



BOARD OF ALDERMEN &
CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION
JOINT SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF SHELTON

JULY 22, 2024

SHELTON CITY HALL, 54 HILL STREET, SHELTON, CT

Live Streamed at www.cityofshelton.org

Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Alderman Anglace called the joint meeting of the Board of Aldermen and Charter Revision Commission meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. in the auditorium at Shelton City Hall. All those present stood and pledged allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Roll Call

Board of Aldermen

Alderman John F. Anglace, Jr., President – Present
Alderman Eric McPherson, Vice President – Present
Alderman Cris Balamaci – Present
Alderman Lorenzo Durante – Absent/Excused
Alderman Porter McKinnon – Present via Zoom
Alderman Anthony Simonetti – Present
Alderman Bernie Simons – Present
Alderman Benjamin Perry – Present

Charter Revision Commission

Win Oppel, Chairman - Present
David Presutto - Present
Joanna Carloni - Absent
Ruth Ann Dunford - Present
Peter Finch - Absent

Administration

Kellie Vazzano, Administrative Assistant to the Mayor

Alderman Anglace: A motion would be in order to use the revised Agenda of July 22, 2024. I put this together for purposes of accomplishing all the things we want to accomplish tonight.

1. Receive C.R.C. Report ... listen to what the CRC has to say.
2. Clarify the law and determine where we are with the Charter Revision process.
3. Review the C.R.C. Proposed Voter Questions (red lined version) that the CRC suggests be on the ballot in detail.

Alderman McPherson MOVED to adopt the amended agenda as presented. Seconded by Alderman Balamaci.

A voice vote was taken and motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Alderman Anglace: Will you be working off the red-lined version? (Yes). We will turn this over to Win Oppel, the Chairman of the Charter Revision Commission.

1. CHARTER REVISION – RECEIVE CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION REPORT AND LISTEN TO WHAT THE CRC HAS TO SAY

Win Oppel: The Charter Revision Commission has been working since the middle of April on a revision of the existing Charter which goes back to 2012 which is the last time we had a Charter revision in the City of Shelton. I want to thank the members who participated. We met weekly. We started in some ways with the Charter that we had recommended last year and then worked forward from there. Our commission is recommending two specific questions be placed on the ballot this November.

The first one is printed on the front cover of the red-line version and reads:

“SHALL SECTION 5.1.2.1 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHELTON BE REVISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION?”

That covers 90+% of the recommended changes that this Commission is making.

Alderman Anglace: That question covers what is contained in the red lined version?

Win Oppel: That is correct. Everything in the red lined and yellow highlighted document is covered under that single question.

The second question that the Charter Revision Commission is recommending reads:

“SHALL SECTION 5.2.2.1 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHELTON BE REVISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION?”

That is a single paragraph recommendation and it has to do with the number of members from a single political party to be elected to the Board of Education. Those are the two questions we are recommending.

I'll start with the second one first since it is the shorter of the two. The current Charter says that there shall be no more than five members from a single political party elected to the Shelton Board of Education. Our recommendation is that that be changed to six. We went through a fairly detailed discussion last time when we met with this Board as to why we are recommending that. Much has to do with the fact that there have been numerous instances over the previous 12-14 years where folks who actually received the majority of votes did not get seated in the Board of Education due to our current minority representation requirement. The State allows, with a nine-member board elected at large, that the number could be brought up to six. So our recommendation is for that number.

5.1.2. Board of Education:

5.1.2.1. Board: *The City shall have a Board of Education, elected as provided by Section 2.4.1 (d) of this Charter, no more than ~~five (5)~~ six (6) members of which shall be from the same political party. The members shall hold no other elected or appointed office within the City. Members may, however, be appointed to temporary committees relative to the duties of the Board. The Board shall operate a school system in the City and shall appoint and may remove such personnel as may be necessary or convenient to the operation of the system. The Board shall have the power to receive, manage, and expend any gifts for school purposes. The Board shall have such duties as prescribed by Connecticut General Statutes.*

If I go back to the original red line version, you will see as you go through it that there are numerous grammatical and punctuation changes that we have made and are recommending be made.

As we work our way through the document, we have added a Preamble.

PREAMBLE

Since our founding in 1789 as the Town of Huntington, we the people of Shelton, Connecticut, have always strived to provide a community where families can find prosperity and happiness. Our perennial goal is to offer a high quality of life for all our residents, based firmly on our shared values of liberty, equality before the law, and representative government. To that end, we, the citizens of Shelton and proud citizens of Connecticut and the United States of America, do hereby adopt this Charter of the City of Shelton.

We thought it was a nice touch. Dave Presutto reworked it from a couple of previous versions. The preamble is highlighted in yellow and precedes Chapter 1 of the Charter.

The first big change you will see is under the elected municipal officials under the Planning & Zoning. Because there was a term staggering in the 2012 Charter, the term stagger was spelled out. We don't need that anymore. We have been operating for 12 plus years, so that is why we are going to take that section out of the Charter. (2.4.1. f)

- (a) *A Planning and Zoning Commission consisting of six (6) members elected to serve for staggered terms of four (4) years with the terms of three (3) members expiring at each general city election. ~~In November 2013, three (3) members shall be elected for a term of two (2) years and three (3) members elected for a term of four (4) years, thereafter they shall all be elected for four (4) year terms at each biennial election~~ The Planning and Zoning Commission shall also consist of two (2) alternates elected for a term of two (2) years;*

Alderman Balamaci: Win, Section 5.1.2 Board of Education and below, 5.1.2.1, it looks like the no more than five members, shouldn't that have been redlined and corrected?

