

Roxanne Maher

From: Jessica Buhle
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 7:41 PM
To: Roxanne Maher
Subject: Forward of communication with Matt Ritter
Attachments: Modified Draft with Attorney Revisions.docx

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jessica Buhle <jessicab@ledyardct.org>
Subject: **Re: Redline version of the draft and two notes.**
Date: October 27, 2025 at 7:29:29 PM EDT
To: "Ritter, Matthew D." <MRitter@goodwin.com>

Good evening,

I am attaching a final redline draft incorporating your changes. I have made the changes from the clean draft I sent you.

Green items are the changes you've recommended adding or defended modifying; redlines are items we've deleted.

With these changes adopted, do you feel this ordinance is effective to protect the Town of Ledyard and can be defended if the need arose?

Thank you again for your assistance and prompt replies (but if you happen to read this this evening, please don't reply until tomorrow and enjoy your evening).

Best,

Jessica Buhle
Ledyard Town Council
jessicab@ledyardct.org

On Oct 27, 2025, at 6:29 PM, Ritter, Matthew D. <MRitter@goodwin.com> wrote:

Hi Jessica – thanks for the redline. Very helpful. Comments/suggested edits below:

1. Definition of "Gift" - I think you accidentally deleted the phrase "and one hundred dollars (\$100.00) total in any one (1) year from the same person."

2. You include the “Town Attorney” in the definition of “Official.” However, the Town Attorney is already included in the definition of consultant.

If you include Town Attorney in the definition of “Official” you will have to clarify some provisions in which the term “Official” is used. See Section 9.d., Section 12.a. and #8 of “Gifts do not include”, for example. There may be some more as well.

3. Conflicts of Interest – I fully appreciate that this language below in subsection (a) comes directly from the Glastonbury code. I will only point out that this is a subjective standard. I just note that it will be easier for the Ethics Commission to make rulings if there are objective criteria (i.e. the gift rule or financial interest rule). However, this is a policy decision for the Town Council/Mayor to determine.

“that is incompatible with the proper discharge of that individual’s official responsibilities in the public interest or would tend to impair his/her independent judgment or action in the performance of official responsibilities.”

-I think it is fine to leave in subsection (d) even though it is already in the employee handbook.

-I would delete (f) because it appears earlier in the ordinance (or vise versa...delete the earlier section).

4. Section 9(c) – I assume section 1. applies only to property in Ledyard? I would clarify that for the corporation, trust, partnerships, etc.

Section(c) 3. – delete the term “political subdivision.” Or let me know what you are trying to capture here? This was in my prior comments as well.

Section 9(d) – I know this comes from Glastonbury but what does it mean for a Town official to report to a “particular agency?” I would recommend that these officials report to the Town Council Chair and/or Mayor maybe? Or maybe the chair of that board or commission?

For Town employees, it is hard without a Town Manager. However, the term “appropriate authorities” may not be clear enough. Again, maybe it is the Mayor and/or Town Council Chair? Or the full Town Council like with department heads?

-It may also be easier to just require anyone who is uncertain to ask for an advisory opinion? Maybe eliminate the middle step? The involvement of other individuals raises questions about FOIA, confidentiality, etc.

5. Section 10 – is almost identical to the conflicts of interest section I highlighted above. If the Town Council keeps the provision, I would just use it once in the ordinance.

-10. b. I understand subsection (c) because it relates to a matter a consultant/employee may have been involved with in their role as a consultant (and they may be privy to certain confidential information, etc). However, it does not work as well for subsection (b). What is meant by “affiliated” for a consultant? For example, if the P&Z Commission hires a consultant for advice in 2025, can that consultant advise a different applicant in 2026 if it is a completely different property and an unrelated matter?

“No former Town official, employee, or consultant shall appear on behalf of any person or other entity before any agency with which he/she previously was employed or affiliated for a period of one (1) year after the termination of his/her public service or employment; provided, however, that such an individual may be permitted to make such an appearance upon receipt of a favorable prior advisory opinion by the Ethics Commission pursuant to Section 13 following its review of the individual’s written application and relevant facts.”

-As noted before, I understand that Glastonbury has these revolving door provisions but I do not know if they will pass legal muster for certain consultants, unionized employees, etc. We can certainly research this issue further if requested.

-10. f. – I know this is in Glastonbury, but I still think it is a typo. I would recommend deleting this language in yellow. This was also in my earlier comments.

To avoid even the appearance of impropriety or creation of a situation that would be contrary to the declared policy and purpose of the Code, a Town official, not otherwise restrained by the Code, shall exercise care when appearing before other agencies and shall disclose whether he/she is appearing in his/her official capacity or as a private citizen.

6. Section 12. How are you going to handle existing employees/consultants as opposed to new hires/contracts? Are you going to require them to all sign the form or just new employees? The language may have to be amended to reflect this policy decision.

7. There are no legal issues with adding the training requirements.

<image001.png>

Matthew D. Ritter
Shipman & Goodwin LLP
Partner
One Constitution Plaza
Hartford, CT 06103-1919

Tel: (860) 251-5092
Fax: (860) 251-5212
MRitter@goodwin.com
www.shipmangoodwin.com

[Shipman & Goodwin LLP is a 2022 Mansfield Certified Plus Firm](#)

Disclaimer: Privileged and confidential. If received in error, please notify me by e-mail and delete the message.

From: Jessica Buhle <Jbuh@ledyardct.org>
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 4:09 PM
To: Ritter, Matthew D. <MRitter@goodwin.com>
Subject: Redline version of the draft and two notes.

CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL: Please be cautious of links and attachments.

Good afternoon,

I have attached the redline draft of the ordinance proposed comparing to the Glastonbury code of ethics. There are also notes in the document as well regarding some of the changes if they are visible. If they are not visible, please let me know and I can send those separately.

Before a final draft is adopted, I have two changes I would like to make to it that didn't get changed before I sent it to you.

First, I would like to change the requirements for finding probable cause to 3 votes instead of 4 while retaining 4 for a final decision.

Second, I would like to re-add section c and d from Section 2-68 about maintaining training for town employees and officials. The language as written in the Glastonbury code is sufficient removing the reference to their charter and naming the Mayor instead of the Town Manager.

Lastly, if you think the language specific to inquiries and complaints directly from the Glastonbury code is better overall, we can move forward with that language instead of the previously proposed language. All of the hearing and procedural language in the draft sent to you is directly from the previous draft.

Thank you for all the feedback and assistance you have provided to support effective legislation for Ledyard

Best,

Jessica Buhle
Ledyard Town Council
jessicab@ledyardct.org

Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast, a leader in email security and cyber resilience. Mimecast integrates email defenses with brand protection, security awareness training, web security, compliance and other essential capabilities. Mimecast helps protect large and small organizations from malicious activity, human error and technology failure; and to lead the movement toward building a more resilient world. To find out more, visit our website.