

THESE MINUTES ARE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

The Charter Revision Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, June 16, 2015 in the Old Court Room at Edmond Town Hall, 45 Main Street, Newtown, CT. Chairman Jeff Capeci called the meeting to order at 7:37pm.

**Present:** Kevin Burns, Jeffery Capeci, Tom Long, Dan Wiedemann, Eric Paradis, Deborra Zukowski, George Guidera, Eric Paradis, Bob Hall, James Ritchie

**VOTER COMMENTS:** None

**MINUTES:** Mr. Guidera moved to accept the minutes from the 6/10/15 meeting as presented Mr. Paradis seconded. Motion unanimously approved

**COMMUNICATIONS** – Mr. Capeci received a timeline from the Legislative Council for the CRC

**NEW BUSINESS**

Meeting/Public Hearing Schedule – Tuesday 7/7/15 or Wednesday 7/8/15 will be the public hearing. The actual date will be determined after a room is located. Having it in the Council Chambers or the HS Lecture hall is desired to have it recorded.

Section 5-01 Office of the Financial Director – Not discussed

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

6-25(b)(2) – There were two alternatives put forth

1)By simple majority. Mr. Burns articulated that there is a timing issue. You need 6 to decrease it or 8 to increase it you may not get it done to get the tax bills out on July 1<sup>st</sup>. The advisory questions are telling you something. That is why the application of the restrictive rule should not apply.

Mr. Long articulated that the advisory question asks, should revised budget be higher, there are no tools for the Legislative Council (LC) to respond. The Board of Selectman (BOS) puts a budget in, the Board of Finance (BOF) reduces it by \$200,000. The LC can go up to the amount that the BOS originally requested, on a failed vote. Looking back at 6-20(b)(3), inclusive of any amendments made in 6-20(f)- The budget that failed would go back to the BOS or the BOE and they can then amend their budget. There is a process but it would involve 3 boards. Mr. Hall suggested that if the budget fails, you need the majority of the LC and they can raise it to the cap. If it fails again then it would go through the amendment process. Putting this language in could persuade voters to vote no. (f) only applies to the budget that was given to the LC by the BOF. The final approval of a town budget is when the voters say yes. The language is 6-20(f) is not clear. That language needs to be cleaned up before they can move forward. And 6-25(b)(2) also needs to be clear before they can move forward.

Should the council be able to go above what the agency requested. Ms. Zukowski articulated that they should be free to listen to the voters and prefers the first alternative.

2)The second alternative has the cap and the super majority. On a failed referendum the LC can vote to raise or lower it with the cap being the original requested budget. Mr. Hall prefers this alternative because the agency that came with the original budget it would only go that high. The advisory question

says go up and the charter says you can't. You will not have the BOE come in with a budget of \$100 million and the citizens want it at \$110 million. Mr. Long suggested considering, instead of saying 6-20(b) can language be pulled from it to make it more clear.

An informal vote by show of hands was asked to determine who wants subsequent referendum to have a super majority above the BOF recommended amount. Mr. Weidemann, Mr. Capeci, Mr. Long are in favor. Mr. Burns, Ms. Zukowski, Mr. Hall, Mr. Guidera, Mr. Paradis and Mr. Ritchie were not.

Ms. Zukowski articulated that the only way to understand what people want is through the advisory questions. (i) under the two alternatives is the this language that is consistent with the original charter language. Mr. Tom long was opposed this and everyone else was for.

After a failed referendum, the LC can raise or decrease it with a majority. If we have hit the cap of the requesting board, and the Towns people want more spending, how can this be handled in the charter. Right now the current language says that either BOE or BOS can amend their budget at any time. It was unanimously agreed that that the BOE and the BOS can amend their budget.

It was also agreed that after a budget failure, they be able to amend their budget and the new cap is the amended budget request. Mr. Weidemann was the only one opposed to this.

6-25(b)(1) – The question if it should it be The Legislative Council may also or shall request additional financial advice from the Board of Finance? Mr. Guidera moved that it should be shall, Mr. Hall seconded. Motion passes 5 yes (Guidera, Hall, Zukowksi, Ritchie, Capeci) 4 no (Weidimann, Long, Paradis, Burns).

Binding aspects of the budget was discussed. Ms. Zukowski expressed concern because prior to this, there was a referendum that failed and then the BOE's budget was increased and the BOS was reduced by \$200,000. That strategy is no longer available. Telling a voter that there vote only counts if it wins disenfranchises the voter.

2-125 Board of Finance Terms – The term of office shall be evenly split between two and four year seats following the 2017 election. Thereafter, the term of office for each seat shall be four years.

3-15(e) in the 2017 election, one set of elections for 2 year seats and one set for 4 years. In the 2019 town election 3 members of the BOF having 4 year terms shall be elected. Thereafter, elections for the BOF shall be set forth in subsection 3-15(b).

6-30 – Laying of taxes - 6-30(b) Language changed to - Real estate tax bills shall be due and payable in 2 semi-annual installments, July 1 and January 1.

6-35 (b) changed from 30 days to 90 days and "or to the ongoing delivery of essential town services" was deleted.

(e) deleted – The total of Special and Emergency Appropriations made by the LC for all purposes during a fiscal year shall not exceed an amount equal to one half of one mil on the most recently completed Grand List. Mr. Hall is not comfortable with this because it is a floating number. Mr. Burns disagrees, there should be flexibility. Text was added back in

Mr. Guidera moved to include language, Mr. Burns Seconded. Mr. Hall amended the motion to be \$1,500,000 instead of one half of one mil, Mr. Paradis seconded the amendment. Amendment called and failed 2 yes (Hall, Paradis) to 7 No (Guidera, Burns, Zukowski, Ritchie, Wiedemann, Long, Capeci).

Original motion called and passes 7 Yes (Guidera, Burns, Zukowski, Ritchie, Wiedemann, Long, Capeci) to 2 No (Hall, Paradis).

**VOTER COMMENT - NONE**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS – NONE**

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:24pm

Respectfully Submitted, Arlene Miles, Clerk