

TOWN OF GREENWICH, CT
CHARTER REVISION COMMITTEE
FINAL REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN
JUNE 27, 2007

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

John B. Margenot, Jr., Chairman
Frank E. Mazza, Vice-Chairman
Nancy C. Brown, Secretary
Laurence B. Simon
Valeria P. Storms

CHARGE TO THE COMMITTEE

Be it further resolved that the Charter Revision Committee shall study:
 The size and structure of the Representative Town Meeting;
 The advisability of creating a Charter provision for the position of Town Administrator.

The Committee shall also consider and make recommendations with respect to the method of implementation of any proposed change to the size and structure of the Representative Town Meeting and the creation of the position of Town Administrator.

Be it further resolved that the Committee shall issue a draft report recommending changes as outline above. The Board of Selectmen will then make a determination as to whether any proposed changes should proceed under Chapter 99 of the Connecticut General Statutes or under the existing provisions of the Town Charter.

COMMITTEE MEETING DATES

The committee met 14 times on the following dates:

April 2, 2007	2:00 P.M.
April 10, 2007	9:30 A.M.
April 12, 2007	3:00 P.M.
April 17, 2007	5:00 P.M. Public Hearing
April 19, 2007	3:00 P.M.
April 23, 2007	4:00 P.M.
April 24, 2007	2:00 P.M.
April 26, 2007	3:00 P.M. Executive Session with Law Department
April 30, 2007	2:00 P.M.
May 4, 2007	11:30 A.M.
May 8, 2007	2:00 P.M.
May 9, 2007	10:30 A.M. Presentation to the Board of Selectmen
June 21, 2007	2:00 P.M. Review of draft report with Board of Selectmen
June 27, 2009	9:30 A.M. Revisions and creation of final report

INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

The committee heard from 27 individuals including 4 First Selectmen, 3 Town officials, 12 current members of the RTM, and 8 others. The names of all 27 individuals are listed in Appendix A.

SUMMARY

This report is divided into six sections. Section I reviews the Town Administrator and supports our recommendation to revise the job description, clarify the responsibilities and terms of employment and resubmit the Charter Amendment back to the RTM for approval. Section II through IV presents our analysis of the Representative Town Meeting (RTM). The committee looked at the size (Section II), structure (Section III) and process (Section IV) of the RTM and made recommendations in each of these three areas. Section V examined the implications of convening a Charter Revision Commission and we do not recommend that course of action at this time. Last, Section VI presents our recommendation for the RTM which is not to reduce its size. The committee believes that it is better to solve the problem you know than create a new one. The conclusions reached by the committee were unanimous.

I. TOWN ADMINISTRATOR

a. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. The position should be in the Charter
- ii. The position reports to the First Selectman and is an 'at will' employee
- iii. The proposed Charter Amendment should be written to state more clearly the employment relationship of the Town Administrator and should be resubmitted to the RTM.

b. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

- The Town Administrator should be a permanent position of the Town Table of Organization.
- Position should not be able to be eliminated from the Table of Organization
- The Town Administrator should be a professional position competitively filled with someone with experience and training in this field. Using the Recruitment Guidelines For Selecting a Local Government Administrator (Published by the International City/County Management Association [icma.org]) will ensure that the recruitment process is done properly.
- The Town Administrator should be interviewed by a representative panel of Town officials selected by the First Selectman in conjunction with the Human Resources Department.
- This position is an administrative, not a policy making position. The Town Administrator implements the policy of the First Selectman. See Appendix B for a clear distinction between administration and policy making.
- The Town Administrator shall be nominated by the First Selectman and appointed by the Board of Selectmen.
- The Town Administrator is identical to all other Managerial/Confidential (MC) employees who are not classified.
- The Town Administrator has the same rights as any other MC employee. This includes being evaluated annually, being given a reasonable time period to rectify any deficiencies, and the right to be evaluated again. With a second unsatisfactory evaluation, the Town has the right to terminate employment of the Town Administrator.
- The Town Administrator's salary should fit on the MC pay scale and not be set independently by the Board of Selectmen. The initial step on the MC pay

scale should be negotiated between the Board of Selectmen and the Human Resources Department.