Win Oppel: In the red line copy, we are not changing that. That is the second question.

Yellow highlights are additions and usually have to do with grammatical changes. For example we capitalized the C in the word clerk, capitalized the D in the word director. Added commas, etc. Mostly punctuation.

The next big change that you will see has to do with the Public Building Committees. Section 5.3.2

5.3.2. Public Building Committees:

*The City shall have a Public Building Committee for each public building project which may reasonably exceed ~~Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000.00)~~ **Seven Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000.00)** in total cost. Each committee shall consist of from five (5) to nine (9) members as appointed by the Board of Aldermen to serve for an indefinite term until completion of the public building project for which the committee was appointed. **No more than a simple majority of the Committee(s) shall be from one political party.** The Board of Aldermen shall appoint each committee no later than fourteen (14) days after the Board has first authorized the expenditure of any funds for the public building project. At the first meeting of each committee, the committee shall elect, by plurality vote, a chairman from its members to serve until completion of the public building project for which the committee was appointed. Each committee shall supervise the public building project for which it was appointed, develop a project program with input from the appropriate department head or representative of the Board/Commission for which the project is being completed and shall have such other powers as conferred upon them by the Board of Aldermen. Each committee shall supervise the public building project for which it was appointed and shall appoint and may remove such professional service providers and such other personnel as may be necessary or convenient to the supervision of the project. Each committee shall have the power to issue change orders which do not result in an increase in the total cost of the project above the authorized total bond issue or cost. No committee shall have the power to award contracts or waive bids on any project, but a committee may recommend the acceptance or rejection of any bid on any project or the waiver of the bids.*

We are making two specific changes. Currently the threshold for a Public Building Committee..

Alderman Anglace: Wait, in 5.2.1 there is a yellow highlight there. (*The **D**irector of Parks and Recreation shall report to the ~~Administrative Assistant~~ **Chief of Staff***)

Win Oppel: We capitalized the D in the word director and this references a later change where we strike the words Administrative Assistant and change the title to Chief of Staff.

Alderman Anglace: That is an issue. We can talk about it more. The minute you take out the words Administrative Assistant and put in Chief of Staff you are converting two positions, two people.

Win Oppel: There is only one Administrative Assistant under the Charter in the City of Shelton.

Alderman Anglace: Kellie Vazzano is an Administrative Assistant.

Win Oppel: I can't comment on what people's titles are. I was not an appointing authority to that.

Alderman Anglace: There are two positions. Kellie Vazzano is an Administrative Assistant and so is Fran Freer.

Win Oppel: The Charter reads, the Mayor shall appoint and may remove an Administrative Assistant. That is singular.

Alderman Anglace: To change one of those positions, the Administrative Assistant position is filled by two people. To change one of those to become the administrative second in command so to speak, I don't have a problem with that, but to take and change both of the Administrative Assistants to Chief of Staff rank, I do have a problem with that.

Win Oppel: The Charter Revision Commission took the single position of Administrative Assistant as listed and is simply changing the title to Chief of Staff.

Alderman Anglace: This is the impact it has.

Ruth Ann Dunford: Do two people do the same position? Is it a shared position?

Alderman Anglace: Two people with the same title of Administrative Assistant with one primarily in the area of administration and the other I'm not sure as I have not read the job description, but the other one does more legal assistance work making things happen, for instance selling some property, doing the research.

Alderman McKinnon: Without making it too complicated, why would you make that change?

Win Oppel: The Charter Revision Commission recommended the change as it is a much more popular title being used today than the term Administrative Assistant. It has evolved. As a previous Administrative Assistant, there were a number of folks throughout government that held that title. As the title evolved and the job evolved a more common title for the position and the duties of the position are now called Chief of Staff.

Alderman McKinnon: So it is not to redefine the duties of the position, it is just to the title.

Win Oppel: There are some revisions of the definition and when we get to that section, I will go over them. The other thing is there is a saving clause in the Charter that says no one loses their position based on any change approvals. Towards the back of the Charter you will see there is a savings clause.

Alderman Anglace: I don't have a problem with one person being designated as the Chief of Staff and that person being Administrative Chief of Staff. It is not identified.

Win Oppel: I don't know what is not identified Mr. Anglace.

Alderman Anglace: The position is not identified as Chief of Staff and no job description for it. We are creating a position which is okay.

Win Oppel: In Section 6.1 the duties of the Chief of Staff are outlined. I was trying to get through it in numerical order instead of jumping back and forth.

Alderman Anglace: You have two people doing two different things with the same title. You are only going to convert one of them. One is in the Administrative area. The other one is also Administrative but a different type, day-to-day administration. One handles bus services, oversees, cooperates and works with various department heads. The other one does a different kind of things on a different level.

Win Oppel: I can only speak to the recommendations that our Commission is making.

Alderman Anglace: I would say I would not agree with making both positions Chief of Staff.

Win Oppel: We did not make two positions Chief of Staff. Ours is to make the singular Administrative Assistant a Chief of Staff.

