

Town of Ridgefield
Charter Revision Commission Regular Meeting
Monday, April 30, 2018 – 7:00 p.m.
Town Hall Large Conference Room
400 Main Street, Ridgefield, Connecticut
APPROVED MEETING MINUTES

*These minutes are a general summary of the meeting and are not intended to be a verbatim transcription.

Members Present:

E. Burns, W. Davidson, J. Egan, E. Geisinger, C. Hancock, J. Seem, J. Shapiro, L. Steinman, P. Walsh

Agenda

1. Open for Public Comment.
2. Dave Ulmer, Chairman of the Board of Finance.
3. Jane Berendsen-Hill, Tax Collector.
4. Review tracker of proposed Charter changes and possible vote.
5. Approve the Minutes from Charter Revision Commission Special Meeting on April 21, 2018.
6. Any other business.
7. Adjournment.

The meeting was called to order by CRC Chair Jon Seem at 7:00 p.m. He noted that there is a full agenda, including some guests. He opened the meeting to public comment.

1. Open for Public Comment.

Public Comment by Frances Walton, Chair, Board of Education.

Frances Walton, the Chair of the Board of Education (BOE), spoke first. She noted that she had sent a submission to the CRC. Addressing the possibility of having time specifically schedule for the BOE to comment to the CRC, she noted that Saturday, May 5, 2018, would not work for her and for many BOE members.

Ms. Walton noted that the submission contained two proposals. She explained that one of the two concerns establishing a carryover account when there is a surplus. The surplus, she said, could go into the carryover account and help the BOE when there are unanticipated expenses. She explained that unanticipated expenses can

include unanticipated special education expenses, and she provided some examples of special needs costs.

Ms. Walton said that the BOE can move its spending around to meet other needs, but is not allowed to close the year in deficit. She said that she expects to end the year with a \$95,000 surplus that will be returned to the town. She said that the BOE would want to carryover such a surplus, but currently there is no provision for such a carryover in the Charter. She observed that the Board of Finance (BOF) does not provide for a carryover.

Ms. Walton then said that the other proposal in the BOE submission is a request that the Board of Selectmen (BOS) nonbinding recommendation concerning the BOE budget be removed from the Charter. She explained that it was added to the Charter in 2010, and that BOE members subsequently advocated its removal from the Charter. She explained her reasons by first noting that the members of the BOE are elected directly. They have a deep knowledge of the needs of the school district and the resources required, she said. The difficulty that the BOE is finding when preparing to submit the budget to provide to the BOS, she commented, is that the BOE really is not ready to determine the budget. Ms. Walton noted the late determination of healthcare costs as an example of the budgetary uncertainty at that point in time.

Ms. Walton expressed concern that there would not be a good upcoming opportunity for the BOE to further elaborate its view to the CRC at a time when consideration of the BOE proposals is an agenda item since the May 5, 2018 date would not work and the next two scheduled BOE meetings are on May 14, 2018 and May 29, 2018 (which are the dates of the next two regular meetings of the CRC).

Mr. Seem noted that in light of those schedule concerns, he was willing to let Ms. Walton extend her comments and to entertain questions from CRC members.

There followed some questioning on how the 1% amount would work in the carryover account. Ms. Walton explained that some towns that have done this have adopted strict guidelines. She explained that the cap on the carryover would be 1% of the current year BOE budget. She said that she views this as intended for use for special education expenses. Mr. Steinman said that his reading of the statute is that the limit is 1% per year, meaning that it could grow above that 1% figure.

Mr. Steinman then explained that his principal comment is that the statute, as he reads it, gives the BOF the authority to do what the BOE has requested without any

change in the Charter, although he would defer to what the Town Attorney would have to say. The enabling legislation, he then reiterated, seems to give direct authority to the BOF if it wishes to exercise that authority.

Mr. Davidson expressed a view that there should be a cap if the Charter were to be amended to provide for a carryover fund, and Charter amendment should limit the use of the carryover fund to special education unless the BOE specifically seeks authorization for another purpose.

Mr. Hancock noted that even if allocated to special education, the BOE would have the authority to move funds, so limiting it to special education would not be meaningful.