- Explanatory comments have been rewritten (Appendix D) which more clearly explain the employment relationship between the Town and the Town Administrator. The proposed Charter Amendment should be redrafted to accurately reflect this employment relationship. A suggested draft is included as Appendix C.

II. SIZE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TOWN MEETING

a. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. The RTM should be reduced when there are insufficient candidates to fill 85% of the seats in two consecutive municipal elections.
- ii. The RTM should be reduced if attendance at meetings continues to fall below an agreed upon threshold. We recommend using a threshold of 69% or 9 meetings out of 13 to allow incumbents to run without using a petition. This change will affect less than 15 people and will establish a reasonable expectation of commitment for RTM members.
- iii. Appendix E provides a table of the 200 members who were elected in November 2005 and who were still serving as of March 2007. This table shows that 173 out of the 200 members met the proposed meeting attendance threshold of 69%.
- iv. If the process recommendations, observations and findings discussed in Section IV below cannot be implemented, we recommend that the RTM considers reducing its size in order to solve the process issues.

b. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

- Elections are not competitive
 - In the 2005 election there were 23 seats which were not filled, and 12 people were elected as write-in candidates. This represents 15% of the RTM body. In addition 19 people have resigned, and their seats were filled by RTM delegates only at their district elections. Therefore 54 people or 23% of the RTM were elected by delegates of the affected districts or were write-in candidates.
 - In the 2005 election, 207 people ran and all members were elected except for one write-in candidate who received only two votes.
 - In 2005, on average, each RTM member was elected by just 26% of the votes cast in the First Selectman's race.(See Appendix F)
 - In the 2003 election there were 20 seats not filled or filled by write-ins.
 - In the 2003 election, eight candidates were not elected in competitive races despite 20 seats not being filled in other districts.
- If there are not enough residents willing to run for the RTM and this pattern continues with more members elected by district delegations, then size does become an issue and representation becomes questionable.
- The RTM is unwieldy. Getting legislation enacted can be difficult because of the large number of its committees, which may be a result of its size.
- Attendance should be improved. Would propose raising attendance bar to 69% from 50%.
 - 173 people out of 200 attended 73% of the 11 meetings since January 2005 (Appendix E)
 - 13 people attended more than 50% but less than 69% of the RTM meetings.
 - 2 people have not attended a single meeting.
 - 150 people have been there for 70% or more of the votes.(Appendix G)

- 30 people have missed 50% of the votes or more.(Appendix G)
- From 1996 to 2006, on average, 90% of the RTM members who were present at the beginning of an RTM budget meeting (May) remained until the last vote. For non-budget meetings, the percentage dropped slightly to 86%. This corresponds to 75% and 70% respectively of all RTM members. (Appendix H).
- Large size requires better process and these processes must be well defined.
- Large size enables anyone who is interested in Town government to be part of the RTM and provides a good training ground for residents interested in their government.
- It is difficult to know if there are underlying issues not discussed during committee meetings that surface during district meetings. Feedback mechanisms among committees, districts and Town Departments should be improved.

III. RTM STRUCTURE

a. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Resolve in writing through the Town Attorney whether or not all RTM districts should be of approximately equal size (based on registered voters or population) and whether or not the RTM is in compliance with the one man, one vote rule.
- ii. The RTM should continue to be a non-political body.
- iii. Align the committee structure to Town government structure.
- iv. Consider the elimination of some committees.

b. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

- If all districts should be of approximately equal size, the Board of Selectmen should present a redistricting plan to the RTM for its approval.
- Smaller districts do not have enough members to attend all of the committee meetings without some members attending two committee meetings.
- Smaller districts have a disproportionate influence on committees and larger districts have a greater influence in the votes cast at Representative Town Meetings.
- Larger districts (#8 for example) do not have enough opportunities for members to participate.
- There is nothing sacred about 12 districts. For example for election purposes, Districts 2, 3 and 4 could be combined into two districts with the correct proportionate number of delegates.
- The number of standing committees is too large. A smaller RTM would probably lead to fewer committees.
- The use of registered voters is permitted by law as a proxy for population within a district.
- The large number of committees may make presentations by department heads repetitive. The number of committees should be reduced or aligned to conform to Town government structure. Ideally, most items would only be reviewed by one committee, and possibly Finance and/or Legislative and Rules when deemed necessary.

