

CHARTER REVISION COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

JULY 21, 2016

MINUTES

PRESENT: Chairman Stephen Knight; Vice-Chair Christina Tatta; Commissioners Robert Swick; Jim Seichter; Tom Corrigan; Mark Gingras; Jonathan Chappell; Gina Morgenstein; Patricia Kohl; Members of the Public: Tom Laffin, Town Council Vice-Chair; Mary Heffernon, Conservation Commission Chair; Leigh Tauss, Record-Journal.

NOT PRESENT: Commissioners Samuel Carmody and Jim Pyskaty.

Chairman Knight called the Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

1. Approval of Minutes of July 7, 2016

Mr. Gingras made a motion to approve the Meeting Minutes of July 7, 2016 as amended. Mr. Chappell seconded the motion.

On page 7 regarding term limits, the word "not" should be removed. On page 2, second paragraph three lines from the top should read the Town Council had a liaison to attend the PUC meetings; on the last paragraph should read Commissioner Seichter not Chair Seichter.

Vote: Unanimous

Chairman Knight took the agenda in the following order:

Item #3 -Question #1 –"Shall the Charter be revised to provide for an override of the Mayoral veto by six votes of the Town Council where it now provides for seven votes".

Chairman Knight entertained a motion.

Vice-Chair Tatta: Motion that the override of the Mayoral Veto remains seven votes of the Town Council.

Commissioner Kohl: Second

Discussion

Mr. Chappell said he reached out to the Town Council Chair and the Corporation Council and it appears the language as is has been in place since the initial Town Charter. He said this has been seven as long as the Charter has been in existence since 1961. Vice-Chair Tatta said six could be all of one party, so she said to override the Mayoral veto it should require one person not be from the same party, if all six were from the same party. She said having one person from the minority party if there are six to override makes sense.

Ms. Morgenstein said this works in both directions; if one is the party in power, the seven of nine is nice and if one is not the party in power, they would want the number to be less.

Vote: Swick-yes to remain seven votes; Seichter-yes to remain seven votes; Tatta-yes to remain seven votes; Knight-yes to remain seven votes; Corrigan-yes to remain seven votes; Gingras-yes to remain seven votes; Chappell-yes to remain seven votes; Morgenstein-no; Kohl-yes to remain seven votes

Motion passes 8-1

Item #4 – Chairman Knight said there are several elements to this question and was not sure how it should be approached. He opened up general discussion.

Mr. Swick said the initial question was: **“What is the actual purpose of the Board of Ethics per se”**.

Mr. Swick asked if anyone could shed any more light on this subject. Mr. Chappell said there is a Statute which allows for the creation of a Board of Ethics and there is an ethics code by ordinance and a provision in the Charter. He said he was not against ethics but as acting Council for other municipalities, he saw other issues put aside and a lot of money spent. He said he was struck by the proposal in the 2009 ballot as extensive. He cautioned the Commission to be careful what is put in the Charter and noted the Council can control a lot of the Ethics Code by changing the ordinance. Mr. Swick asked if this still needed and does it have to be addressed in the Charter.

Chairman Knight said this has a place and said members of public not in office should have an avenue to bring up issues they believe are worthy of consideration. He asked if the Board was required by State Law. Mr. Chappell said he knows just about every Town has a Board of Ethics. He said the Board issues advisory opinions so if one has an ethics issue they can be contacted and their position determined.

Ms. Morgenstein asked Mr. Chappell if one said too much, then if there is a case called, we might open up the Town to something litigious. She said she didn't understand why the Commission should be careful what is said. Mr. Chappell said he believes the Charter is a starting point to draw a line, and the ordinance is a lot less fluid so a mistake or an error can be changed, but in the Charter it may be 20 years before it can be change. He pointed out that on

page 2 of the ballot question, the “who” cannot be on the Board of Ethics is very stringent and noted he might not even qualify. He pointed out it isn’t easy to get people to volunteer as it is. He said most of the people in this room couldn’t qualify under the current qualifications. He said this will cast a net which is narrow and make it hard to confirm someone.

Mr. Swick mentioned page 3 which states the Town Charter doesn’t specify that the Board of Ethics has to issue a written decision and the proposed revised charter requires a written decision within 30 days of concluding the hearing. He asked if there was any legal recourse after that decision has been made or can the Board of Ethics make a decision which could have legal ramifications to the Town. He said he was very uncomfortable from an economic and legal sense.

Ms. Kohl said the proposed question was in error when it said the Charter doesn’t require a written decision. She said the language goes on to say the advisory opinions shall be published and filed with the Town Clerk. Ms. Kohl said she would say this is a written decision and noted there is an appeal procedure in the Charter on page 38. Mr. Swick asked if this now supersede this and therefore there is no appeal process. He said to him the way the question was written, even back in 2009, doesn’t make sense. He said his biggest point of contention were what would be the legal and or ramifications. Ms. Kohl said she looked at the proposed language from 2009 and noticed the appeal provision was eliminated and wondered if this were legal and didn’t know if it would be. Ms. Kohl said she agreed with the comments regarding the qualifications being too strict on who can or cannot serve.

Mr. Chappell said he had concerns with the entire proposal and was concerned with prohibiting a class of people who could be a potential candidate who may or may not survive the confirmation process. He said this is something the Corporation Counsel should give us guidance on.

Ms. Morgenstein said the Town Council may be asked at times to recuse themselves when asked about ethics and should there be any other person in this. She said she pulled out from East Hampton, a statement of why there should be a code of ethics. She said she believed it made sense to have a statement on why we care about ethics. Ms. Morgenstein said if a resident questions someone’s ability to be objective on an issue, if the code of ethics has no teeth how can one have confidence in the integrity of Town government, adding the consideration of the East Hampton statement may be valuable. She said she looked into the possibility of the ethic advisors being regional citing New London which tried this but didn’t work. She said the people who are voting on the ethics are some people who are involved in many things and if one considers something broader outside the Town itself, it creates another layer.

Chairman Knight asked the Commission if they wished to table this item until the Corporation Counsel could appear in front of the Commission which he said wouldn’t be until August 30

because the Charter Revision and Town Council meet the same night on August 23 and Atty. Small will be at that meeting. He asked if any Commissioner had any real interest in making any changes and if not, he didn't believe Atty. Small needed to be contacted.

Mr. Gingras said it appeared to him that some Commissioners were interested in asking questions regarding making changes. Mr. Swick said he didn't believe in choosing someone from a regional ethics board because we are dealing with Wallingford issues and are a community of our peers. Mr. Chappell said he would like Atty. Small to research is the comparison of the current ethics code with the current ethic charter, noting that if they are not the same, this needs to be addressed. He said if they are the same, the only choice would be to take something out of the Charter and just leave it in the Ethics Code. Ms. Kohl said the only questions she had were in going through the text for tonight's meeting. She said she didn't have any interest in any changes to the ethics section of the Charter. She said she agreed with Mr. Chappell that it might be a good idea to compare what is in the Charter with what is in the Ordinance because the Ordinance can be more specific and can be easily amended.

Chairman Knight said there is enough interest in pursuing this topic further and suggested tabling this item to the August 30 meeting. Vice-Chair Tatta said just this question is confusing enough. She suggested tabling this and talk about it again. Chairman Knight said there is a question about doing this right noting the Corporation Counsel will be here at the August 30 meeting. Mr. Seichter said Chairman Knight's idea was good and said if Commissioners have issues, they should raise them with the Chairman who can discuss them with Atty. Small. He said it was appropriate for the Commission to say if we have issues with the Ethics and how they are elected. Chairman Knight said he would try schedule a discussion of Chapter 17 and the Ordinance.

5. PUC Override which stated: "Shall the Charter be revised by a veto of the Town Council of any action of the PUC by six votes where it now provides for seven votes."

Chairman Knight said if the Commission voted to do nothing, a motion wouldn't be needed. Ms. Morgenstein said this is a timely topic because the WED is considering raising rates and noted the public is being asked to incur more of the rates than previously. She said people have told her that they own the utility company and the business owners don't. She said the PUC said they have to bring the residential rates more in line to be more of a percentage of the payments than the businesses. She said the way to have the public voice heard is to change the reality of an override.

Ms. Morgenstein: Motion to change the current reading to entail requiring only six votes for a Town Council override of the PUC rather than the current seven

Mr. Chappell: Second for purpose of discussion

Mr. Swick noted the wholesale price of electricity has gone through the roof citing deregulation in this part of the country which has created some of the highest prices in the country. He said he sympathized with the PUC because they are being presented with rates over the next four years. He said he didn't see how if the vote override was changed from seven to six will impact the decision of the PUC. He said the PUC are given contracts and electrical rates and this is what they have to deal with and it is a complex process. He said he hadn't heard of any Town Council overrides of the PUC over the years and if there were, it was minimal.

Ms. Kohl said she agreed with Mr. Swick for the same reason we didn't change the Town Council override of the Mayoral veto. She said she wouldn't want to see this be a party line vote. Chairman Knight said he was at the PUC electric rate hearing and the next day spent time with Director George Adair attempting to learn how capacity charges were arrived at. He said this is very complex information and he would have misgivings about ceding some of the authority of the PUC commissioners to Town Councilors. He said we need to leave as much authority with the PUC as shown in the Charter. Mr. Gingras said it was mind boggling what the PUC has to go through. He said at the workshop he attended, the Consultant spent hours going through scenarios and was not just raise the rates; it was not even near that. He said if the Council had to make a decision regarding the PUC, it would probably be one of the most difficult decisions they make.

Mr. Chappell said looking at the Charter document, he said a change will do anything for the current situation and provide the public more protection. He said there are public hearings and meetings where people can voice their concerns. He said as far as the Charter document, this Commission is not controlling electric rates and was inclined to keep everything as is. Ms. Morgenstein said the PUC has people with real expertise, and she was just expressing some people's opinions.

Vote: Seichter-no to change from seven to six; Swick-no; Morgenstein-yes to change from seven to six; Kohl-no; Chappell-no; Corrigan-no; Knight-no; Tatta-no; Gingras-no.

Motion defeated.

Item #6 – Question #6 -“Shall the Charter be revised to provide for the passage of a referendum or ordinance by initiative by a majority vote of at least 15% of the electors where it now requires 20%”.

Mr. Chappell asked if there were actual numbers or estimates from the last election in order to gather how much of a difference the 5% really is. Ms. Morgenstein said she believed there was an approximate 24% turnout for the last Mayoral election. Mr. Chappell said 5% sounds big if talking a large number, but if a small number, it is a few bodies and said he didn't see this question warranting a change, but said it would help decide the issue if he knew the actual numbers and if it ever made a difference to the Town.

Chairman Knight said it's not whether or not to have a referendum, that is 10%; it's whether or not the vote stands. Mr. Seichter said he preferred to keep the number at 20% which makes more sense than lowering it. He said we elect our Mayor and Town Council and if people are not confident in what they are doing, the people can vote not to re-elect them. Mr. Seichter said it should not be too easy to start second guessing. Vice-Chair Tatta said she agreed with Mr. Seichter and said she would want a good reason for changing this number, not just based on 2009. Mr. Corrigan said he agreed with Mr. Seichter noting that if 20% of the vote is not a large number. Chairman Knight said everyone loves participatory democracy, but there comes a point where it affects the efficiency and effectiveness of the government. He said we do elect people to office and expect them to make votes and we have seen the results of some of the referendums which have come to pass in this Town which required the 20% and got the 20% gave it legitimacy. Chairman Knight said the lower the number, where only 15% of the people have to appear, this is only 7.5 plus one vote can kill a vote of the Council which doesn't make sense. Mr. Chappell noted that the same section of the Charter requires at least 10% to petition to have a referendum, so the 10% and 20% seem to make sense because the majority of the 20% have to vote.

NO ACTION TAKEN-NO CHANGES MADE

ITEM #2 – Discussion and possible action concerning Chapter IV, Section 5 of the Town Charter and any other section pertaining to the Inland Wetlands Commission or Conservation Commission

Chairman Knight acknowledged the receipt of Ms. Heffernon's letter to the Commission which he said the Conservation Commission believes the position of Environmental Planner should be classified and not appointed by the Inland Wetlands Commission. He said there was correspondence from Atty. Small. He said late this afternoon a memo went out from Personnel Director James Hutt regarding the Conservation Commission/Environmental Planner position which he distributed to the Commissioners.

Ms. Heffernon said she wanted to make clear this comes request comes from the Conservation Commission and not from the Environmental Planner. Chairman Knight said there are two elements to this issue: who is going to appoint the Environmental Planner and referencing the Conservation Commission. Ms. Heffernon said who has the ability to fire the Environmental Planner is another issue.

Chairman Knight read Mr. Hutt's memo which stated: "the position of Environmental Planner is covered under the Classified Services of the Town of Wallingford. This position should be treated the same as similar department head level positions in the Classified Service that fall under the Executive Branch of Town government which includes the appointment and removal by the Mayor. If this were to be adopted, this change would necessitate the removal of the last

sentence of Chapter IV, Section 5 of the Town Charter pertaining to the Inland Wetlands Commission appointing employees.

Additionally, with respect to the language of Chapter VIII, Section 3 (a) of the Charter which states, in part: the Planning & Zoning Commission may at its discretion, appoint such additional enforcement officers as deemed appropriate and/or necessary. It is unnecessary for this sentence to be in the Charter as it is covered by State law. I have confirmed this with Corporation Counsel, Janis Small."

Mr. Seichter said when he was looking through the Charter where it stated the Commission shall appoint and remove, he wondered if this were the case. He said Mr. Hutt's statement in his memo about the appointment and removal by the Mayor because the Environmental Planner's position falls under Classified Service, is what he thought would happen. Ms. Heffernon noted the Environmental Planner reports to the IWWC. Mr. Seichter asked if the IWWC has the ability to appoint and remove the Environmental Planner. Ms. Heffernon said the IWWC has this ability and noted there were several meetings and interviews and the IWWC offered the Environmental Planner her job.

Ms. Heffernon said the Environmental Planner has to answer to the IWWC and if there is an issue, the Mayor doesn't get involved. She said she isn't aware of any other circumstance in Town where a volunteer Commission is in charge of a staff member. Ms. Heffernon said the Environmental Planner is shared with the Conservation Commission. Chairman Knight said the Personnel Director agrees the Environmental Planner should be a Mayoral appointment as other department heads in Town. He said some changes to the wording of the Town Charter will have to be made.

Ms. Kohl said there are protections by being in the Classified Service (union). Chairman Knight asked Ms. Heffernon who the Environmental Planner would report to if changes were made. Ms. Heffernon said she would report to her supervisor, the Mayor. Ms. Heffernon said she shouldn't report to a volunteer Commission. Chairman Knight said he would like the Charter Revision Commission to make a motion to ask Atty. Small to draft language that agrees with what the Charter Revision Commission wants to do.

Ms. Kohl: Motion that the Charter be amended to state that the Environmental Planner is appointed and may be removed by the Mayor, and that the Law Dept. be asked to provide suggested language to comply with the Classified Service section of the Charter.

Mr. Seichter: Second

Vote: Chappell-yes; Kohl-yes; Seichter –yes; Morgenstein-yes; Gingras-yes; Corrigan-yes; Swick-yes; Tatta-yes; Knight-yes

Motion passes

Chairman Knight said this will be sent out to Atty. Small and taken up at the next Charter Revision Commission meeting.

Chairman Knight pointed out the other half of this issue is that there is no reference to the Conservation Commission in the Town Charter. Ms. Heffernon said there was an error in her letter and the Conservation Commission is not mandated. She said a municipality may establish a Conservation Commission, it is not mandated. She said every other Commission has wording on how they get appointed. She said it would be good to put a sentence in the Charter on how the Conservation Commission is appointed. She said currently, the Mayor appoints the Commissioners and is not party driven.

Vice-Chair Tatta: Motion that the Conservation Commission not be added to the Charter

Ms. Kohl: Second

Discussion

Ms. Tatta referred to Atty. Small's memo which stated she cautioned the Commission as mandatory, an optional Commission or Board. She said she spoke to Atty. Small and noted that legally. Atty. Small had reservations about adding Boards and Commissions to the Charter which are not State mandated. She said Atty. Small referred to other Boards & Commissions which are not in the Charter.

Mr. Gingras asked Ms. Heffernon why she preferred to have the Conservation Commission in the Charter. Ms. Heffernon said she didn't have strong feelings one way or the other, but noted the Charter Revision Commission doesn't have to put wording in that the Conservation Commission is mandated, wording could be put in that the Town may established and how it is appointed. She said she saw no harm in this. Mr. Gingras asked what the purpose would be. He said wording could be put in "may" do it, and noted this is being done now, and asked why it is important the Commission be put into the Charter. Ms. Heffernon said this would specify how the Conservation Commission is being appointed as the other Commissions say how they are appointed. Ms. Morgenstein said this also just expresses this is a value that we hold, as something we want to have.

Ms. Kohl said the Charter doesn't need to specify how members are appointed because Atty. Small memo's makes clear the Statute specifies who appoints and how. She said this is under State Statute. Mr. Seichter said he wouldn't be in favor and doesn't seem to be a necessity. Ms. Kohl read the Statute-Sec. 7-1-31 (a): "Conservation Commissions – Any Town, City or Borough by vote of its Legislative body, may establish a Conservation Commission for the development, conservation, supervision and regulation of natural resources, including water resources, within

its territorial limits. The Commission shall consist of not fewer than three or more than eleven members and not more than three alternates, to be appointed by the Chief Executive Officer of the Municipality to serve for terms designated by the Legislative Body establishing the Commission. Such Alternate members when seated, shall have all the powers and duties of the members of the Commission. The Chief Executive Officer may remove any member or alternate for cause and may fill any vacancy."

Mr. Gingras said the way things are set up for now is fine. He said the Commission is doing the job it is doing and there seems to be responsible people on there and if that isn't ever the case, the Mayor will take care of this. Mr. Chappell said he is inclined to follow Atty. Small's advice. Chairman Knight said he didn't prefer to enshrine anything to the Town Council if it weren't necessary.

Vice-Chair Tatta WITHDREW her motion and Ms. Kohl WITHDREW her second on the motion that the Conservation Commission not be added to the Charter.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Chairman Knight asked the Commissioners to clean up the Constable issue. He cited a memo from Atty. Small which stated: "upon further review, I believe you can eliminate Constables from the Charter or amend the Charter to provide that the Council may, by ordinance, appoint Constables in accordance with the Law. I will point out the Marshalls are appointed by County. New Haven County has 60. Two are from Wallingford. In the event either one no longer serves, any replacement would not necessarily result in the appointment of a Wallingford resident."

Chairman Knight said Atty. Small's thinking must be that in the future, there might be a use for a Constable. Mr. Gingras said he didn't agree and noted that he believed what Atty. Small was saying was there were 60 people and basically that Constables can serve papers. He said if this is the case, Marshals can do the same thing, except they are from the County rather than through the Town. He said he believed Atty. Small was indicating there are 60 available throughout the State that can serve papers and there happen to be two from Wallingford, but that doesn't necessarily mean one needs anyone from Wallingford to serve papers within Wallingford.

Ms. Kohl said the 60 Marshals who cover New Haven County have jurisdiction in any town in the County. She noted the Constables can only serve in Wallingford. Ms. Morgenstein said she believed Atty. Small was saying that there was a chance that of those 60 in the County, one could wind up, if the two in Wallingford were to leave, we might end up with two more from another Town, (Marshals), and not have anyone from Wallingford. She wondered if this really mattered.

Mr. Chappell said if there were no State Marshals in Wallingford, they could still be Constables if they were in the Charter. He said they would have limited serving power as a Town Constable.

He said there would be no opportunity for anyone from Wallingford to serve papers as a legal process if they were removed from the Charter. He said he didn't know what the value was either way.

Mr. Seichter said he was ambivalent about this issue stating we have had the Constables for a long period of time and don't see any harm in keeping them. He said this is not a pressing issue. Mr. Gingras wondered what would happen if someone in Wallingford needed papers to be served and there were no Constables or Marshals who resided in Wallingford. Mr. Chappell said the Constable could still serve papers under State Statute if there were no Marshals in Wallingford. Mr. Gingras said the Constables do serve a purpose.

Ms. Morgenstein said they are not used at all because there is a fear of liability. Vice-Chair Tatta said she heard from one of the Constables where he was called to serve papers on a few occasions because it was a sensitive situation and a Marshal didn't seem appropriate. Mr. Corrigan said this Constable position seems ceremonial but if there is no cost, there is no harm in keeping the position. Ms. Kohl said there are two choices: leave the Charter the way it is and make the Constables mandatory or take Atty. Small's suggestion that the Charter be amended to say that the Council MAY, by Ordinance, appoint Constables. Vice-Chair Tatta said if the Commission chooses to change this, this would be another item the public would have to vote on.

Vice-Chair Tatta-Motion that no changes to the Charter language with regard to the Town Constables be made.