Ms. Geisinger stated that there is political risk if the CRC were to recommend this change. She elaborated, noting that if the Charter change to establish a carryover fund were presented to voters, and the voters were to turn it down, that negative outcome with the voters would make it politically difficult for the BOF to decide to exercise its apparent statutory power in order to accomplish a purpose that the voters had decided was not advisable.

David Ulmer, Chairman of the BOF, noted that some towns have this carryover, and its use is normally very restrictive. He said that if the Charter were revised to give the BOF the ability to put in the carryover and take it out, it would work, but it would be redundant to the authority already given by statute.

Mr. Shapiro stated that it would be good to get the opinion of the Town Attorney both as to independent authority of the BOF without a Charter change, and as to how a new Charter provision regarding a carryover would affect the BOF's independent authority under the state statute.

Mr. Walsh said that is clear to him that under the statute establishing the carryover is the BOF's responsibility, and should not be submitted to voters as a Charter revision.

Ms. Walton said that she is happy to take that back to the BOE.

Mr. Davidson said that perhaps it would be prudent if the BOF were to consider a special fund for carryovers as proposed by the BOE.

Ms. Walton then addressed the second Charter revision request by the BOE, which is the elimination of the nonbinding recommendation of the BOS regarding the BOE that was added to the Charter in 2010. She explained that the primary problem is a practical one. The BOE, she explained, has not tied down its numbers by the time it needs to submit its budget to the BOS for the nonbinding recommendation of the BOS. In particular, she cited the difficulty of healthcare budgeting.

Mr. Steinman noted that other than the formality, there is nothing that prevents the BOS from making a recommendation, so he said he does not see that the current provision makes a difference.

Mr. Davidson said that it is appropriate that the nonbinding recommending by the BOS be in the Charter because of the overall responsibility of the BOS.

There followed a discussion of healthcare costs, the timing of the determination of healthcare costs, and the relatedness of the healthcare costs of the BOE and those of the town.

Ms. Geisinger noted that four years ago, when the BOE expressed to the 2014 Charter Revision Commission the BOE's opposition to the nonbinding recommendation of the BOS, she and the other members of the 2014 Charter Revision Commission felt that the current language provided good checks and balances.

Rudy Marconi, First Selectman, spoke on required timing in the budget process. He concluded that removal of the nonbinding recommendation from the Charter would not make much of a difference in required timing for presentation of the budget.

Ms. Burns asked how many time the BOS has given a negative nonbinding recommendation since the provision was added to the Charter in 2010. Mr. Marconi provided some general comments on the process.

Mr. Ulmer then spoke about healthcare costs in the budget. He explained some of the figures and how those figures were ultimately developed. He said that healthcare costs in the budget have generally been the source, ultimately, of a surplus in the BOE budget as actual costs have come in lower than budget.

Public Comment by Jan Rifkinson.

Mr. Rifkinson noted that he had submitted written comments concerning Section 10-1(c) of the Charter and the interpretation of "line item" at the Annual Town and

Budget Meeting. He spoke about the issue concerning the interpretation of “line item” in the context of the BOE budget and he answered questions from members of the CRC, who also offered comments. Mr. Davidson and Mr. Hancock expressed the view that the Annual Town and Budget Meeting should be able to lower the bottom line of the budget.

Public Comment by Ed Tyrrell.

Mr. Tyrrell pointed out that he made a motion to reduce the total BOE budget at last year’s Annual Town and Budget Meeting and he was ruled out of order. He then made a motion to reduce the certified salary line of the BOE budget, which was voted upon. It was voted down.

2. Dave Ulmer – Chairman of the Board of Finance.

Mr. Seem explained the reason for inviting Mr. Ulmer to the meeting. Mr. Seem noted that there are several matters on which the CRC would like to hear from Mr. Ulmer. He thanked Mr. Ulmer for his written response, which consisted of an email of April 27, 2018 to the CRC. Mr. Seem also referred to the February 5, 2018 letter from Mr. Marconi transmitting Charter comments of the BOS, some of which involve the BOF.

In that letter there was a request that the CRC define “Town agency” and also the matter of the definition of “line item” and related publication in a local newspaper. Mr. Seem also referred to Mr. Rifkenson’s request which also relates to “line item”. The last item, Mr. Seem explained, is the proposal by Mr. Hancock that the First Selectman be a voting member of the BOF.