IV. RTM PROCESS

a. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. Raise dollar limit for RTM action on gifts, transfers, etc. from \$5,000 to either \$25,000 or \$50,000.

- ii. Since excellent process is the key to a well functioning and accountable RTM which has 229 members, existing processes should be reviewed for possible improvements.
- iii. The role of both the committee chairs as well as the district leaders is essential to the effective operation of the RTM and should be more clearly defined and strengthened.
- iv. The First Selectman should initiate an on-going dialogue with the Moderator's Committee of the RTM. This dialogue will help improve the process and communication between the RTM and the Board of Selectmen. We urge that they meet as soon as possible to address issues raised by this report.
- v. Consider assigning a lead person or committee to each substantial issue that comes before the RTM.

b. OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS

- The size of the RTM requires excellent processes to make the RTM an effective body.
- The role of the committee chairs as well as the district leaders is essential to the operation of the RTM.
- All committee reports should be in writing and:
 - Posted on Town web site before the district meetings.
 - Sent via email to all district leaders.
- Issues surfaced at district meetings that are not covered or resolved by committee members should be sent back to both the committee chairs and the proposing departments in order to resolve open issues prior to the RTM Meeting.
- Explanations of certain items are not sufficient and lead to confusion. This is both a size and process question since there is the need to educate 229 people about each issue. More attention and effort should be given to this area. Since RTM members come to each issue with different levels of experience and knowledge, background information becomes particularly important.
- Encourage electronic bulletin boards or blogs (a user-generated website where entries are made in journal style and displayed in a reverse chronological order) for RTM members to ask questions or conduct dialogues. The goal is to make certain that all known issues are raised and addressed before the RTM meetings.
- We recommend that the Law Department play a greater role in the preparation of the RTM call.
- Some members do not come to the RTM district meetings or the full RTM meetings well versed in the issues. This is a district leaders' responsibility.
- With the RTM's large body, accountability becomes important. Accountability can be defined in various ways:
 - Each member is accountable to come to the RTM meeting having read the material in advance and having asked relevant questions at the committee or district meetings. It is not acceptable that members come to the RTM meeting not having opened their call material and they should be held accountable in that regard by their district leaders.
 - district leaders and committee leaders are accountable to make certain that all questions and issues are resolved prior to the RTM meeting.
 - Without having a lead committee or person assigned to each issue, the RTM lacks a central point or person to coordinate the questions raised and the resolution needed for each issue.

V. **Establishment of a Charter Revision Commission**

a. **RECOMMENDATION**

We do not recommend the creation of a Charter Revision Commission at this time.

b. **OBSERVATIONS AND FINDINGS**

- This committee met with the Town Attorney and other members of the Law Department in executive session.
- The committee reviewed the consequences of Charter change under CGS 7-192 and the subsequent loss of home rule authority especially in areas of planning and zoning.
- At this time, the committee believes that the ability of the Town of Greenwich to maintain home rule authority outweighs the issue of RTM size or charter provision for the Town Administrator position.

VI. **SUMMARY**

The committee has closely studied the issues presented in its charge and debated extensively the issue of reducing the size of the RTM in order to improve the process and to make members more accountable for their actions. In order to have a more effective RTM without changing the process, the committee thinks that the number would have to be reduced below 60 and preferably in the 36 to 48 range. However, the committee thinks that an RTM of that size would create a completely different dynamic for the RTM and the Town and discourage people from being involved in Town government. A smaller RTM would create a different set of issues.

Therefore, the committee recommends improving the process by which the RTM conducts its business. On-going dialogue between all branches of government is necessary for the efficient operation and we recommend that these discussions begin immediately.

However, if the process issues cannot be resolved or if there are insufficient candidates to run for the RTM, then we recommend that the issue of the size of the RTM be revisited after the November 2009 elections.

Respectfully submitted:

John B. Margenot, Jr., Chairman

Nancy C. Brown, Secretary

Frank E. Mazza, Vice-Chairman

Laurence B. Simon

Valeria P. Storms

APPENDIX A
INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

1. First Selectman(4)
 - a. Tom Ragland
 - b. Lolly Prince
 - c. Richard Bergstresser
 - d. James Lash
2. Town Elected Officials(3)
 - a. Carmella Budkins- Town Clerk
 - b. Veronica Musca –Registrar of Voters
 - c. Sharon Vecchiola – Registrar of Voters
3. RTM Members and their District(12)
 - a. Tom Byrne Moderator(6)
 - b. Joan Caldwell Moderator Pro Tem(10)
 - c. Carl Carlson (1)
 - d. Paul Settlemyer (2)
 - e. Christine Edwards (8)
 - f. Nick Edwards (8)
 - g. Chris Von Keyserling (8)
 - h. Betsy Frumin (9)
 - i. Ed Dadakis (1)
 - j. Robert Brady (5)
 - k. Tom Conelias (3)
 - l. Franklin Bloomer (5)
4. Others (8)
 - a. David Tobin – Former RTM Moderator
 - b. Michael Ulasky (Former District 9)
 - c. Victor Coudert
 - d. Joanne Messina and Donna Nickitas – League of Women Voters
 - e. John Wayne Fox - Town Attorney
 - f. Aamina Ahmad-Law Department (Executive Session)
 - g. Eugene McLaughlin (Executive Session)
 - h. John Wetmore (Executive Session)

APPENDIX B

Definitions of Policy Makers and Administrators in First Selectman-Town Administrator Governments

Administration Is... managing the day-to-day business of local-government. An appointed manager, accountable to the Board of Selectmen for organizational performance, is responsible.

Town Administrator

- Appointed by Board of Selectmen
- Administrator who implements policy through staffing and budget control
- Decides “how”- the manner, way, or means to accomplish it
- Trained professional
- Selected for office based on expertise and experience
- Hired for indefinite time at will of Board of Selectmen
- Influence *formal* through organizational authority
- Influence is positional through organizational *authority*
- Community typically viewed as whole-“systematically”
- Full-time, paid, public service
- Town Administrator is *not* a member of the governing body
- Town Administrator provides administrative and organizational leadership

Policy Making Is... deciding what the government should do. A democratically elected First Selectman, accountable to the voters for carrying out their will, is responsible.

First Selectman

- Elected by voters
- Policy maker who defines public purpose through action and budget approval
- Decides “what/why”- the intent, expectations, motive for government action
- Representative lay persons
- Elected for defined terms of office
- Influence informal through a community network
- Influence is personal through individual *power*
- Community typically viewed as parts-“incrementally”
- Full time, low-paid public service
- First Selectman is a member of the governing body
- First Selectman provides political and community leadership

**APPENDIX C
PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT FOR TOWN ADMINISTRATOR**

Sec. 217A. Town Administrator

(a) There shall be a Town Administrator. The Town Administrator shall be qualified in the administration and management of town or city government as evidenced by his/her experience and education. The Town Administrator shall be appointed by the Board of Selectmen upon recommendation of the First Selectman. The Town Administrator shall be an employee at will and may be removed from office by the Board of Selectmen upon recommendation of the First Selectman.

The Town Administrator shall be responsible for the day-to-day administration of those departments and operations under the supervision of the First Selectman. The Town Administrator shall coordinate the Annual Budget Process for the First Selectman. The Town Administrator may perform other duties as assigned by the First Selectman.

(b) The compensation of the Town Administrator shall be set by the Board of Selectmen upon the recommendation of the First Selectman. The First Selectman shall evaluate the performance of the Town Administrator annually. Such evaluation shall become a permanent part of the Town Administrator's personnel file

**APPENDIX D
RECOMMENDED EXPLANATORY COMMENTS FOR TOWN
ADMINISTRATOR CHARTER AMENDMENT**

EXPLANATORY COMMENTS - This provision creates a new section of the Charter, Sec. 217A, to follow immediately after Sec. 217 in the Charter which sets forth the powers duties of the First Selectman. Sec. 217A creates the position of Town Administrator and sets forth the duties of the position including day-to-day administration of departments and operations under the supervision of the First Selectman, coordination of the Annual Budget Process for the First Selectman, and the authority to perform other duties as assigned by the First Selectman. The Town Administrator is an "at will", full time employee of the Town with performance standards and goals established by the First Selectman. This section of the charter endows the position with continuity from one administration to the next, and empowers the Board of Selectmen to appoint and remove the Town Administrator upon recommendation of the First Selectman and in accordance with the letter of employment.

**APPENDIX E
RTM MEMBERS BY ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS
JANUARY 2006 TO APRIL 2007 (11 MEETINGS)**

NUMBER OF MEETINGS	% OF MEETINGS	NUMBER OF RTM MEMBERS	CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF RTM MEMBERS	% OF RTM MEMBER	CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE
11	100%	71	71	35.5%	35.5%
10	91%	52	123	26.0%	61.5%
9	82%	32	155	16.0%	77.5%
8	73%	18	173	9.0%	86.5%
7	64%	9	182	4.5%	91.0%
6	55%	4	186	2.0%	93.0%
5	45%	6	192	3.0%	96.0%
4	36%	3	195	1.5%	97.5%
3	27%	0	195	0.0%	97.5%
2	18%	3	198	1.5%	99.0%
1	9%	0	198	0.0%	99.0%
0	0%	2	200	1.0%	100.0%
TOTAL		200			

APPENDIX F

VOTES FOR RTM MEMBERS AS A PERCENT OF VOTES CAST FOR FIRST SELECTMAN NOVEMBER 2005 ELECTION

District #1(19)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
24.2%	585	342	927
AMBROGIO, Mary	257		27.7%
CARLSON, Carl G., Jr.	237		25.6%
CHELWICK, George F	244		26.3%
COLLINS, Norman R.	230		24.8%
DADAKIS, Edward D.	246		26.5%
FELDMAN, Frederick R.	198		21.4%
FREDERICK, Pamela	217		23.4%
FREY, Margaret W.	230		24.8%
FRUMIN, Gregory S.	199		21.5%
GENTRY, Nora T.	229		24.7%
GOSS, Dean L.	234		25.2%
HELBIG, Hans A.	214		23.1%
HOLLERAN, Richard P.	211		22.8%
MAHER, Patrick E.	226		24.4%
PELLEGRINO, Mary G.	264		28.5%
RAY, Julie L.	206		22.2%
SCARPELLI, Patricia C.	222		23.9%
SHAMS, Najm	170		18.3%
ZARRILLI, Carol A.	230		24.8%
DISTRICT #2(15)(14 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
31.4%	495	231	726
BROGAN, Kevin J.	235		32.4%
BURKE, Duncan G.	235		32.4%
BURKE, Nancy B.	260		35.8%
CANTAVERO, Carlo F.	232		32.0%
CONWAY, Donald R.	220		30.3%
FOGWELL, Nancy A.	227		31.3%
GEISS-ROBBINS, Suzanne	0	APPOINTED 12/05	0.0%
LIEBMAN, Walter H.	220		30.3%
MORGAN, Cecilia H.	229		31.5%
NACINOVICH, Wilma	219		30.2%
RELYEA, Meredith E.	224		30.9%
SCHROEDER, Mark	230		31.7%
SETTELMEYER, Paul	222		30.6%
TONER, John F.	221		30.4%
WELLS, Douglas J.	221		30.4%

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED)

DISTRICT #3 (10)(9 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
33.3%	256	162	418
AURELIA, Michael	150		35.9%
BAVIS, Louise T.	134		32.1%
BLACKSON, Mercedes	140		33.5%
COLOMBO, Laurel G.	134		32.1%
CONELIAS, Thomas P.	170		40.7%
DELOHERY, Holly G.	132		31.6%
PAROLY, Murray	121		28.9%
TUTHILL, J. Robert	140		33.5%
VELEZ, Claudia	0	WRITE-IN	0.0%
WARNER, M Michael	133		31.8%
DISTRICT # 4(16)(11 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
26.6%	453	312	765
ANDREONI, Felix	204		26.7%
AVERY, Frances	209		27.3%
BAMBINO, John	21	WRITE-IN	2.7%
BOWMAN, Russell	196		25.6%
DeSEIFE, Linda R.	185		24.2%
GRECO, Thomas J.	217		28.4%
McKNIGHT, Robert J,Jr.	196		25.6%
POPP, Alexander J, Jr.	211		27.6%
POPP, Maria M.	224		29.3%
RUPERT, David	184		24.1%
SCHAFFNER-PARNELL, J	192		25.1%
SHANKMAN, Jonathan R.	12	WRITE-IN	1.6%
VITTI, Donald R.	224		29.3%
WAHBA, James	48	WRITE-IN	6.3%
DISTRICT #5(19)(18 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
27.1%	848	320	1168
BAKER, Frederick L,III	353		30.2%
BLOOMER, H. Franklin, Jr.	361		30.9%
BRADY, Robert K.	314		26.9%
BROADHURST, Edward T,III	342		29.3%
CAMPBELL, Elizabeth C.	312		26.7%
DAINE, James H.	255		21.8%
DAYTON, Jennifer A.	252		21.6%
ERICKSON, Laura B.	316		27.1%
FERRY, Mary S.	313		26.8%
HAFFENREFFER, David H.	275		23.5%
HAMMOCK, Jacqueline K.	305		26.1%
INNES, James W.	332		28.4%
ISAACSON, Gerald S.	347		29.7%
KRASNOR, Lucy B.	314		26.9%
LANDES, Richard J.	12	WRITE-IN	1.0%
OZTEMEL, Karen S.	351		30.1%
TELERICO, Samuel T.	347		29.7%

VAUGHN, James W.	353		30.2%
WEISSLER, Nancy	263		22.5%
DISTRICT # 6(20)(18 ELECTED)			
	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
26.3%	792	437	1229
BARNABY, Michael J.	342		27.8%
BARR, Jeanne A.	329		26.8%
BYRNE, Thomas J.	402		32.7%
CURDUMI, Abelardo S.	265		21.6%
DUCRET, Carol C	337		27.4%
GRIEB, Richard F.	289		23.5%
GUERRIERI, Robert	323		26.3%
HOUSTON, Kelly J.	313		25.5%
HOWE, Walter K.	272		22.1%
JENKINS, Coline	345		28.1%
KEELER, Claudia M.	352		28.6%
LOMAZZO, Arline	338		27.5%
MANGANIELLO, Edward M.	313		25.5%
MESKERS, Stephen	303		24.7%
NOBLE, David	263		21.4%
PORTER, Erford E, II		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
RUUD NUCCI, Barbara T.	336		27.3%
SADIK-KHAN, Karen A.	420		34.2%
TAUTEL, Eric	268		21.8%
VOULGARIS, Alexis		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
DISTRICT # 7(20)(19 ELECTED)			
	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
22.0%	659	253	912
BLOOM, Eleanor S.	209		22.9%
BRENNAN-GALVIN, Ellen		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
BURKE, Michael K.	198		21.7%
JAMES CAMPBELL	187	RESIGNED DEC 2005	20.5%
CARMICHAEL, Susan L	202		22.1%
CLARK, William L.	176		19.3%
DUFF, Alice B.	271		29.7%
FASSULIOTIS, Karen		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
GILLIS, Patrick	177		19.4%
HUFFMAN, Randall	185		20.3%
HYLAND, Angela M.	182		20.0%
JACOBSON, Mary A.	190		20.8%
JANSEN, Lucia D.	178		19.5%
LOCKTON, Janet	240		26.3%
LOURIE, Roger H.	197		21.6%
McDERMID, Ralph M., Jr.	186		20.4%
MORTON, Susan M.	243		26.6%
MULLIS, Winona	173		19.0%
SEARLE, Robert	199		21.8%
STAUFFER, Valerie	225		24.7%
WILLIAMS, Joseph L.	198		21.7%

