

Roxanne Maher

From: ghosey924@gmail.com
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 4:01 PM
To: Town Council Group
Cc: 'Anthony Favry'; garyjonschneider@comcast.net; Fred Allyn, III
Subject: 100-015

Hi all,

At the recent Admin Committee meeting, Council Chair Rodriguez, with my permission, read an email to the Committee.

Although, as Chair Rodriguez stated, I am currently a member of the PMBC, the opinions expressed in that email, as well as this one, are my own, and do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of my fellow PMBC members.

I had written that email in the hopes that it would generate discussion and resolution of several questions regarding the proposed revision to Ordinance 100-015 governing the PMBC. I was, thus, surprised, when it, instead, spurred a 5-minute effort by the committee to (incorrectly) analyze my motivations for writing said email. While I have absolutely no idea how my motivations for emailing impact the content of the ordinance, I thought I would write to clarify.

While there was discussion of last year's situation in which a bid waiver was denied by the Town Council, that has absolutely nothing to do with my email of last week. My motivations are quite simple. As someone who lives and volunteers in Ledyard, I want to see the town enact clear, intelligent ordinances that benefit the town. To that end, I see that a more recent version of the proposed ordinance revision discusses the Town Council rejecting the PMBC recommendation and referring it back to PMBC, instead of the previous wording that simply allowed TC to choose a different vendor. The new wording is in line with what I was requesting. Thank you for that.

Unfortunately, other questions remained unaddressed.

- Who is the “firing authority” for an owner’s rep? In the unlikely event an owner’s rep performs or behaves in a manner warranting termination of their employment with the town, who makes that decision – the PMBC, the Town Council, or the Mayor?
- What is the basis of the \$500k number? Why not \$250k, \$1M, \$2M? What is the statistical or historical significance of \$500k?

- The proposed revision defines a quorum as a majority of regular members. This is fine. It also states that temporary members may vote only on matters concerning the project for which they have been appointed. This is also fine. However, the ordinance leaves unanswered whether a quorum of regular members can vote on matters concerning temporary projects, such as schools, if neither of the temporary members appointed for that project is present. Is it the intention of the Council that regular members may vote on questions concerning the temporary projects without a temporary member present? If so, this section is also fine as-is. If not, then this section requires additional verbiage.

Thank you for your time and attention.

George Hosey
Ledyard Resident