Alderman Anglace: I know the intent. If you eliminate the position of Administration Assistant and there are two people in that position of Administrative Assistant, two people become Chief of Staff and are no longer an Administrative Assistant. That is not the intent.

Alderman McKinnon: Is there a downside to leaving it as is? It sounds like you are introducing a title because that is a common title.

Win Oppel: There were functions that were listed as duties of the Administrative Assistant that are no longer being performed and this is the information that was provided to us both last year and this year.

Alderman McKinnon: Is there a downside to leaving it as it is?

Win Oppel: The Board of Aldermen can take our report and do what they would like with it.

Alderman Anglace: I don't think we can. I have a whole thing to cover here with the legal aspect of this thing. Let's for now pass on that.

Win Oppel: 5.3.2 of the Public Building Committees. The current threshold for the requirement of a Public Building Committee is \$500,000. Given the fact that that number was at least 12 years, if not older, we thought it might be wise to raise it to \$750,000. A second addition to that section is that no more than a simple majority of the committee shall be from one political party. There was no minority representation stated in the previous iterations of that paragraph.

We are proposing a new section 5.3.6, Page 19, the Veterans Memorial Committee as it was brought forth by Alderman Anglace and several others at our Public Hearing and at the meeting following our Public Hearing.

5.3.6. Veterans Memorial Committee:

The City shall have A Veteran's Memorial Committee consisting of five (5) members, all of whom shall be veterans or active members of the American Legion, VFW or other veterans organization. Appointed by the Board of Aldermen to serve staggered three (3) year terms with member terms set so that not more than two (2) terms shall expire in any year. The initial appointment schedule shall have one (1) member appointed for one (1) year, two (2) members appointed for two (2) years and two (2) members appointed for three (3) years.

We are also proposing section 5.4, the Technology Committee.

Section 5.4 Appointed by the Mayor, Board of Aldermen and Board of Education

Technology Committee

The City shall have a Technology Committee consisting of nine (9) members, with three (3) appointed by the Mayor, three (3) by the Board of Aldermen, and three (3) by the Board of Education. Members shall serve for staggered terms of four (4) years. Each Appointor shall appoint one member for a two (2) year term, a three (3) year term and a four (4) year term. No appointor shall appoint more than two (2) persons from the same political party and no more than six (6) members of the Technology Committee shall be from one political party. The Technology Committee shall devise a city-wide strategy for hardware, software, and services related to information technology. The Technology Committee's strategy will include a multi-year view of the technology needs of the city (inclusive of the Board of Education). The Committee shall prepare its report within 12 months of appointment and shall submit said report to a joint meeting of the Technology Committee, the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education with the Chairman of the Technology Committee serving as Chairman of this meeting. Thereafter, annually, the Technology Committee shall report to the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education all progress made towards their recommendations. The Technology Committee will update the original report annually. The Technology Committee may recommend expenditures to the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education. The Technology Committee may also be authorized by the Board of Aldermen to spend funds on technology, in which case they shall operate in the same manner as a Public Building Committee in Section 5.3.2.

The Technology Committee is almost entirely as it was previously suggested. We have, however, changed the first report date to 12 months rather than 18 months. Trying to keep the process moving. The Technology Committee would be appointed equally by the Mayor, the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education so there would be nine members on that commission.

Alderman Anglace: As we go along and get to our presentation to you, I am going to give you some feedback on that that I got last Friday from Superintendent of Schools and the Chairman of the Board of Education.

Win Oppel: Section 6.1 is the Administrative Assistant section. As I said earlier, we are recommending the title change and also recommending that the duties be outlined to reflect the current activity of that office as provided by Mrs. Nesteriak and other members to us over the last two years.

Section 6.1 ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff.

6.1.1. Appointment and Removal; Qualifications:

The Mayor shall appoint and may remove ~~an Administrative Assistant~~ a Chief of Staff. The ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff shall be chosen on the basis of his/her administrative qualifications, character, education, training and experience. The ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff shall hold at least a baccalaureate degree with a minimum of one (1) year of experience in public administration (federal, state, or municipal) or private business or industry in a responsible management, supervisory capacity; or he/she shall hold at least an associate degree with a minimum of two (2) years of such experience; or in lieu of a college degree, shall have a minimum of four (4) years of such experience.

6.1.2. Powers and Duties:

The Mayor may, from time to time, delegate to the ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff, such administrative powers or duties vested in the Mayor as the Mayor deems appropriate, and any powers or duties so delegated may be increased or diminished only by the Mayor. The Mayor may, from time to time, terminate the delegation of any powers or duties to the ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff, but all acts of the ~~Administrative Assistant~~ Chief of Staff pursuant to the delegation of such powers or duties which are performed prior to termination shall be and remain the acts of the Mayor.

The powers and duties delegated shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

- ~~(a) — Serving as personnel officer and administering the merit system, the Administrative Assistant, subject to the approval of the Mayor, may delegate these duties to a Personnel Director/Director of Human Resources;~~
- ~~(b) — Serving as Intergovernmental grantsman by researching, preparing, and submitting required applications for programs pertinent to the well being of the City;~~
- ~~(c) — Assisting the Mayor in the supervision of all offices, departments, and other agencies of the City;~~

- ~~(d) — Serving as public information officer and handling citizen comments;~~
- ~~(e) — Exercising such other powers and performing such other duties as the Mayor may prescribe.~~

~~The Administrative Assistant or a designee of the Administrative Assistant, both of whom are subject to the approval of the Mayor shall be responsible for the day-to-day administrative supervision in personnel matters, of all full-time and part-time employees of all Boards and Commissions. Such supervision shall not be deemed to infringe upon the authority of such Boards and Commissions granted by this Charter.~~

- (a) **The Chief of Staff shall assist** the Mayor in the supervision of all offices, departments and other agencies of the City;
- (b) **The Chief of Staff shall oversee** researching, preparing and submitting required **grant** applications for programs pertinent to the well-being of the City;
- (c) **The Chief of Staff serves** as public information officer;
- (d) **The Director of Human Resources shall report to the Chief of Staff.**

The ~~Administrative Assistant~~ **Chief of Staff** shall devote his/her full time to the duties of his/her office.

6.1.3. Other Positions:

The ~~Administrative Assistant~~ **Chief of Staff** shall act only as such and shall hold no other elected or appointed office within the City and shall have no other employment with the City.

The next change is in Section 6.4.4.1 on Page 24.

6.4.4. Central Purchasing:

6.4.4.1. *Division of Central Purchasing: The City shall have within the Department of Finance a Division of Central Purchasing headed by a Purchasing Agent and consisting of such other personnel as may be necessary or convenient to the operation of the Department subject to the approval of the Mayor.*

~~The Purchasing Agent may be the Director of Finance or any other person within the Department except the City Treasurer.~~

There was a conflict in the Charter. Several sections of the Charter say that employees can't serve in multiple positions. There was a line under the Central Purchasing which allowed the Purchasing Agent also to be the Finance Director or any other person within the Department of Finance except the City Treasurer. We felt it was in the best interest of the community to strike that. So the Purchasing Agent will be the Purchasing Agent only and not hold any other title. That restriction, as I said, is in other sections of the Charter.

In Section 6.9.3.2 on Page 27. At the request of Mike Maglione, the Chairman of the Public Safety Committee, it was recommended that anybody who is appointed a member of the Board of Fire Commissioners, also be an elector in the City. There was no requirement to that end previous.

6.9.3.2. Board of Fire Commissioners: The Board of Fire Commissioners shall serve as the administrative body of the Fire Department. It shall consist of one (1) Commissioner appointed by the Mayor, who shall be the Chairman of the Board of Fire Commissioners, and one (1) 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. Each Commissioner shall serve for a term of two (2) years and be an elector of the City of Shelton.

The last set of changes of major import are 7.14.

- (b) *Bidding:*
1. *The Purchasing Agent shall let to bid all purchases (including those made by the Board of Education) which reasonably may involve the expenditure of ~~Seven Thousand Five Hundred~~ **Twenty-Five** Thousand Dollars (~~\$25,000.00~~) or more by the invitation of sealed bids, giving at least ten (10) days notice of the closing date for bids by publication **on the City website** ~~at least once in a newspaper having a substantial circulation in the City~~. The bids shall be opened publicly during regular working hours, by the Purchasing Agent and a representative of the entity requesting the purchase, at a time which shall be published in the invitation of sealed bid. A list of all bids received shall be prepared and recorded in the City/Town Clerk's Office and a copy of all bids shall be available for public inspection in the Office of the Purchasing Agent. The Purchasing Agent shall determine the lowest responsible bidder; however, he/she may reject any, all or any part of any bids. The Board of Aldermen may establish such other regulations for purchases and bidding as it deems appropriate.*
 2. *When any purchase involves expenditures in excess of ~~Two Five~~ Thousand Dollars (~~\$5,000.00~~) and does not exceed ~~Seven Thousand Four Hundred~~ **Twenty-Four Thousand Nine Hundred** and Ninety-Nine Dollars and Ninety-Nine Cents. (~~\$24,999.99~~),*

the Purchasing Agent, or in the case of the Board of Education, an agent designated by the Board of Education, shall obtain a minimum of three (3) written proposals for the purchase of the item and shall make such purchase from the lowest responsible vendor, unless the Purchasing Agent, or in the case of the Board of Education, an agent designated by the Board of Education determines that the purchase is due to an emergency or is available only from a single source vendor and in that event, the Purchasing Agent or in the case of the Board of Education, an agent designated by the Board of Education shall create and maintain a written record of the reasons for such choice.

3. *When any purchase involves expenditures of ~~One~~ Four Thousand Nine Hundred and Ninety-Nine Dollars and Ninety-Nine Cents or less (\$4,999.99) the Purchasing Agent or in the case of the Board of Education, an agent designated by the Board of Education, may make such purchases direct as prescribed by the procedures enacted by the Purchasing Agent.*

This has to do with the bidding amounts required to get bids, to do direct purchases and to get quotes. Starting from the top, the current threshold is \$7,500 to get a bid. We have heard from numerous sources that it is simply too low. Folks who are doing bidding are not willing to spend the time to do a bid for that kind of money. The second side is, it is a bid so there are legal requirements and the City is expending a fair amount of time to try to get a bid for \$7,500. We felt that a raise in that threshold to \$25,000 was appropriate. The \$7,500 preceded 2012. You probably can't buy a good lawnmower today for \$7,500. You have to look at what the reality of the expenses are and the costs both for the City or the Board of Ed to do that kind of purchasing.