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED)

DISTRICT #8(26)(20 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
29.1%	800	587	1387
ANDERSON, Susie L.	484		34.9%
BASILEVSKY, Peter A.	359		25.9%
BECKWITH, John Jeb	3	WRITE-IN	0.2%
BERG, Peter E.		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
BOUTELLE, James G.	411		29.6%
BROWN, Joshua H.	365		26.3%
BURGWEGER, Francis J,Jr.	398		28.7%
CARLSON, William F.	406		29.3%
CHAPIN, Nancy P.	437		31.5%
EDWARDS, Charles N, III	368		26.5%
EDWARDS, Christine L.	415		29.9%
ENNIS, Gordon	360		26.0%
HOPPER, Kathryn F.	474		34.2%
KRAL, Richard, Jr.	419		30.2%
LAUDONIA, Anthony Tod	437		31.5%
MARZULLO, Drew	3	WRITE-IN	0.2%
MELICK, David	376		27.1%
MURPHY, R. Blair	379		27.3%
O'BRIEN, James J.	424		30.6%
PELLERZI, Peter	359		25.9%
SCHREFF, David J.	3	WRITE-IN	0.2%
SHREDERS, Alicia		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
SHULMAN, John A.	368		26.5%
SOLER, Stephen M.	390		28.1%
VonKEYSERLING, C.	438		31.6%
DISTRICT #9(20)(14 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
22.1%	610	338	948
ARNONE, Jane W.		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0
BEERMAN, Robert L.	220		23.2%
BRAXTON, Meredith C.	223		23.5%
CURTIS, Paul F.	215		22.7%
DELMAN, Evan L.	188		19.8%
DiMARCO, Vincent A.	257		27.1%
DOBBS, Robert C., Jr.	190		20.0%
DUNNE, Michael		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
FRUMIN, Betsy S.	221		23.3%
GAUDIOSO-ZEALE, Donna F.	201		21.2%
NAPOLITANO, Anna B.		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
PASTERNAK, Adrian		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
PETISE, Frank P.	221		23.3%
REILLY, James C.	195		20.6%
RICHMAN, Howard	2	WRITE-IN	0.2%
ROTA, Adele	201		21.2%
ROTA, Frank L.	212		22.4%
SOSA, Juan P.		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%

VIZZARI, Ralph	214		22.6%
WOEI, Frank	178		18.8%
DISTRICT #10(20)			
	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
26.7%	700	237	937
ANDERSON, Gerald L.	258		27.5%
ANNUNZIATO, Joseph M.		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
BYRNES, Robert M.	238		25.4%
CALDWELL, Joan E.	292		31.2%
CHIAPPETTA, Robert	247		26.4%
DETJEN, David W.	224		23.9%
DIELS, Jean-Pierre	209		22.3%
FORROW, Brian D.	235		25.1%
GRANT, Swan M.	285		30.4%
HARTCH, Gale	277		29.6%
HULL, Lloyd N.	274		29.2%
LARSON, Lawrence E.	280		29.9%
LUCARELLI, John M.	191		20.4%
METTER, Bertram M.	7		0.7%
O'MALLEY, C Hooker	253		27.0%
RICHARDSON, Robert J.	238		25.4%
ROITSCH, Eric	213	RESIGNED DEC 2005	22.7%
SMALL, Alan A.	215		22.9%
STEFANI, Richard J.	264		28.2%
STONE, Emerson	262		28.0%
STONE, Louisa	291		31.1%
DISTRICT #11(23)(13 ELECTED)			
	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
27.4%	841	283	1124
BRUCE, Mary	341		30.3%
BRUCE, Richard D.	324		28.8%
COYNER, Kevin	287		25.5%
FASSULIOTIS, Despina K.	278		24.7%
HIGBIE, Gina F.	333		29.6%
HOFFMAN, David L.	301		26.8%
HULEY, Joseph	8	WRITE-IN	0.7%
KENNEDY, Todd		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
KLEIN, Stanley J.	290		25.8%
LARDON, Robert V.	273		24.3%
LEWIS, Mary Hope		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
LINDSAY, Fern M.	341		30.3%
NICASTRO, Rosalind		APPOINTED DEC 2005	0.0%
PELLEGRINO, Joseph	321		28.6%
SCHOENBERG, Sabine	297		26.4%
SMITH, Sheilah T.	297		26.4%
WALDRON, Mary	324		28.8%

