

To: Letter to the Board of Finance  
From: Virginia Carmany  
Date: Nov. 15, 2021

As Chair of the Board of Finance and the driver of an effort to understand how the State Statutes and the Town Ordinance governing the filling of vacancies on the Board of finance should be vs. had been implemented I make the following statements:

In my opinion there are some deficiencies in the prepared minutes for the joint meeting of the Board of Selectmen and Board of Finance on November 1, 2021 per my review of a recording of the meeting and the BoS prepared meeting minutes:

- There were no references to the specific language used by me ,V. Carmany during the meeting:
  - a) Regarding State Statutes:7-340: Establish a Board of Finance, followed by 7-340a: Alternate members of boards of finance. "provide by ordinance for the appointment [...] of not more than three alternate members to its board of finance or 7-343 Filling of Vacancies. The language indicates the alternate members are part of the Board of Finance and go further with 7-343 to give the Board of Finance the authority to fill vacancies.
  - b) Regarding specific language that highlighted and compared Statute 7-343 to the lack of any specific statutes giving the same right to those other boards and commissions
  - c) Regarding specific language to highlight and compare the Town Ordinance: Creating Alternate members to the Board of Finance with other town ordinances for Zoning, Planning, Planning and Zoning, and Zoning Board of Appeals in which similar steps are followed for the establishment of alternate members to the board, and then diverge regarding the filling of subsequent vacancies.
  - d) Regarding specific language that addressed the untenable possibility that the steps outlined in c above could be cut and pasted into a different order for a different interpretation.
- In some instances, direct quotes are made incorrectly: e.g. Andrew specifically stated agreement with the comments made just prior to his statement by Kris Pollock and that is missing before he continues as well as similar statements by others.
- It is important to note that there were no comments made during the in which the ordering and application of the State Statutes was disputed.
- There is no mention when the discussion moves from open discussion to the polling of all members or to note per R. Nygard that consensus had been reached based on consistency with the Statutes

- There was no mention regarding a question of voting on same or it's discussion or that it was determined a vote was unnecessary based on a comment "that we would be only voting to indicate we would be following the law. "

Normally it is important for the meeting minutes to accurately and fairly represent the discussions and comments that led to consensus on the issue ("Best Practices"). However, in this case due to previous meeting minutes, attendant documentation and the interest of time I am submitting revised summary meeting minutes with (based on my opinion) specific items of importance fully stated. This summary could replace the minutes prepared by the BoS or reside as a summary in front of the prepared meeting minutes. Additionally, I request the following to be attached: the July 5, 2021 Memorandum from Attorney Richard Roberts from Halloran and Sage and the Office of Legislative Research Document: "Methods for filling Municipal Vacancies" By Kristan Sullivan, November 29, 2018.

---

---