The second threshold has to do with getting three written proposals – not a bid, but three written proposals. That threshold would go from the current \$2,000 to \$7,499.99 and raised to \$5,000 and \$24,999.99. Anything over \$5,000 and under \$25,000 for the two ends of it, you would be required to get three written proposals for pricing.

The last change in that section is to be able to allow direct purchases. The current threshold for a direct purchase is \$1,000. We are recommending that that be changed to \$4,999.99. The costs of goods and services and repairs, we have heard it from several department heads over the last two years on different sides of this question, that those numbers had to be lifted up in order to make it a better cost benefit to the City. Department of Finance does not need to do a bid for the threshold that it is currently set at. Get three quotes or do a direct purchase.

Alderman Simonetti: I thought that in the last Charter revision there was some language that would allow the City, if the State of Connecticut changed the language of bidding so we would not have to put articles in the paper because the cost of these articles was \$800-\$1000.

Win Oppel: Our recommendation is that bids be placed on the City website. There were other legal notifications that currently have to be placed because of State law in newspapers having general circulation. The bidding can be placed on the City website and not have to go any place else. You buy

a truck, a tractor, a new refrigerator – all of that can be done through the City website and not have to have it printed in the newspaper having general circulation.

There is one more change, at the very end of the document, 9.6.1.

9.6.1. Elected Office:

(a) *Except as otherwise provided by this Charter, any vacancy in any elected office shall be filled at the next general City election or at a special election called by the Board of Aldermen for such purpose, but until such vacancy is so filled, it shall be filled as provided by law or this Charter.*

(b) *If there is no applicable law or Charter provision, the vacancy shall be filled within forty-five (45) days by the remaining members of the same political party on the board, commission, or other body (including the Board of Education) from the same political party in which the vacancy occurred; if there are no remaining members of such party, the vacancy shall be filled within ~~thirty~~ forty-five (45) days by the remaining members of the board, commission, or other body (including the Board of Education), from such person or persons as the town committee of the party in question shall recommend in writing within twenty (20) days of the vacancy; if there is no town committee of the party in question, or if no recommendation in writing is made within twenty (20) days of the vacancy, the vacancy shall be filled within ~~thirty~~ forty-five (45) days by the remaining members of the board, commission, or other body (including the Board of Education) from any elector from the political party or unaffiliated voter in which the vacancy occurred.*

There was some confusion regarding the filling of vacancies. The way it was written was they used the word “thirty” was written out in letters, but then inside the parentheses was number was “45”. It happened in a couple of places. Rather than get into a contest of what was really meant, we switched everything to 45. In filling of vacancies there is a forty-five (45) day window and it has to do with two different processes of filling those vacancies.

Those are the recommended changes by our committee. My understanding is that once we have issued the report tonight to you, you have the requirement to hold a public hearing. You can make specific changes as to how it appears on the ballot. I think we have done our job. I would thank my commission for going through it.

2. CLARIFY THE LAW AND DETERMINE WHERE WE ARE WITH THE CHARTER REVISION PROCESS

Alderman Anglace: I think we need over the weekend to spend a lot of time trying to understand the legal requirements of who does what and when. I guess I paraphrased, took it right out of the State Statutes. I was under the impression that we, the Board of Aldermen, had the final say, like you just said, but I don’t find that in the legal version. I would want to get a legal opinion on this. Section 7-191

of the State Statutes outlines the process. What I did was I went through it and typed up. This is why I put it on the revised agenda to go through this and understand who does what and when. What I am reading in the legal document is that the Board of Aldermen can suggest changes and send them back to you. You have the final say, not us, as to what gets put out for vote.

Win Oppel: Maybe we need Fran to send a little note to both of us and he can outline what the next steps are. My understanding is that the Board of Aldermen have until the end of August to a) hold a public hearing and b) set the questions for the November election. It is earlier this year because it is a Presidential election along with the others. I would maybe suggest, Alderman Anglace, that you ask the Corporation Counsel to give us a written direction as to what the next steps are over the next 30-35 days and then our committee is prepared to do whatever it is supposed to do to get these questions on the ballot.

Alderman Anglace: Let's just go through the legal requirements.

The commission shall hold at least two public hearings on the proposed Charter, one prior to the beginning of any substantive work on such Charter, and one after the draft report to the appointing authority.

You have done that.

The commission shall submit its draft report, including the proposed Charter, Charter amendments to the clerk of the municipality.

You have given it to us tonight, but you have to give it to the clerk of the municipality.

Win Oppel: Once we get through this meeting, I will email them to the clerk.

Alderman Anglace: The clerk shall transmit such report to the appointing authority. It then comes back to us. The appointing authority, which is the Board of Aldermen, and we hold at least one public hearing on the draft report and shall hold its last hearing not later than forty-five (45) days after the submission of the draft report to such clerk. We have 45 days once you give it to her.

Win Oppel: Except that, my understanding is that there is a second clock that is running because to get the question on a Presidential ballot is a different clock. You may not have all of the 45 days.

Alderman Anglace: Okay. The appointing authority shall make recommendations to the commission for changes in the draft report as it deems desirable.