Mr. Steinman asked if Mr. Ulmer has a comment on timelines. Mr. Ulmer said that timelines are always compressed, and sometimes educated guesses are required, but there is nothing that can really be done about that. He said that the timelines are difficult, but not insurmountable.

Mr. Davidson asked Mr. Ulmer suppose that at a town meeting there could be a reduction by the town meeting in the bottom line of the BOS budget as well as the BOE budget, and suppose that the BOS had the flexibility that the BOE has to reallocate money, rather than getting into an issue of line items. He asked Mr. Ulmer what he thought of just changing the bottom line. Mr. Ulmer said he thought that was fine. He said that is consistent with what the BOF does, so he thought it would be fine if the town meeting could do that. Mr. Steinman noted that at the end of the day, the result is to reduce the budget as a whole.

Mr. Walsh asked about reallocating funds from one department of the town to another. Mr. Ulmer explained that first the BOS has to approve it and then the BOF has to approve it. Mr. Ulmer explained that intra-department the BOS can move things around.

Mr. Marconi stated that he would be concerned about giving the BOS the same power that the BOE has to move money around. He does not like it, he stated. He said that the current system is a good check and balance and keeps us focused on our original projections.

Ms. Burns stated that if the bottom line budget were reduced at a town meeting, then the BOS would be given the authority to reallocate. Mr. Marconi said that he understands that point if the bottom line of the budget were changed at a town meeting. Mr. Davidson returned to the issue of "line item". Mr. Marconi gave a brief history of the town meeting and line item when the vote was taken at a town meeting and it did not go to referendum.

Following some additional discussion of the budget process, Mr. Hancock explained to Mr. Ulmer the reason for Mr. Hancock's proposal that the First Selectman be a voting member of the BOF. Mr. Hancock explained that in the private sector, a CEO is regarded as the person responsible for the financial health of the company, and people in Ridgefield regard our First Selectman as having that responsibility. Mr. Hancock's proposal, he explained, would make the First Selectman's job more accurately reflect what the people of the town believe the First Selectman's job is.

Mr. Ulmer responded that in most organizations a CFO reports to a CEO, but he noted that the Charter now has a system of checks and balances, and that the proposal by Mr. Hancock throws a wrench in the cogs. He said that he had not discussed this with the members of the BOF but he had sent them the proposal. He said that one member of the BOF wrote back, expressing opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Davidson raised the possibility of making a line item a department's budget.

Mr. Hancock asked about the handling the town budget and the school budget, noting that the BOE can move things around within the school budget, but the town cannot. Mr. Marconi explained the process further. Mr. Marconi said that after approval of the budget by the voters, if moving expenditures is within a department the BOS can move it, but if expenditures go from one department to another then the move needs BOS and BOF approval.

Ms. Geisinger noted that line item vetoes are unconstitutional at the Federal level, and she reflected on the concept as we apply it in Ridgefield.

Mr. Shapiro noted that Mr. Ulmer, in his April 27, 2018 email, proposed that the Charter should be changed to define what should be done with capital closeout funds. He asked Mr. Ulmer if he could provide language to the CRC regarding his recommended Charter change.

Mr. Ulmer explained that the current Charter is silent as to what is to be done with capital closeout funds when there are monies left over. He explained that it goes into the general fund, but can be taken out of the general fund to do other things with it, which he said he thought would require a town meeting. He noted that several years ago, a member of the BOS wanted the leftover funds to be used to pay down the town's debt rather than going into the general fund. He said that there was a legal opinion saying that legally it was up to the BOS whether it would be used for return to the general fund or for the paydown of town debt. Previously, according to Mr. Ulmer, it had been the BOF which made such a decision, and the legal opinion had been a surprise. Mr. Ulmer said that the Charter should specify whether the BOS or the BOF decides the use for leftover capital closeout funds.

Mr. Steinman and Mr. Walsh referred to the applicable statute. Mr. Davidson asked whether Mr. Ulmer would be comfortable with the Charter specifying that the unexpended capital project funds go into the general fund. Mr. Ulmer said he would be comfortable. Mr. Ulmer also noted that it had been bond counsel that had opined on the issue. Mr. Marconi identified the bond counsel as Robinson & Cole LLP. Mr. Davidson cautioned that any change should be checked with bond counsel.

