

**SAUGUS CHARTER COMMISSION**  
**APPROVED MEETING MINUTES**  
**OF**  
**OCTOBER 23, 2008**

The fortieth meeting of the Saugus Charter Commission was held on Thursday, October 23, 2008. The meeting was held in the Town Hall Auditorium. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Peter Manoogian, at 7:30 P.M.

***Completion of STEP 4: SELECT THE BEST POSSIBLE SOLUTION(S)***

**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

All nine members of the nine member committee were present at roll call: Cam Cicolini, Karen Cote, Eugene Decareau, Karla J. de Steuben, Albert W. Diotte, Jr., Joan Fowler, Peter Manoogian, Sr., Debra Panetta and Thomas Stewart.

**READING OF MINUTES OF LAST MEETING (October 16, 2008)**

Minutes were distributed to all Commission Members for review before the next meeting.

**ACCEPTANCE OF PREVIOUS MINUTES (October 9, 2008)**

Ms. Cote made a motion to accept the Minutes of October 9, 2008.

The Chairman seconded the motion.

The motion passed **9-0**

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None at this time.

**CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

• **“Our work in context.”**

The Chairman noted that three of the Members were at the Finance Committee Meeting the previous night, as Town Meeting Members, and had an interest in the Warrant. Although the Members were not sitting together, it became apparent that they were thinking about their work as Charter Commission Members in the context of some of the deliberations. In particular, Articles having to do with how the Selectmen have established a Sewer Rate, and Town Meeting has yet to act, and the concern if there is no action. There were issues of transparency of what was listed on the Warrant, and the need to call a Special within a Special. He went on to say that, the Members that were there, began to look at all of these issues in the context of what the Commission has been doing, and it provides you with a different lens, and a “what if” perspective. Mr. Manoogian stated that he wanted to share that with the Members that were not at that meeting, and asked if, even when reading a newspaper, if they look at it in the context of the work that they have been doing a Commission Members. Having been doing this for almost a year now, it is part of human nature to start making those associations.

- **Next meeting – October 30th at School Administration at 7:30**  
The Chairman reminded Members of the location change for the October 30<sup>th</sup> Meeting, which will be held in the School Administration Building at 7:30 P.M.

**TREASURER’S REPORT**

Mr. Decareau made a motion to pay the Clerk for 32 hours, \$384, for the month of October. The Chairman seconded the motion.  
The motion passed **9-0**

Mr. Decareau asked the Chairman to speak on the request of Town Accountant, Joan Regan. Mr. Manoogian explained that Mr. Curran’s contract is now in place, and has been signed by all of the parties. He stated that he has a copy that he is giving to the Clerk to put into the Commission’s file at the Town Clerk’s Office. Also, the Town Accountant would like to have a purchase order on file that binds the contract. The Chairman stated that, with the permission of the Members, he has asked Mr. Decareau to prepare and execute that purchase order.

**COMMITTEE REPORT**

None at this time.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

None at this time, however, there was an email from Mr. Busalacchi wondering about Town Meeting, ethics, etc. The Chairman suggested that Mr. Busalacchi read the Minutes and see what the Commission has been doing. The Members can see the reply in the email.

**NEW BUSINESS (order to be determined by members)**

- **Input from Mr. Curran**  
Mr. Curran reiterated his comments of last week, stating that he hoped the Members would spend the evening, in the spirit of compromise, thinking about what is best for Saugus.
- **Legislature – size, format, duties**  
The Chairman stated that he had included a Legislative Model memo in the Members’ folders, based on some of the discussions that the Commission has had, and their Areas of Apparent Consensus. He stated that this model is for topical purposes, and to, perhaps, start a discussion.