If the appointing authority makes no recommendations for changes in the draft report to the commission within such fifteen days, the report of the commission shall be final and the appointing authority shall act on such report. If the appointing authority makes recommendations for changes in the draft report to the commission, the commission shall confer with the appointing authority, which we are doing tonight...

Win Oppel: No. You haven't made any recommendations, so that would be another meeting between us.

Alderman Anglace: And concerning any such recommendations - the commission may amend any provisions of the proposed Charter, or the commission may reject such recommendations. So it is pretty cut and dry. You can change them or reject them. Not later than 15 days after receiving the final report, the appointing authority shall either approve the proposed Charter or reject the same or separate provisions thereof. Not later than thirty (30) days after the approval by appointed authority, the proposed Charter shall be (1) published in full, at least once in the newspaper having a general circulation in a municipality or (2) the portion of the Charter being amended shall be published at least once in a newspaper having a general circulation in a municipality.

The appointing authority shall, by a majority vote, determine whether the proposed Charter, Charter amendments or home rule ordinance amendments shall be submitted to the electors for approval or rejection at a regular election or at a special election. I think it goes on to say that the proposed Charter, charter amendments shall be prepared for the ballot by the appointing authority and may be submitted in the form of one or several questions. So what you are proposing to us is two questions. One question is cut and dry, specific. The other one is inclusive of the red line changes in the Charter.

Win Oppel: That's correct. If I understood what you read, your Board can make recommendations after you receive the proposal of our commission from the Town Clerk.

Alderman Anglace: We can make them now. I don't think we have to wait for the Town Clerk to give them to us. We know what they are.

Alderman Simonetti: I believe what Mr. Oppel is saying is that is the procedure. There is no seal or time stamp on the copies we have.

Alderman Simons: It would show that we were looking at the original, the right copy, the one that was filed.

Alderman Simonetti: Who wrote the preamble?

David Presutto: I didn't write it. I just kind of rearranged it because they were kind of run on sentences. I can't take credit for writing it.

Alderman Simonetti: Thank you all for the hard work you have done and taking the time you spent.

Alderman Anglace: I'd like to give you some feedback when I spoke to the Superintendent and the Chairman of the Board of Education last Friday and made them aware that the meeting was taking place tonight and invited them. They gave me some feedback with respect to the organization, if you will, of the Joint Technology Committee. They have asked why it was being proposed to have nine (9) people on it. I told them that there was no other reason other than that was how it was originally formed way

back when and have had it in action for 12 years. That was the original concept and we just used that. They said that they would suggest that it be a five (5) member commission. The reason they would suggest that is because first of all it is easier to appoint. They would be looking in the area of primarily two types of people – people with a technology background with a history in that area, and people with the knowledge of the Board of Education and City facilities type people who understand how to get things done and how our system works. The other suggestion would be that the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education each appoint two people as opposed to three people and that the Mayor appoint one person. You would have five (5) people sitting on the Technology Committee. They felt it would be less controversial and better acceptance by members of the Board of Education. The City discussion went along the lines of annually we are funding a minimum of \$350,000 for Chromebooks every year. Last year we funded the Chromebook from LoCIP (Local Capital Improvements) and used that money which we could be using to make improvements in other areas in town to do things, but we chose to use it because it is necessary. The problem is, those Chromebooks at \$350,000, they have to be ordered early on when school is out. They are ordered off the State bid and the numbers have been coming in around \$350,000 up to this point. Once they come in, they have to work on them, they have to be gone through and have to get them ready to be used for the specific purposes they are intended for. The kids take State tests on those Chromebook. Then they have to be distributed at the start of school.

The other big need that they have and will be having is Promethean boards. That will be a big number. They use them in the classrooms for teaching and they are very expensive. I don't have numbers at this point. The problem is, one of the issues with the Joint Technology Committee is that the aldermen will authorize the going out to referendum to get seed money so that the Joint Technology Committee can make the purchases that are needed to be made over the course of their lifetime.

Win Oppel: If I could interrupt you for a moment. We did not include any reference to the Board of Aldermen and referendums because that is in another part of the Charter and you are entitled to do that. The only action that we included regarding expenditure is that the Technology Committee may be authorized by the Board of Aldermen to spend funds on technology in which case they would operate the same as a Public Building Committee. It would be, for example, a two step process. One would be to appoint a committee. The second step would be, if the aldermen so chose, to authorize that committee then to act as a Public Building Committee. That is the two pieces. The Board of Aldermen has the right under several other sections to go out to referendum and spend money in that fashion.

Alderman Anglace: That is what we did with the last committee that was in place and that worked out fine. The problem is going to be if the Joint Technology Committee is not approved by the voters, they will be in dire need of getting Promethean boards and other technology needs and the other building needs that they need. You saw fit to keep the amount of money we get for bonding at 2% of the budget. It would have been nice if that was upped to 2.5% because it would give us a little more, this is capital spending and it is big money.

Win Oppel: I think we envisioned that the Board of Aldermen and the Board of Education would receive the report of the Technology Committee which would include a long term plan and a funding structure and that maybe the referendum would be for more than your existing borrowing capacity, therefore

hit the threshold that we would ask the residents of the City to approve a long term funding plan for technology.