APPENDIX F (CONTINUED)

DISTRICT #12(21)(20 ELECTED)	LASH	BERG	TOTAL
25.7%	705	492	1197
BAMBRICK, Bill	297		24.8%
BANCROFT, Thomas E.	306		25.6%
DECARO, Alice B.	315		26.3%
DECARO, Fred A, III.	321		26.8%
DIPRETA, Richard S.	333		27.8%
HASKELL, Ellen Jo	29	WRITE-IN	2.4%
HINDMAN, Barbara G.	373		31.2%
KAVEE, Robert C.	286		23.9%
MAY, Robert T.	304		25.4%
MENNIN, Miriam	263		22.0%
MOORE, Peggy B.	316		26.4%
NORTON, David J.	258		21.6%
PERRI, Robert A.	317		26.5%
POLIDORO, Hope	292		24.4%
PORRICELLI, Gerald J.	392		32.7%
POULIOT, Michael E.	217		18.1%
ROMANIELLO, Sandra A.	297		24.8%
ROMEO, Mary	459		38.3%
SHERR, Peter	271		22.6%
SULICH, Jane S.	267		22.3%
THIVIERGE, Charles E, Jr.	257		21.5%

**APPENDIX G
RTM MEMBERS BY PERCENT OF VOTES CAST
JANUARY 2006 THROUGH APRIL 2007 (78 VOTES)**

% OF VOTES CAST	# of RTM MEMBERS	% of RTM MEMBERS	CUMULATIVE %
100%	20	10.0%	10.0%
95 TO 99%	38	19.0%	29.0%
85 TO 94%	42	21.0%	50.0%
70 TO 84%	50	25.0%	75.0%
50 TO 70%	30	15.0%	90.0%
0 TO 50%	20	10.0%	100.0%

APPENDIX H
RTM MEETING ATTENDANCE BY BUDGET MEETING (MAY)
AND ONE OTHER MEETING (1996 TO 2006)

	% PRESENT AT END OF MEETING OF THOSE PRESENT AT BEGINNING OF MEETING	% PRESENT AT END OF MEETING OF TOTAL RTM MEMBERSHIP	TIME MEETING ENDED
1996			
May	84%	73%	12:10 AM
Oct.	92%	75%	10:00 PM
1997			
May	68%	56%	1:50 AM
Jan.	99%	79%	9:25 PM
1998			
May	98%	80%	9:10 PM
Mar.	98%	79%	8:55 PM
1999			
May	93%	80%	10:40 PM
Apr.	96%	77%	9:20 PM
2000			
May	98%	83%	9:47 PM
June	91%	71%	10:05 PM
2001			
May	99%	82%	9:10 PM
Sept.	86%	75%	11:15 PM
2002			
June	74%	62%	12:25 AM
Dec.	90%	79%	11:00 PM
2003			
May	98%	80%	9:56 PM
Mar.	70%	55%	11:10 PM
2004			
May	92%	78%	11:20 PM
Apr.	98%	78%	9:55 PM
2005			
May	93%	76%	11:25 PM
June	52%	40%	12:40 AM
2006			
May	95%	77%	10:43 PM
Sept.	70%	62%	12:55 AM
	AVERAGE		
MAY	90%	75%	Budget meeting
OTHER	86%	70%	