TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

Special Meeting Monday, July 9, 2018 Scout Hall, 28 Abbe Road, East Windsor, CT.

Committee Members

Co-Chairman: John Matthews, Keith Yagaloff

Members: Don Arcari, Cher Balch, Betsy Burns, William Loos, John Mazza,

Rachel Safford Charlie Szymanski, Bonnie Yosky

MEETING MINUTES

*** These Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting ***

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL:

Co-Chairman Matthews called the Meeting to Order at 7:02 p.m. in Meeting Room 2, Scout Hall, 28 Abbe Road, East Windsor, CT.

ATTENDANCE: <u>Present:</u> John Matthews, Co-Chairman; Keith Yagaloff, Co-

Chairman; Don Arcari; Betsy Burns; William Loos; John Mazza; Rachel Safford; Charlie Szymanski, Bonnie Yosky

Absent: Cher Balch

Press: No one from the Press was present.

PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES, COMMENTS AND ACCEPTANCE VOTE:

MOTION: To AMEND the Minutes of the Charter Revision Commission Regular

Meeting dated June 25, 2018 as follows:

Page 1: Attendance: Cher Balch was present.

Page 2: Not included in copy of document; Minutes to be reviewed at

The Commission's July 23, 2018 Special Meeting for approval.

Yosky moved/Loos seconded/ VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

(Matthews/Yagaloff/Aracari/Burns/Loos/Mazza/Safford/Saymanski/Yosky)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: The public is encouraged to provide their thoughts as succinct as possible. CRC members will not comment on the merits of an idea at this meeting, but may ask questions to clarify the proposal. A time limit may be imposed.

No one from the public was present.

OLD BUSINESS/A. Discussion of 6/21 Town meeting results and process:

i. Recommended changes to Supplemental Appropriation Process:

1. Obtain bids before advancing project proposal:

The Commission reviewed several documents related to standards for the competitive bidding process, including past correspondence from surrounding towns and an excerpt from the Connecticut General Statutes. The current bid process, as approved by the Board of Selectmen (BOS) in June, 2014 was reviewed. The Commission felt the *projects should be submitted with a detailed work proposal/scope*. The difficulty acquiring cost estimates at the project proposal scoping/review stage was noted; the formal bid process would occur after approval of the project by the Board of Finance/Board of Selectmen. The bid process, including publication in local newspapers, opening/awarding of the bid, followed by project initiation was discussed. The Commission felt that if the specified project comes in under the voter approved amount then remaining funds should be returned to the funding source rather than be reallocated to another outstanding project. Approved projects should include a "not to exceed amount".

2. All requests proposed to go through Board of Selectmen first:

Discussion followed regarding the supplemental appropriation approval of a Capital Improvement Project. The process was discussed relative to the timing of submission of project detail and the work statement. The Commission reviewed the Capital Improvement Project process for project review and selection prior to review by the Board of Selectmen. The Commission felt the Board of Finance should advise on the affordability of any proposed increase in the budget or supplemental appropriation. Should the Commission add the position of Chief Financial Officer the Commission felt that *the CFO should sign off on all estimates presented*.

3. Board of Finance and Chief Financial Officer to advise and consent (can be overruled):

<u>The Commission considered the need to create a position to assist with budget preparation and guide the Boards through the budget process</u>. The Commission is seeking better communication between the Boards/Commissions/Committees. Discussion followed regarding the position being a Town Manager, Town Administrator, or Chief Financial Officer.

MOTION: To CONSIDER having a Town Administrator.

Burns moved/Mazza seconded/

DISCUSSION: Co-Chairman Matthews recalled that an earlier Charter document had proposed the Town Manager position; he noted that vote failed 3:1. Members felt the public had perceived the Town Manager position to have too much power/responsibility. The Commission felt the job description needs to be more specific as to whom that person reports to, what are their responsibilities, how does the Board of Selectmen fit in the process? Co-Chairman Matthews suggested the <u>CFO position should include responsibilities of a municipal analyst to compare what other towns are doing</u>.

Discussion followed regarding the pros and cons of creating a Town Administrator position. Co-Chairman Yagaloff suggested such a position adds another layer of administration which can result in a less responsive town. The Board of Selectmen will be elected officials but will no longer be responsible for the decisions; they become simply policymakers. While there will be more consistency as the Town Administrator continues on through changing Boards the Town Administrator will be subject to the same pressures as everyone else. Co-Chairman Matthews felt the voters lose their voices and need a way to make timely changes where things go awry.

MOTION: To POSTPONE discussion on the Town Administrator until more research is completed.

Yosky moved/Safford seconded/DISCUSSION: Nothing further.

VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

(Matthews/Yagaloff/Arcari/Burns/Loos/Mazza/Safford/Szymanski/Yosky)

4. Board of Selectmen to hold hearing before Town Meeting:

The <u>Commission discussed adding an additional step between approval of the funding request by the Board of Finance/Board of Selectmen to acquire more detailed information. The Board of Selectmen would hold a separate Public Hearing prior to sending the proposal to Town Meeting. During the overall approval process the Board of Selectmen would refer to the requirements of the Charter regarding the item being referred to Town Meeting, or any Charter requirements specific to the Board. If the Charter requirements were not adhered to then the Board of Selectmen would deny the funding proposal or any increase in the budget during the budget process.</u>

5. Town Meeting to have minimum attendance or go to referendum for final approval:

The Commission discussed adding a requirement that approval of projects at Town Meeting would be subject to a specified percentage of the voting public. The Commission considered East Windsor's population of 10,000 to 12,000 and;

8,000 registered voters a requirement that 1% of the voters must be present, and vote, at the Town meeting would compute to 80 residents. Should the minimum attendance at a Town Meeting fail to be established the question would advance to a referendum.

The Commission cited concern that this requirement would result in excessive referendums. To reduce the financial impact or voter inconvenience the Commission considered establishing a periodic referendum schedule, perhaps grouping requests to a quarterly referendum. A more detailed method might be to base the funding requests by value: under \$50,000 would go to Town Meeting, no quorum required, no referendum option; greater than \$50,000 but less than \$200,000 would require attendance by 1% of the voter list; over \$200,000 would require a 3% voter attendance l. See additional comments under "Ordinance Approval".

NEW BUSINESS/A. Review Ordinance origination/change process:

Approval of ordinances should require attendance by 2% of the voter list.

NEW BUSINESS/B. Review Annual Budget Process:

A recommendation had been made to include large ticket items as a line item approval during our budget process; the Town of Preston had been noted as an example of the line item vote in Connecticut. It was noted Ellington initially votes on the total budget but if failed divides the approval process into separate approvals for the General Town Government and the Board of Education. East Windsor votes on the total budget with a 2% default increase after 3 votes. Discussion followed regarding the public's displeasure with increased taxes vs. the possible inability to maintain growth as a town due to budget funding restrictions.

NEW BUSINESS/C. Develop list of responsibilities of Financial Officer:

Discussion postponed to research job descriptions.

NEW BUSINESS/D. Review/Discuss Charge from Board of Selectmen:

Mrs. Yosky felt that part of the charge from the Board of Selectmen is for this Commission to clarify what responsibilities fall to which entity. She suggested the Commission consider reviewing the document chapter by chapter to create more specific/clear language to clarify the roles and responsibilities. Co-Chairman Matthews suggested he would delay this to identify problems/concerns and solutions first.

2ND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

No one from the public was present.

SUGGESTIONS FOR NEXT MEETING AGENDA:

Continue review of responsibilities of Town Administrator, Town Manager, and Chief Financial Officer.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Yosky moved/Yagaloff seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary for the 2018 Charter Revision Commission