Mr. Seichter: Second

Vote: Swick-yes; Corrigan-yes; Gingras-yes; Morgenstein-yes; Seichter-yes; Chappell-yes; Kohl-yes; Tatta-yes; Knight-yes

Motion passes

Mr. Seichter spoke about appointments and suggested looking at cleaning up how it works. Chairman Knight said Question #7 will be postponed until Atty. Small can attend the Aug. 30th meeting. He said for the Aug. 23 meeting, he will take all the requests he has had and go through some of the public correspondence and see if the deck can be cleared on some of these issues. He said at the first public hearing, there was an interest in a second public hearing, stating this would be a good thing to do. He said the Commission must first get through the public questions and any questions the Commissioners had. Chairman Knight said he hoped to accomplish this in the next three meetings.

Mr. Chappell said it would be a good idea to have something for the public to hear like a redline version so the public could see what the Commission has or hasn't done and they can comment on this rather than just review the Minutes and votes. Chairman Knight said by the Sept. 15

meeting, the Commission should know where it is at and possibly schedule the second public hearing in October. Ms. Kohl asked if there needs to be a draft charter showing changes or can the Commission prepare a list of topics discussed and whether the Commission has approved or not approved the changes. Mr. Chappell said it is easier and more efficient to do a red line version.

Ms. Kohl said her other concern is that the Law Department would have to draft any of the changes, and draft the actual language for the changes made. Chairman Knight said he believed Atty. Small has done this. Vice-Chair Tatta asked about typos and asked if people had to vote to fix this. Some Commissioners noted they had different versions of the Charter, some with typos and some without and this was discussed.

Chairman Knight said the Commission should have seen responses regarding the Board of Ed memo from the Purchasing Department. He said in his mind this took care of it, but noted Ms. Kohl obtained additional information from Mr. Hutt on whether there was anything in the Board of Education memo which was pertinent to the Charter Revision Commission's work. He spoke about his email to Schools Supt. Sal Menzo and said there didn't seem to be a single thing the Commission needed to deal with in the Town Charter. Ms. Kohl said there might be one issue, noting the Board of Education made some type of comment regarding the bid limit. She said the Commission received a memo from Atty. Small stating the Commission can change the language to read the bid limit is set by ordinance. She said she believed this is the only thing from the Board of Education that the Commission can do something about. Chairman Knight cited Chapter 7, Section 4, page 16, Line 59 which mentions \$2,000 or more. He asked if the Commission wanted to take action on this tonight.

Ms. Kohl said the 2009 language on page 15 of the draft states "purchases shall be made under such rules and regulations as may be established by Ordinance, which among other things, shall provide, that if any purchase or contract for purchasing including a continuing order or contract for the purchase of the same commodity or service over a period of time involves of the expenditure of a minimum sum specified in the Ordinance. The purchasing agent, unless it shall be determined by the Council to be against the best interest of the Town, shall make the purchase by a competitive bid or selection process as defined and specified in said Ordinance."

Ms. Kohl said the \$2,000 limit was taken out along with "invite sealed bids or proposals giving sufficient publication to the trade and/or the profession and 10 days public notice thereof by publication at least once in the newspaper in the Town, and shall let the purchase or contract to the lowest responsible bidder thereof and may reject any or all such bids or proposals, all such sealed bids or proposals shall be opened publically."

Ms. Morgenstein said there needs to be a discussion on this because this is something that can't be acted upon quickly. In response to Mr. Seichter's question, Chairman Knight said the Board of Education was asking for specific numbers. Mr. Seichter said it seemed this started out as a

simple request but is getting more complicated. Ms. Kohl said Atty. Small suggested the Commission use the 2009 draft language. The Commission agreed to postpone any action.

Ms. Kohl said the Commission could address an issue in Mr. Hutt's memo regarding the Planning & Zoning Commission may at its discretion appoint additional enforcement officers as deemed appropriate or necessary. She said Mr. Hutt's memo states this sentence is unnecessary to be in the Charter as it is covered by State Law and this has been confirmed by Atty. Small. Ms. Kohl said this is in Chapter 8, Section 3 (a) under the Building Inspection section, page 17.

Mr. Gingras said all if this should be taken up together. Ms. Kohl said this can be put off until the Commission deals with Planning & Zoning and other issues.

Adjournment

Ms. Morgenstein made a motion to adjourn the Meeting at 8:15 p.m. Ms. Kohl seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia A. Kleist

Recording Secretary