Subject: Legislature Model  
27 Member Legislature – name “General Assembly”  
1 Leader elected town wide “Assembly President”  
20 precinct reps (10 x 2)  
6 at large (3 per 5 precincts x 2)  
Legislative Body - Standing Committees  
1.) Budget / Finance / Auditing  
(9) o x x x x c c c  
2.) Bylaw / Charter Review / Rules / Ethics

- (7) o x x x c c c
- 3.) Capital Building / Public Works  
(7) o x x x c c c
- 4.) Public Health / Public Safety  
(7) o x x x c c c
- 5.) \*Human Services and Recreation  
(7) o x x x c c c
- 6.) Comprehensive Planning / Land Use / \*\*Housing  
(7) o x x x c c c

*\*Senior Center, Youth, Handicapped, Veterans, Holidays and Celebrations, Parks and Natural Resources, Historical and Archaeological*

*\*\* except programs administered by the Saugus Housing Authority*

Key

O = at large legislator / committee chairman

X = precinct based legislator

C = citizen

The Chairman then opened the discussion for any Member's thoughts or questions.

Ms. de Steuben stated that it was pretty clear that she preferred a small legislative body. She explained her reasons for running for Charter Commission, and the thought process involved in arriving at her decisions. Ms. de Steuben noted that her original proposal, if she remembers correctly, was 15. One of the elements in her proposal was to maintain elected representation by precinct, because some citizens who came before the Commission like having someone that they can call on. She stated that she would agree with two members from each precinct, as previously discussed, and stagger the terms so that one is elected each year. She went on to say that she thinks three from each precinct is too many. Ms. de Steuben noted that she has proposed three at large, with one running for the position of chairperson. She recalled, from previous discussions, that the Members had considered four at large, 2 from each half the town, with one elected leader. Ms. de Steuben stated that, if she has to go larger than she originally proposed, that is the number she would be comfortable. She also stated that the body should serve on a continuous basis, not like the Town Meeting that we currently have, which has to be called by the Board of Selectmen. To summarize, Ms. de Steuben stated that she would support a continuously serving body, 24 plus 1 members, and that is the maximum number that she thinks would be manageable for a legislative body.

Mr. Decareau explained that his number of thirty-six, three from each precinct, plus six running at large, was based on the information the Commission received as to how many people actually ran per precinct. He feels that dropping the number to three gives more competition, more opportunity for discussion, and a better and easier number to work with. Mr. Decareau stated that he is flexible as to having more or less, but wants to stay with the current form of government, whether called town meeting, assembly or whatever. He feels that the most important thing the Commission has to do is set up rules and regulations, and job descriptions, so that every person that is running for a position, understands what their responsibilities are and who they are accountable to. Mr. Decareau went on to say that the public must also know. He said that he is not looking to "blame," he is looking to "correct."

Mr. Decareau noted that he was interested in the information provided by the Chairman this evening, and would ask questions about it later on.

Mr. Diotte feels that the concept of the town, should basically stay as it is, but the selectmen should be the policy makers, and the manager should work for them. He agrees that the town meeting should be smaller, and likes the idea of precinct and at large. Mr. Diotte would like to see a licensing board with the police chief, fire chief, and building inspector as part of that board. He feels the need for a comptroller, who could work for the finance committee, and would also like to see the Selectmen as the water / sewer commissioners.

Ms. Panetta stated that in one of her models, she had 50 members, but after being on the Commission and listening to everyone, she does see the need for a smaller legislative body. She likes the idea of standing committees, and feels that the information that the Chairman handed out, is a summary of what the Members want, and thinks that, at first glance, it is workable. Ms. Panetta stated that she is open to both the 35 members that she had in one of her models, and the 27 in the model presented this evening.

Mr. Stewart said that it wasn't any secret that he had wanted a much smaller legislature, having maybe 9-11 in his proposal. He likes the idea of precinct / at large. Mr. Stewart went on to say that it should not be called "town meeting," because it will not be the same as the public sees now. Mr. Stewart also agreed that he wants contested elections, and with only two seats per precinct, the elections would be contested, and people would have to campaign. He thinks that the framework distributed this evening is workable, even though it was not his ideal size, and believes that it is something he could sell to the community.