Mr. Ulmer concluded by saying that he will try to get back to the CRC regarding a recommendation on this issue of leftover funds from capital projects. He said he would do so by contacting BOF members electronically since the next BOF meeting is not until May 15, 2018.

3. Jane Berendsen-Hill, Tax Collector; and Barbara Serfilippi, Town Clerk.

Jane Berendsen-Hill, the Tax Collector, and Barbara Serfilippi, the Town Clerk, spoke to the CRC about the proposal by the Board of Selectmen to make those two offices appointive rather than elective.

Ms. Serfilippi noted that she had sent an email to Mr. Seem expressing her view and the reasons for her view. Mr. Seem stated that the email (email of April 30, 2018) had been distributed to all members of the CRC.

Ms. Serfilippi said that although there are good arguments on both sides, she still believes that the position of Town Clerk should remain an elective position.

Mr. Seem expressed his view that if it is not broke, then don't fix it, and his view that it is important to maintain as much as possible the ability of voters to participate.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill said that she really can make a good argument both ways. She said that she sees some pros and cons. However, she said, by making it elective rather than appointive you get a commitment that you would not get by making the positions appointive.

Ms. Burns asked about the positions being unopposed. Ms. Serfilippi noted that they have been unopposed. Ms. Burns said that if the Democrats thought there was a problem with their performance, they would have gotten someone good to run against Ms. Serfilippi and Ms. Berendsen-Hill.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill said that in most towns Tax Clerks are elected, but Tax Collectors are getting to be about half and half, elective versus appointive. She also said that it is often appointive because it is about peoples' money and worrying about getting qualified people doing the job. She went on to say that the certification regarding the Tax Collector job is not particularly hard and the job of Tax Collector is not rocket science. It does not demand a lot other than knowing the statutes and following them. Ms. Berendsen-Hill also made clear that a certification is not mandated for her job, but that she obtained it and she required people who work for her to obtain it. Ms. Serfilippi noted that the certification is not mandated for the Town Clerk position either, but she obtained it.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill pointed out that having the Tax Collector position be elective gives the First Selectman political cover because when a taxpayer is unhappy about the way the Tax Collector is interpreting statutory requirements and goes to the First Selectman to complain, the First Selectman can say that the Tax Collector does not report to him.

Ms. Serfilippi said that the same applies to her job, except that she reports to the Secretary of State.

Ms. Serfilippi, concluding her comments by turning to another issue, then asked the CRC to please work on Section 10-1 of the Charter, which she said needs to be more specific.

Proposal that the Office of Town Clerk be Appointive Rather Than Elective.

Mr. Hancock moved and Mr. Egan seconded a motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the office of Town Clerk from elective to appointive. Motion carried 6-3.

Proposal that the Office of Tax Collector be Appointive Rather Than Elective.

Mr. Hancock moved and Mr. Egan seconded a motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the office of Tax Collector from elective to appointive.

Mr. Davidson said that the Tax Collector should be appointed rather than elected, really for one reason. According to Mr. Davidson, it broadens the field of who can be Tax Collector. It does not require a resident if appointive, Mr. Davidson explained. The Tax Collector job is not tied to the soul of the town as the Town Clerk job is, he said.

Mr. Hancock explained that he believes the office should remain elective. He said that the townspeople have been able to find qualified people for this position.

Mr. Shapiro noted that the Tax Collector told the CRC that about 50% of Tax Collector positions in the state are appointive rather than elective, unlike the Town Clerk position which is much more frequently elective rather than appointive in Connecticut.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill said that she does not think that the town will be able to find a person who has the same level of commitment if it is appointive rather than elective. She explained that an appointive person could consider it just a job.

Mr. Shapiro noted that the people who work in the office of Town Clerk and Tax Collector do not need to be residents of the town, and there could be a very capable number-two person in the office who is a terrific person but lives outside Ridgefield and would not be eligible to run for the office if the Town Clerk or Tax Collector were to step down or not run for reelection. It is unfortunate to make the number-two person ineligible for the number-one job in the office, he said.