Alderman Anglace: One of the things they are going to have to do if it is approved and the Joint Technology Committee sits down right up front they will have to take a look at the Promethean boards and replacements because they are getting to the point where in some classes they are not working. It is a key expenditure and a critical expenditure as well. I think it directly affects the learning. I just stress all this because I think it is important to the Board of Education and nobody is here to speak for them.

Win Oppel: They haven't shown up at our public hearings or any of our meetings.

Alderman Anglace: Of course, they look to us to fund these things. We can't fund them unless we have the wherewithal to do it. We are trying to make an effort to do that, that is why I reached out to them last Friday for a quick meeting just to explain this to them. Where we are in this whole thing, what our recommendations are going to be – you will get the final report into the Town Clerk and she gets it to us then we will have to sit down and go through and make our recommendations. I don't think we can do that tonight.

Win Oppel: I will get it filed tomorrow.

Alderman Anglace: What would be your take on this? We have to hold a public hearing.

Win Oppel: That's correct.

Alderman Anglace: The public hearing we will hold is putting out your final report.

Win Oppel: That's correct. You would hold a public hearing on the two documents that you have in front of us. The single sheet and the multi-page document. That is what you would hold a public hearing on.

Alderman Anglace: So our steps should be:

- You file.
- They give it to us.
- We set the public hearing.
- We come back to you with our recommendations.

Win Oppel: That's my understanding from what you supplied tonight.

Alderman Anglace: We have some time to do it. I think it is critical. Our capital funding is reaching critical stages. Incidentally, just so you know, we are going to add another thing in here – buses, school busses.

Win Oppel: School buses aren't in the Charter.

Alderman Anglace: I know, but the funding for them, the replacement is education. It is not technology but it is necessary.

Alderman McPherson: In Section 6, Chief of Staff position. I don't have an issue with that. Administrative Assistant is outdated. We are in a different day and age. I agree with the concept. The issue I do have is because of the nature of the position is with Director of Human Resources. I think, because of the nature of that position, dealing with confidential information, employee records, etc., that position should report directly to the Chief Executive. I say it because regardless of who the Mayor is, the Mayor comes and goes and when a Mayor comes in they appoint their Chief of Staff and Administrative Assistant, that is a political appointment. You have Human Resources Director with the merit system, these are career people, so Mayors come and go but in many cases the Human Resources people stay the same. I think, because of the nature of that position, it is a very key position and should report directly to the Chief Executive. That is the only change I would urge to that, to strike that part out where they report to an Administrative Assistant or Chief of Staff. We are talking about a future document so going forward that is something I would suggest.

Going to the Technology Committee, I agree with the concept of the Technology Committee. I think it is important on the City side and especially for the Board of Education, between terms, when we had the last Technology Committee I think it was geared more to helping and working with the Board of Education, but now this has become citywide. One of the questions that I have is, has anyone reached out to both the Board of Education IT Director and the City's IT Director for their thoughts and input?

Alderman Anglace: No one has reached out to them at this point because we are still trying to establish the Technology Committee. We are making it joint so that it encompasses technology for the City and Board of Education.

Alderman McPherson: I wanted to ask the question because I think it is important that we have both director's input. These are individuals who have a great deal of experience and knowledge and I think could really contribute to a Technology Committee. Getting to one of the comments John made when talking to Amy Romano and the Superintendent about having people with experience on such a committee, I don't think we should be appointing just anybody. I think we need people that have at least some kind of supervision or several years of experience in this. I would like to see that as a part of the section. They will submit resumes and we should include that they have experience in this field. John talked about that 9 people was too large and I think 5 is very good. Then there was a clause in there about them doing a report every 12 months as opposed to every 18 months. Would this be a report or recommendations? I would be concerned about any report talking about our infrastructure, current or future where something that should not get out there gets out there. I would caution as to what type of a report. A report on a plan for equipment and so on. I think we have to be careful that nothing of the nitty gritty details would pose a security risk.

The next question for me would be, is this more of an advisory body or is this going to be an authoritative body? They are just making recommendations or this is it, that's that.

Win Oppel: That's why the last sentence is written there. That is up to the Board of Aldermen. It can be done that this group of people, 5 to 9 or any other number in between, simply makes a report as to what the technology for both the City and Board of Education should look like and then the Board of Aldermen establishes a separate Building Committee or you can use your powers to make this the Building Committee. That would be up to you.

Alderman McPherson: The other question I thought, we technically have two IT directors, BOE and the City. It is not the intent, I don't think, of what this Technology Committee would be that they would report to them?

Win Oppel: No. I think in our conversations those two folks would act like staff to the Committee to help them work through different questions of what is proprietary, particularly for the Board of Ed where you have student records and teacher records involved. I viewed them, and I don't want to speak for everybody, but our conversation was that the IT staffs employed by the City of Shelton generally would serve as staff to the committee and not any other way.

Alderman McPherson: The other thought too is perhaps they should be on the committee, maybe even as ex officio or something just because of the experience and the knowledge that I would think both directors have, that they can really take a part in this. That was one of the other thoughts I would like the Charter revision to consider. The other thought too is what happens if you have both directors and the Technology Committee that may be in disagreement on something and how does this get resolved. That is something I would like the Commission to consider on how they can be involved.

