning and Zoning Board if it was a 7 member being, why wouldn't it be a 4-3?

Chairman DiMauro stated that he will not answer questions during this Public Hearing.

Mr. Jones continued, I was just looking for some clarification, I can look at the Statute itself. Right now the way the current system is 4-2, there is no way, being a minority board member to sway another person or two people from the other empowered position. I don't see the reason to go to 5 members, that's just beating a dead horse. I think, as Commissioner Harger stated, there hasn't been any meetings cancelled due to the lack of quorum. So, my own opinion, if it's not going to a 4-3 split where one person can be swayed either way to vote, I don't see there being a reason to change it. Thank you.

*Thomas Harbinson
15 Soundcrest Drive*

Mr. Paul Dimauro, Chairman
Charter Revision Committee
City of Shelton
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

Thomas Harbinson
15 Soundcrest Dr.
Shelton, CT 06484

Re: Board of Aldermen Majority Voting

July 29, 2008

Dear Mr. Chairman,

Section 4.3.2. Quorum and Action reads:

Five (5) members of the Board of Aldermen, exclusive of the Mayor, shall constitute a quorum for any meeting, and the Board shall take no action, except on a vote to adjourn or to fix the time and place of the next meeting, unless the action is adopted by at least five (5) affirmative votes.

From RROO: Art VIII/Sec.46 "When a quorum is present, a majority vote, that is a majority of the votes cast, ignoring blanks, is sufficient for the adoption of any motion that is in order."

This confliction came to my attention in 1999 when the BOA were deciding on the purchase of an open space parcel known as the Tall Farm on LongHillAve. There were several meetings attended by 5 aldermen (a charter defined quorum) where a motion to purchase open space land was made, and Alderman Chaffee would always abstain. Due to the charter requiring 5 affirmative votes to adopt a motion, it didn't pass and this continued for several meetings until it finally was accomplished.

From RR: "While it is the duty of every member who has an opinion on the question to express it by his vote, yet he cannot be compelled to do so. He may prefer to abstain from voting". Further, the member doesn't have to state the reason for abstaining.

At the time I was upset that rather than stand and be counted with a position, this alderman would abstain in order to effectively be voting no, while still claiming to be for the issue. However, in these days of questionable ethics by elected officials I have begun thinking about this issue differently.

This was not the case, but imagine if that alderman had a personal interest in seeing the land not sold to the city because he was in construction or real-estate and wanted to profit from its development. By abstaining, he could say that he was removed from the ethics of voting on the issue – yet have the knowledge that without 5 votes from the 5 in attendance he effectively killed the motion.

In essence, the charter should be in conformance with the RROO so that a person abstaining from vote retains the ability to be removed from the process. Actions should be adopted by a majority of those casting a vote. A person abstaining from a vote is not voting. If there is a quorum with 5 members, and 1 abstains, then 4 are voting, and 3 affirmatives would pass a motion.

Please modify Section 4.3.2 of requirements for Alderman "actions" to bring it in appropriate conformance with RROO, a conduct outline used since 1876 for proper operation of an organization.

++++

I read the above to the Board of Alderman in the year 2000. I wrote a letter to the Charter Revision Commission on May 20, 2002. I again wrote to another Charter Revision Commission on Aug 12, 2004. On Feb 13, 2008, I brought this same issue to the attention of this Charter Revision Committee with references to my previous letters from 2002, 2003, and 2004 – all of which were attached to your February 13th minutes.

There is again a lack of any comment, and no modification is recommended to the Charter Draft on this issue, so I again raise the question of conflict between Roberts Rules of Order for the Board of Alderman to conduct meetings, and the charter's Section 4.3.2

I have raised this sole issue repeatedly over the years with no response and having heard no debate. If that makes me a malcontent, I wear that badge with honor.

Current form:

Five (5) members of the Board of Aldermen, exclusive of the Mayor, shall constitute a quorum for any meeting, and the Board shall take no action, except on a vote to adjourn or to fix the time and place of the next meeting, unless the action is adopted by at least five (5) affirmative votes.

Proposed form:

~~Five (5) members of the Board of Aldermen~~ ***A simple majority of members from the Board of Aldermen.*** exclusive of the Mayor, shall constitute a quorum for any meeting, and the Board shall take no action, except on a vote to adjourn or to fix the time and place of the next meeting, unless the action is adopted by ~~at least five (5) affirmative votes~~ ***a simple majority of the votes cast.***

Please consider my suggested change to the City of Shelton Charter. If the Commission does not see the changes appropriate, I look forward to hearing of the member's reasoning as to why it should remain unchanged. Thank you in advance for your consideration,

Tom Harbinson

Chairman DiMauro stated that he would like to read a letter that was received by the Charter Revision Commission into the record.

10 Brookpine Drive
Shelton, CT 06484
926-0677

July 26, 2008

Shelton Charter Revision Commission
Shelton City Hall
54 Hill Street
Shelton, CT 06484

Attention: Paul DiMauro, Chairman

Dear Mr. DiMauro:

We hope that the city's Charter Revision Commission and the voters will reject the proposal to restrict city officials from holding more than one elected municipal office and one appointed municipal office. After reading about the issue in the Huntington Herald, it appeared that this restriction is aimed at only one individual in the entire city of Shelton – Alderman Jack Finn (who is also the Democratic Registrar of Voters). It also appeared that due to the wording of the proposal, no other city officials would be required to give up any of their elected or appointed positions. This proposal seems arbitrary and personal. Therefore, we hope that it will not be included in Shelton's new charter.

Sincerely,

Mark and Monica Peterson

Chairman DiMauro thanked everyone who attended and stated that the most of the comments stated were already into consideration.

There was no one else from the public that wished to address the Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Bashar motioned to close the Public Portion of the Public Hearing and adjourn. Commissioner Lally seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken; motion passed unanimously.

Chairman DiMauro closed the Public Hearing of the Charter Revision Commission at 8:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sophia V. Belade

Sophia V. Belade
Charter Revision Clerk

TAPE IS AVAILABLE IN THE TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE

ATTACHMENTS MAY NOT INCLUDED ON THE CITY WEBSITE BUT ARE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW IN THE CITY/TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE.