

Roxanne Maher

From: Gary St. Vil
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2026 10:12 AM
To: Town Council Group
Subject: Rule 10 Clarification and Disposition

Council,

I have reviewed the concerns raised regarding Rule 10 of our Rules of Procedure and the publication of communications with the agenda.

Rule 10 governs what is included with the posted meeting agenda. It provides that certain categories of communications — including social media posts and communications containing profanity — are not to be published with the agenda, but remain public records.

The rule addresses agenda publication. It does not prohibit access to public records, nor does it restrict a councilor from referencing or sharing materials that are public records outside of the formal agenda packet.

Under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act, communications received and retained in the conduct of public business are public records unless specifically exempted by statute. The communications at issue fall within that definition and are not exempt.

Based on my review of our Rules of Procedure, the Town Charter, and applicable state law, I do not find that Rule 10 was violated.

Our current Rules of Procedure do not establish a disciplinary or code-of-conduct mechanism applicable in this situation, and I do not find a basis for any formal inquiry.

Accordingly, I consider this matter closed.

To avoid any inadvertent quorum discussion by email, please reserve any further discussion of this topic for a public meeting.

Respectfully,

Gary A. St. Vil

Chairman, Ledyard Town Council
741 Colonel Ledyard Highway
Ledyard, CT 06339
(860) 980-0656 | gsvil@ledyardct.org
www.ledyardct.org

From: Timothy Ryan <tryan@ledyardct.org>
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 11:13 PM
To: April Brunelle <ABru@ledyardct.org>

Cc: Town Council Group <TownCouncil@ledyardct.org>

Subject: Re: Code of Conduct Violation

Council;

Although Councilor Brunelle is entitled to her opinion, that does not make it fact. To that end, I will address the following actual facts:

The “rules of procedure” are instituted to govern how business is conducted at council meetings. As far as I can tell, none of those rules were violated during the regular meeting.

Specifically, contrary to what Councilor Brunelle alleges, the rule about what will not be published with the Agenda, but remain public record, was not violated as the criteria laid out in section 10 for what should not be published with the agenda was indeed followed. Please advise if I am in err.

In accordance with current the rules of procedure, the communications she cites are indeed part of the public record and members of the public are legally guaranteed access to such communications.

In summary, Councilor Brunelle’s accusation is without merit.

I am, however, deeply concerned with Councilor Brunelle’s perceived disposition and personal motivation regarding this matter, as it seems she is grasping at straws to try and prevent public record information from being accessible to the public. This, by definition, goes against the very principle of open and transparent government that we are to uphold, and being accountable to the public as elected officials.

Additionally, her statement that I am “not working with council but against it” seems to insinuate that I should ‘toe the line’, regardless of whether that action is disenfranchising residents; I will take this opportunity to remind all councilors that we work for the constituents who elected us, not for anyone else. As such, I personally will always put the best interests of our residents first. I can only hope that is a shared sentiment amongst all elected officials.

To that end, I would ask that the Council Chair look into these actions undertaken by Councilor Brunelle; which, at the very least, undermine the trust of the electorate in this town council.

Lastly, and it is with great irony that I state this, pursuant to the current rules of procedure, Councilor Brunelle’s below formally submitted communication to council (and my response) can not be published with the next council agenda, as it would *actually* be a violation since the subject they are referencing is a social media post.

That said, if the Council is willing to entertain a modification to the rules at the next meeting to revert back to having **all** communications being included in the agenda, I think it would absolutely be in the best interests of the town’s residents. I will note that Section 2 of the Town Charter does not explicitly prohibit an amendment or modification to the resolution which adopted the rules of procedure.

V/R;
Timothy Ryan

On Feb 15, 2026, at 3:01 PM, April Brunelle <ABru@ledyardct.org> wrote:

Dear Councilors and Chair,

It is with great disappointment I write to you all on a matter that concerns one of our Councilors breaking established Council procedures which is a breach of code of conduct.

During our Council Meeting on December 1st, the Council established that:

Communications published with the Agenda shall consist of written correspondence formally submitted to the Town Council for the record. The following will not be published with the Agenda, but will remain public records:

- a. Communications that contain confidential personnel or protected information;
- b. Social media posts, screenshots, or online commentary;
- c. Communications containing profanity, threats, or defamatory statements; d. Communications unrelated to items within the Town Council's legal jurisdiction.

With that being the case, during our last meeting Councilor Ryan brought up the fact that some Correspondences were not included in the Agenda, to which he was informed of the above procedure. Regardless if he agreed with it or not, he understood that was the procedure. Yet, he then after the meeting boldly post publicly those communications that were not included in the agenda.

We are all for transparency, that is not the issue here. The issue is that there was a procedure in place and he knowingly broke it. If one has an issue with a procedure there are proper ways to go about addressing them.

When a Councilor breaks a procedure, the consequences in general range up to legal and political sanctions, depending on the severity and frequency of the infractions.

Procedures are designed to ensure lawful, orderly and fair decision making. Violating them typically triggers a code of conduct investigation.

If a policy forbids publishing social media content, but is done so later, it can be viewed as an arbitrary or capricious action. Particularly if it targets specific individuals or topics.

Not only that, but actions like this can lead to litigation against the town. You can indeed sue someone for taking a private Facebook post and making it public, particularly if it invades the persons privacy, causes damage to their reputation or constitutes harassment. Possible legal claims include invasion of privacy, defamation, or copyright infringements in some cases, depending on what the post shared.

In summary, Councilor Ryan knowingly broke a policy in place and thus I would suspect a code of conduct investigation should be triggered as is customary in such circumstances. His actions show he is not working with the Council but against it.

Sincerely,

Councilor April Brunelle