Mr. Seem noted that it can be very helpful to have a strong number-two person still in place.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill expressed her disappointment that the CRC is voting on the three positions separately.

Mr. Walsh noted that four years ago the voters decided overwhelming to leave the positions on the ballot as elected rather than appointed. He also expressed the concern that as an appointive position, only five people make the selection rather than the voters of the town.

Ms. Berendsen-Hill noted that when the proposed change from elective to appointive for the Town Treasurer and the Tax Collector appeared on the ballot four years ago, she opposed the change vehemently. She said that she is not of the same mind now.

Mr. Hancock's motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the office of Tax Collector from elective to appointive then proceeded to a vote. Motion carried 5-4.

Proposal that the Office of Town Treasurer be Appointive Rather Than Elective.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Hancock seconded a motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the office of Town Treasurer from elective to appointive.

Mr. Steinman noted that in addition to the reasons he had stated earlier for supporting making the offices appointive, in this case the Town Treasurer supports making the Town Treasurer position appointive.

Mr. Walsh expressed the view that the position of the incumbent office holder on the appointive versus elective issue is not relevant.

Mr. Davidson noted that if a neighboring town has much higher returns on its cash than Ridgefield, he would want Ridgefield to be able to hire the Town Treasurer in the neighboring town.

Mr. Shapiro expressed the view that the position of Town Treasurer can make a big financial difference to the town so it is most important to hire a person with the skill sets. He also noted that the Town Treasurer office, as opposed to the offices of Town Clerk and Tax Collector, is part-time rather than full-time, yet the Town Treasurer

can make a bigger difference to the financial health of the town than the Town Clerk or the Tax Collector.

Mr. Egan expressed his skepticism of political appointments to select the best person.

Ms. Burns said that the sense of community and knowledge of the town is important to the Town Clerk position but not to the Town Treasurer. Skills are what are most important. She said that she sees no justification for Town Treasurer being an elective position.

Ms. Geisinger said that our mission is to look at the structure, and she is less inclined to reduce the amount of control of voters in choosing people.

Mr. Walsh's motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the office of Town Treasurer from elective to appointive then proceeded to a vote. Motion carried 5-4.

4. Review of the Change Request Tracker.

Proposal that the First Selectman be a Voting Member of the Board of Finance.

Mr. Hancock moved and Ms. Geisinger seconded a motion to recommend revising the Charter to make the First Selectman a voting member of the Board of Finance.

Mr. Egan expressed his view that we elect the First Selectman to do his job and we elect the Board of Finance to do their job. Mr. Seem said that the current system is working well. Mr. Steinman said that he is not persuaded to make the change.

Mr. Hancock's motion to recommend revising the Charter to make the First Selectman a voting member of the Board of Finance then proceeded to a vote. Motion defeated 2-7.

Proposal to Revise Charter to Add Alternates to Ridgefield Conservation Commission.

The CRC next discussed the proposal by Ms. Burns to revise the Charter to add two alternates to the Ridgefield Conservation Commission (RCC) in order to be consistent with a town ordinance, Section 19-48 of the Code of Ridgefield, that specifies two alternates for the RCC.

There followed discussion about the need to specify in the Charter alternate for appointive boards, commissions, and committees. After several members of the CRC focused on the final sentence of Section 5-1 of the Charter, Mr. Walsh pointed out that because “the number or term of office of their members may be changed by ordinance” under that section of the Charter, then an ordinance adopted to establish alternates to the RCC or other appointive board is a valid way of creating alternate positions.

On that basis, Ms. Burns withdrew her proposed Charter revision.

The meeting went through the remaining items on the Change Request Tracker to identify Charter revision proposals that may be ripe for a vote.

Proposal to Revise the Definition of “Town agency” in the Charter.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Hancock seconded a motion decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the definition of “Town agency.”

Mr. Steinman noted that Mr. Shapiro had prepared a detailed review of the use of Town agency in the Charter. He said that most uses could be corrected in the text by inserting “Town” before agency. Mr. Steinman went on to identify the three different clauses in the definition of “Town agency”. He said that after the first clause, it is all confusing.

Mr. Shapiro observed that calling a Town official and a function a “Town agency” is not how the term is used throughout the Charter. Mr. Shapiro said that he did not see that the term was ever used with the meaning of the second of the three clauses, although leaving it there may not be doing any harm.