Ms. Cote stated that the Chairman's model reminds her of Newton, and how impressed she was with their standing committees, etc. She feels that with two from each precinct you will get good elections. Citizens need to recognize the people who represent them. She is flexible on the numbers, and thinks this model is workable.

Ms. Cicolini stated that she is particularly cares for the model provided this evening. Originally she had proposed a much larger form of town meeting. She believes that the Members have to think of what the Town has now as "not working," and the Commission has to fix it. She went on to say that she liked Mr. Diotte's proposal, agreed somewhat with Ms. Panetta, but she does like the model presented tonight, and would go with it.

Ms. Fowler stated that she also liked the model presented this evening, but would like to see a separate licensing board, and a separate water / sewer commission. She also said that she likes the number 27.

The Chairman explained that, as he was putting this model together, he thought of the need for standing committees, and considered what Newton and Burlington had. He believes the Members should really establish the role of these standing committees, and also sees the need for governing rules for the legislature, as well as ethics provisions. Mr. Manoogian went on to explain the six standing committees that he had suggested, and explained his reasoning for having six members elected at large. He feels that the candidates would know that they are running for a meaningful position, and would aspire to do good for the community, knowing that they would be designated chairman of one of these very important standing committees. The

Chairman went on to say that, if there is a way to condense the committees to four, he is open to suggestion, but his reason for having six at large was to have leaders for those six committees. It was not an arbitrary number.

On the issue of standing committees, Ms. de Steuben asked Mr. Curran how it would work with allowing the legislative body some leeway to decide on their own, in the future, what additional committees they might need, or get rid of committees that are no longer necessary.

Mr. Curran's recommendation was to have a "piggy-back" provision that would have the committees as council rules that could be adopted, amended or repealed by future councils.

The Chairman asked Mr. Curran, for clarification, to describe a "piggy-back" provision, and how it would work.

Mr. Curran responded that it would say, "until such time that the legislative body, by rule, shall vote to adopt, amend, or repeal the same, the following shall have the force of a rule of the legislative body," and then you list the six committees, and state that "the chairpersons of those committees would be drawn from persons elected to the office of councilor at large, and no councilor at large can serve on more than one committee," or whatever language the Commission chooses. This eliminates the "straight-jacketing" by the charter, that would require a 2/3 vote by the legislative body, and have to go on the ballot.

Referring to the model, Mr. Decareau asked the Chairman, under the "Budget, Finance, and Auditing" part, if it included an "on-board" internal auditor.

The Chairman explained that, last year when the Town had its audit, it was recommended that they have their own internal auditor. He went on to say that he thinks the finance body should have expertise, whether consulting expertise, part time, or however it is constituted, it should be accountable to the legislature. The town manager that spends the money should not be hiring the auditor.

Mr. Decareau then asked if the internal auditor would be part of the finance committee, to which Mr. Manoogian responded that the auditor should report to the finance committee, and should provide all information necessary to the committee, so that they can make informed decisions.

Mr. Decareau asked the Chairman to explain "Capital Building / Public Works." Mr. Manoogian explained that anything "capital" is outside of the normal budget run, and would be out for a long period of time, for borrowing, etc. He continued by saying that major capital expenditures in this town have traditionally centered around building programs and water / sewer programs. The legislature has to appropriate the money, and should have a recommendation from a body like this, that has access to information.

Ms. de Steuben suggested changing the language so that people wouldn't confuse it with the public works department, and suggested perhaps "capital improvement committee," so Mr. Manoogian suggested "Capital Building / Capital Improvement," to avoid confusion.

Mr. Decareau asked where the licensing board would be, and Mr. Manoogian noted that Ms. Fowler had brought up the water / sewer as well. The Chairman stated that he believed water / sewer policy should reside in an executive body, and the legislative body should approve the spending, borrowing, and / or the rates. He went on to say that, knowing the water and sewer issues in the Town, especially sewer issues, they never go away. There is a mandate to stop putting waste water in the Saugus River, and to repair our pipes, and that needs a sustained ongoing coordination that should reside in the executive realm, with the ultimate approval of spending from the legislature.

The Chairman went on to say that, as far as the licensing board goes, the Commission needs to have a discussion. He noted that the Members had spent time talking about conflict, and the fact that, if a person serving on the board has a business, and cannot vote on licensing matters, you can end up with a deadlocked vote and confusion. Mr. Manoogian said that, whether licensing resides in an elected executive body, or with a separate licensing authority, the Members have to decide if they want holders of licenses to have the opportunity to serve on a licensing commission. It's an issue that still needs to be addressed, and questioned whether licensing should reside with the executive, legislative, or an appointed body.

Mr. Curran stated that it generally resides with the executive, and if the Members decide to do away with the Board of Selectmen, it would automatically fall under the State statute, which says "unless a municipal charter provides otherwise."

The Chairman stated that hard part about the Members divorcing their conversations about the legislature and the executive. You almost have to consider that other branch of government in tandem to this. He went on to say that, if you have a single executive, that implies you would have an appointed licensing board, and if you have a single executive, what are you going to do about water and sewer? Would that reside with one person, or another appointed board? If you have a multiple executive board, do you want them involved in policy, or spend their whole night talking about licenses. It is a conversation that the Members definitely need to have.

Ms. de Steuben stated that she liked Mr. Diotte's idea of having the police chief, fire chief, and building inspector as part of the licensing board, because it is a non-political body.

The Chairman raised the issue that, under that scenario, you could potentially end up with non-residents giving out licenses in Saugus.

Mr. Stewart agreed that both licensing and water / sewer probably should reside in executive, and suggested turning the conversation back to the legislative branch.

The Chairman asked the Members if they had any other thoughts on the standing committees, piggy-back provision, changing the name of some of the standing committees, transitional language, etc.

He then asked Mr. Curran if he had any thoughts on what he had heard so far, or had any prompts for discussion of areas that had not yet touched on.

Mr. Curran responded that he was awestruck at the degree of unanimity that had transpired, and went on to say that the separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches is something that they will deal with in the charter, and perhaps setting up some administrative agencies. Unquestionably there has been more

of a mix in the type of town administration that Saugus has had up to this point. The other issue of the legislative branch, is whether the Members want to stay with the trappings of Town Meeting or not.

Mr. Manoogian said that he did not see any benefit to having somebody set the agenda and call the legislature into session. He would rather see a charter call them into session, as in Newton, where they have to meet at least ten times a year, and Burlington is ongoing. Saugus would still be the Town of Saugus, but he would like to see a legislative branch that can act in an efficient and timely manner, and if they need to amend a piece of legislation, they shouldn't have to go back and write another warrant and advertise it for 14 days. The Chairman went on to state that the only thing he wants is to maintain a size that is large enough to avoid undue influence.

Ms. de Steuben agreed with the Chairman, stating that what is coming up next with the Special Town Meeting, and "Special within a Special" in order to get another item on the agenda, is an example of that. It is baffling that we have to go through those hoops.

The Chairman noted that Ms. Cicolini has been the most vocal about keeping Saugus a town. He went on to say that if, perhaps, you have a town assembly, and maybe keep a board of selectmen, then, clearly, there are "enough spots so that it is still a leopard." Mr. Manoogian stated that he could support this type of a model, but could not support the constraints and restrictions of Town Meeting anymore.

Ms. Cicolini asked, with the model that the Chairman provided this evening, would Saugus still be a town.

Mr. Manoogian stated that the opening paragraph of the charter would refer to the Town of Saugus, and he believes they would still be a town. He noted that they are not going to take on the Chapter 44 provisions of city government. However, he does want the State Ethics Commission to oversee the legislature. It won't cost a nickel to have that type of oversight.

The Chairman then asked Mr. Curran, as Ms. Cicolini had wondered, if Saugus would still be a town. Mr. Curran responded that there is case law that states "it is the substance of the thing done, not the name given to it, that controls." He then went on to explain the difference between town meeting and representative town meeting. He continued by saying that there are safeguards that can be put in.

The Chairman asked Mr. Curran to discuss some of the things that they don't want to give up as a town, for example, the right of citizens to speak before a legislative body on any matter. The Members have talked about putting those provisions in the charter. The Chairman suggested, maybe instead of posting for 14 days, there should be some type of agenda that should be made public for a period of time for citizens to consider. You can put all of those protections in there if your legislature is going to meet on a monthly basis. It could be published on the web, so that people aren't going to be surprised at what came up at a meeting the night before. He went on to say that you can have the benefits of town meeting worked into the process of that legislature meeting, perhaps make a T-chart of all the things that are good, and eliminate the things that aren't helping, keeping, for example, citizens' right to understand what's being proposed, citizens' right to speak for up to, perhaps, five minutes on a budget matter, or consideration of a budget, all of the things the town has now.

Ms. Cicolini stated that if the Commission goes to a city form of government, it is a lot to put on the people of Saugus. It would be a complete change, whereas fixing what the town has, bringing things more up to code, would be more beneficial to the residents of Saugus. She feels that the model presented would be “fixing it.”

Ms. Panetta agreed that this model would be fixing it, but wanted to add, that when people say they want to stay a town, she always asks them what they see as the difference between a city and a town. They usually come back with an answer like, “I want that warm feeling.” They usually don’t understand what the differences are.

Mr. Curran explained that at least 15 towns have gone to a council / manager or council / mayor form, and except for Easthampton, the others have all kept the nomenclature “town,” and most people are satisfied with that. The “warm feeling” of calling it a town continues, but you would be treated as a city, by the State, for those few things, such as the bonding indebtedness, all positions being subject to civil service regulations. He went on to say that charter commissions have had a special act piggy-backed, that asks the legislature to continue to treat them as a town, as far as the civil service requirements, and those have been allowed. Mr. Curran went on to explain the difference in the way the Housing Authority is handled, and noted that, if the Members decided to continue having the Housing Authority elected, it could be specified in the Charter.

Discussion continued as to how the Members could present the Charter to the public as still being a “town.” Members also discussed the various options of nominating and electing the “at large” members of the legislature, and the pros and cons of town wide vs. district wide.

A recess was called at 9:21 P.M.

Meeting resumed at 9:33 P.M.

The Chairman noted that, prior to the break, the Members had been discussing creating an incentive for the six at large people by creating a four year term for them. Mr. Manoogian questioned having a three year term for the at large members to keep it consistent with the three year term the Members had discussed for the School Committee, and the at large leader. He asked Mr. Curran if there would be more competition with the three year term.

Mr. Curran stated that the three year term would work better, if there were three members from each district, 1 would come up for election every three years, and if all six are at large, two would be elected each year. The four year term would be more confusing.

Ms. de Steuben questioned having elections every year, and the Chairman explained that if you have staggered terms, you have to have annual elections. Ms. de Steuben stated that, if the town does have elections every year, it is something else that the Commission will have to sell, because it will cost the taxpayers more money.

The Chairman noted that, since 2000, the Town has had at least two or three elections during non-election years for debt exclusions and overrides, and they all took place in the spring. You could piggy-back those issues with an election instead of incurring a separate cost.



Members discussed the possibility of having one polling location, which would reduce costs. The Chairman noted that it was not a legislative function, and should be left up to the Election Commissioners, but is certainly something that they, themselves, could consider.

Returning to the discussion of the at large members of the legislature, the Chairman suggested, looking across the board at increasing the school committee terms to 3 yr staggered, and to be consistent, having three year terms for the at large members of the legislature, and if there is an at large leader, that could be 3 years too. He also suggested letting them run town wide.