Alderman Simonetti: Alderman McPherson's comments are fine, but I think your commission has already done its work. What we are looking at here is going to be turned into the Town Clerk tomorrow morning.

Win Oppel: Correct. I understand his points. We are not making any changes between now and tomorrow morning.

Alderman McPherson: My comments were only for the commission to hear our thoughts. It will come to us and we will make suggestions back to the commission.

Alderman McKinnon: Eric, you make great points. I agree with almost everything that you said. I think this is the most important part of this entire thing, this education, the Technology Commission. If the two people in charge from the two different departments, Education and City, are not involved in the conversation, then what good is the committee if that is approved. It should be a conversation to go forward, even if they don't have a vote as to what happens on funding or whatever, they should be involved in the conversation.

Alderman Anglace: That's the way the original Technology Committee was formed. We had voting members and also people who were liaisons. Initially, this goes back 20 years at least, the first thing we had to do – there was a different set of challenges back then – we had to establish a wide area network

to get everybody communicating with each other, the City, the Board of Education buildings. That was the initial focus on that.

Alderman McKinnon: John, what you guys did years ago was phenomenal. Why we don't have it now is beyond me and why it was voted down in the last election I don't understand. This is so important, I believe, going forward for our school system and the City, but most importantly for the school system, as you have said about the Promethean boards, all the computers, everything for the school system – if you are not looking five years ahead on how you need to be, where you need to be technology-wise, then you are five years behind, ten years behind. You have to be ahead. You have to be planning for this ahead, both technology-wise of where you are going to be and financially. Financially is the most important part. We have to plan for this. We don't have a committee. Board of Ed says we want this, we need this. City says we need this. Nobody is coming together and planning for this stuff. I think Eric said everything perfectly on how this committee should be formed. I think those people that are involved as decision makers for the City and Board of Ed should be involved as well.

Alderman Anglace: That's why the enabling language for the Joint Technology Committee allows the Board of Education to appoint people, the City to appoint people and the Mayor to appoint a person.

Alderman McKinnon: Could the City appoint the IT director as a person? Could the Board of Education appoint the IT director for the Board of Ed for this committee? Is that not allowed?

Alderman Anglace: No. As was pointed out at the public hearing that the Board of Education uses their technology far different from the City. It is unique in many respects. It is also mandated in some cases. They need the ability to function and access money to do these things. If we just had a Technology Committee for the Board of Education, they wouldn't be able to fund what they wanted to do.

Alderman McKinnon: Maybe I'm not speaking correctly. This is a different thing. This is a forward looking committee. Could those people be involved or not?

Alderman Anglace: Oh yea. When I spoke last Friday with the Superintendent and the Chairman of the Board of Education, they indicated to me that they would want their Technology Director to be on that Committee. The City would want its Technology person on that committee.

Alderman McKinnon: Would that be allowed? Could the City as one of their two people to appoint to this committee be the IT Directors?

Alderman Anglace: The Board of Aldermen can nominate two people.

Alderman McKinnon: Could that be the person in charge of IT for the City?

Alderman McPherson: The Board of Ed could nominate theirs also as an ex officio member just as we could. You'd have five members and then ex officio members.

Alderman McKinnon: If we can't have ex officio members, is my question, of the five members, two coming from the City, two coming from the Board of Ed, could the City nominate the person in charge of IT for the City as one of those two people? Could the Board of Ed nominate one of the people in charge of the IT for the Board of Ed as one of those people? Or does it have to be somebody outside of the employment of the City or Board of Ed?

Alderman Perry: I think that is something we need clarification on. It sounds to me that is something that could possibly be a conflict. That is something we could get clarification on.

Alderman Simonetti: Conflict of interest. I think an ex officio would be good, but they shouldn't have any vote.

Alderman Simons: They would be there strictly to advise.

Alderman McKinnon: But their input would be very important. Can we add that to the Charter?

Alderman Simonetti: At this point we can't do anything until we have a stamped copy.

Alderman Balamaci: I would like something clarified for me. On Page 24, 6.4.5 under IT. It states the Finance Director is responsible for maintaining the City website. Is that true?

Win Oppel: That has been since before 2012.

Alderman Balamaci: Having briefly worked here, I was unaware that that was the person that maintains that.

Win Oppel: I think the word responsible does not mean actual hands on. But that person falls under the Department of Finance as an office spot. It is not the actual setting the website up.

Alderman Balamaci: The bidding in purchasing. Was the value increased arbitrarily or did you look at other towns?

Win Oppel: We had conversations with the Director of Finance. We talked about other towns. We had different levels that we all discussed about amongst ourselves as to what things were. We had some conversations with some department heads about where their thresholds were and that is how we got to those numbers.

Alderman Anglace: Anyone else have anything else to add?

Alderman McPherson: Thank you for your work. God knows it is tedious. Thank you very much.

Alderman Anglace: Thank you for your efforts. We appreciate them.

ADJOURNMENT

Alderman McPherson MOVED to adjourn the Board of Aldermen Meeting.

Seconded by Alderman Simons.

A voice vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously (7-0). Meeting adjourned at 6:40 pm.

Respectfully Submitted

Donna Fonda

Donna Fonda
Acting Clerk, Board of Aldermen

DATE APPROVED _____ BY: _____
Mayor Mark A. Laretti