Ms. Burns said that a human being can be an agent of the Town, but it does not make sense for a human being to be a Town agency as defined.

Mr. Walsh’s motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the definition of “Town agency” then proceeded to a vote. Motion carried 7-2.

Proposal to Review the Basic Structure of the Town’s Government.

The Commissioners next discussed Mr. Steinman’s proposal to review the basic structure of the town’s government in terms of four alternative forms of government. Mr. Steinman suggested that we memorialize this for the future by noting that review of the structure of Ridgefield’s government needs more in-depth study. Mr. Seem suggested that it be noted in the report of the CRC as an area that

is worthy of further review rather than be voted on as a proposed Charter revision recommendation. Mr. Steinman confirmed that he withdraws this matter as a Charter revision proposal to vote upon.

Further Discussion of Charter Revision for Definition of "Town agency."

Mr. Seem raised item 23B in the Change Request Tracker, a proposal to consider miscellaneous Charter issues pertaining to the definition of "Town agency" in Section 1-1 of the Charter as it relates to the term "other agencies of the Town" as used in Section 8-2 of the Charter. Mr. Steinman, the proposer of this Charter revision, stated that this is the proposal that the CRC had disposed of when revision of the definition of "Town agency" had just been voted down.

Consideration of Revision of Article XI of Charter (Standards of Conduct).

With regard to the proposal that we consider revisions to Article XI of the Charter, Standards of Conduct, Mr. Seem said that he would inform the Chair of the Board of Ethics and the chairs of major boards and commissions and send them the ethics proposals.

Proposal to Focus on "line item" as Used in Section 10-1(c) of the Charter.

The CRC next discussed the proposal by Mr. Rifkinson with regard to Section 10-1(c) of the Charter. The discussion focused on the meaning of "line item" in that subsection.

Proposal to Create Account for Board of Education to Retain Carryover Funds.

Mr. Seem next brought up the proposal of the Board of Education that the Charter be revised to provide for the creation of an account that allows the Board of Education to retain funds for unanticipated costs as allowed per Connecticut Statute Section 10-248a (1% carryover), and he asked whether, based on the discussion earlier in the meeting, Ms. Walton was withdrawing this Charter revision proposal. Mr. Davidson said that he did not believe that Ms. Walton was withdrawing it.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Steinman seconded a motion decline to recommend revising the Charter to create an account that allows the Board of Education to retain funds for unanticipated costs. Motion carried 9-0.

Proposal to End Nonbinding Recommendation of Board of Selectman With Regard to Board of Education.

Mr. Seem moved on to the Charter revision proposal by the Board of Education to end the nonbinding recommendation of the Board of Selectmen with regard to the Board of Education.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Egan seconded a motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to end the nonbinding recommendation of the Board of Selectmen with regard to the Board of Education in Section 10-1(a) of the Charter. Motion carried 9-0.

Proposal to Revise Charter to Decrease Members of Youth Commission from 16 to 8.
The CRC next discussed the proposal by the Board of Selectmen to revise the Charter to reduce the number of members of the Youth Commission specified in Section 5-15 from 16 to 8. Mr. Walsh pointed out that under the terms of the last paragraph Section of Section 5-1 of the Charter, the desired change in number of members can be accomplished without changing the Charter.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Davidson seconded a motion to decline to recommend revising the Charter to change the number of members of the Youth Commission, on the basis that the number of members of the Youth Commission can be changed by ordinance pursuant to the last paragraph of Section 5-1 of the Charter. Motion carried 9-0.

5. Approval of Minutes of April 21, 2018 Special Meeting.

Mr. Steinman proposed several minor modifications to the unrevised/unapproved minutes of the Special Meeting of April 21, 2018.

Mr. Shapiro moved and Ms. Burns seconded a motion to approve the unrevised/unapproved minutes of the April 21, 2018 CRC Special Meeting, with the proposed minor modifications. Motion carried 9-0.

6. Any Other Business.

There was no other business brought before the CRC.

7. Adjournment.

Mr. Walsh moved and Mr. Davidson seconded the motion to adjourn at 9:46 p.m. Motion carried 9-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Shapiro, Recording Secretary