Mr. Decareau stated that he feels the people will get better representation if they go with the 3 from each district, as outlined. He went on to say that campaigning town wide is a big job. The candidates running for Selectman work for months to cover the entire community.

Mr. Stewart expressed his concern that with a town wide elected leader of the legislature, 6 town wide offices in the legislature, a school committee of some size, and, potentially, a multi-member executive authority, it seems like a lot of town wide elections.

Ms. de Steuben stated that it is a question of who's making the decisions at the legislative body that the Members should be focusing on. The primary decisions that the legislative body is going to make are has to do with appropriations, zoning, and by-laws. Having at large members means that you are going to have at least some members that are representing the whole town, and taking a wider view of what effect their decisions are going to have on the whole town, as opposed to a section of it. We have an element already in the legislative body that is representative of sections of the town. She went on to say that in order to counterbalance that, so that we don't have a balkanization of the decision making process, members looking out for the interest of their own precincts, that we need to have some element that is town wide to look out for the interests of the whole town. Ms. de Steuben stated that she thought about proposing a legislative body that included only at large members. We have one body in town now, the Board of Selectmen, that are all at large, and it was probably the most contested election, this last time around, of all the bodies that ran. There wasn't any contest with the School Committee, there was not a lot of contest with the Town Meeting Members, but there were a lot of people running for the Board of Selectmen. She continued by saying that, she believes people do run for other reasons, such as having a bigger mandate from a larger number of people. There is something about being representative of a larger number of people that gives the sense of having a bigger mandate. She feels that the Commission would be doing a disservice to Saugus if they don't have more than one person in the legislature that is representing the Town at large.

The Chairman presented a scenario: If there are six standing committees, and the at large members serve as chairmen of these committees, you could have the chairman of the budget / finance / audit committee come from five precincts, and people saying, "I never go to vote for that chairman of that committee." He went on to say that the same could hold true with capital building / capital improvements, with perhaps a chairman coming from the part of town that doesn't have a west side fire

station. The agenda could be somewhat skewed, and you could get a huge mandate from one part of town. Mr. Manoogian agreed with Ms. de Steuben, that there is a different perspective that is brought to bear for the at large person that is going to be in a position to do the work of all of the people, representing that perspective in fairness to everyone. It is one of those principles from the Adapted City Model, that research shows to work. The Chairman stated that he came into the meeting with the five, but after hearing this argument, sees the benefit of this.

Mr. Stewart, again, expressed his concern at being able to get enough candidates for all of these town wide positions, and stated that, when Members discuss the executive branch, will probably suggest reducing the size of the executive.

The Chairman noted that with staggered terms, they will not all be running at once, and asked for Mr. Curran's perspective.

Mr. Curran stated that, staggering the terms for office that have all been elected at the same time in the past, will make a big difference. He stated that you could address the specific issue of having three from each of the two districts by having them voted on at large. It does balance out, and is the Newton experience. On the other hand, the purer thing is to elect them all at large.

Mr. Manoogian noted that with 17 at large positions, and three year staggered terms, you are only talking about 6 or 7 positions being on the ballot at the same time.

Mr. Stewart voiced his concern about the first election, when all 17 would be running at the same time. The Chairman asked Mr. Curran what his experience has been with transitional elections and participation.

Mr. Curran stated that, in the first year, there have been a huge number of candidates. Everyone else that he has dealt with has had some type of carry over.

Mr. Manoogian asked, if they put the Charter on the Ballot in November of 2009, and the town will be electing Selectmen and Town Meeting Members in that same election. (The Town Clerk said that if the town goes to spring elections, she would like May), could you say that, for example, that some of those people running for the Board of Selectmen would morph into a position.

Mr. Curran explained that you could transition into the staggered terms by extending some terms, and bobbing others.

Discussion continued on at large / district, having enough candidates, and quality of representation, and with spring elections, which coincide with the budget process, the candidates being able to run on that issue, and being able to make a difference.

Members reached consensus on the size of the legislature:

**A 27 member legislature**

- **1 leader elected town wide**
- **20 precinct representatives (2 from each precinct)**
- **6 at large or 3 per district – still to be discussed**

Discussion continued on the standing committees as presented in tonight's memo.

The members reached consensus as follows:

**Committees, some piggy-back provisions, and some specified by charter (nature of these committees still to be discussed)**

**MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS / MOTIONS**

None at this time.

**PUBLIC FORUM**

None at this time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Cicolini moved to adjourn at 10:17 P.M.

The Chairman seconded the motion.

The motion passed **9-0**

**APPROVED ON** \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBMITTED BY** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Areas of Apparent Consensus**

1. **A professional administrator with the title of Manager**
2. **A screening committee to be used in the process of hiring a manager**
3. **Having policy reside in the hand of elected officials**
4. **An auditing function within the structure of town government**
5. **Auditing and enhanced financial oversight of the School Department**
6. **25 to 35 member legislative body**
7. **Keeping quantity of 10 precincts**
8. **A mixture of at large and precinct specific representatives**
9. **Appointments to policy making boards would be by elected officials**
10. **Staggered terms**
11. **Provision for ethics or conflict of interest**
12. **The proposal or initiation of a master / comprehensive plan should reside with elected official / officials.**
13. **An initiative process**
14. **Continue with a referendum process**
15. **Retain recall in the Charter lowering the percentage to 15% for town wide elections in 25 days, and for precinct specific offices, 20% of registered voters in that precinct.**
16. **Barring an elected official from obtaining a town position during his / her term, after their term has ended, or after they resign, for an amount of time to be determined.**
17. **Having a conflict of interest provision for the legislative body**
18. **A comprehensive plan would be proposed by an elected executive, (individual or multiple member body), and would be adopted by a legislative branch after recommendation of the planning board is obtained. There would be an annual report on the status of the comprehensive plan. There would be transitional provisions in the charter.**
19. **The right of Individual Petition that can take place with either 1 or 10 signatures** (See Section 8-5 (a) of the October 6th Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran)

20. **There will be a group petition process with 50 signatures, and an action required not later than 90 days.**
21. **Include citizen initiative measures**, (as outlined in “Section 8-6: Citizen Initiative Measures” of the October 6th Discussion Draft submitted by Mr. Curran), **but may want to revisit the percentages.**
22. **Article 6 as submitted on October 6th, will be the workable framework for Finance and Fiscal Procedures.** (The Members are waiting to hear back from Mr. Curran on a timeline of budget events, language related to public input process, and language related to quarterly reporting to the elected body that establishes the budget.)
23. **That there would be a finance / audit committee, with the majority of membership originating from the elected legislative body.**
24. **The “Timetable for Budget Actions,” as proposed by Mr. Curran on October 16th, will be the framework for budgetary chronology.**
25. **Section 6-8: Allotments**
26. **General Provisions, provided by Mr. Curran on October 16<sup>th</sup> as follows:**
  - **Section 9-3: Rules of Interpretation**
  - **Section 9-4: Removal or Suspension**
  - **Section 9-5: Rules and Regulations**
  - **Section 9-6: Periodic Review of Charter and Ordinances**
  - **Section 9-7: Uniform Procedures Governing Multiple**
  - **Section 9-8: Oath of Office of Elected Officials**
  - **Section 9-9: Certificate of Election or Appointment**
  - **Section 9-10: Limitation on Office Holding**
  - **Section 9-11: Enforcement of Charter Provisions**
  - **Section 9-12: Public Forums**
  - **Section 9-13: Annual Report of the Town**
  - **Section 9-14: Notice of Vacancies**  
(Language will be filled in and clarified later)
27. **A 27 member legislature**
  - **1 leader elected town wide**
  - **20 precinct representatives (2 from each precinct)**
  - **6 at large** (whether all 6 town wide or 3 per district is still to be discussed)
28. **Committees, some piggy-back provisions, and some specified by charter**  
(nature of these committees still to be discussed)