

Town of Montville Town Council
Public Hearing Minutes for Monday, January 14, 2016
6:00 p.m. – Montville High School – Auditorium

1. Call to Order
Chairman Jaskiewicz called the Public Hearing to order at 6:00 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance followed by a moment of silence in honor of our military.
3. Roll Call
Present were Councilors Caron, Longton, May, Pollard, Rogulski (6:19 p.m.), Tanner, and Jaskiewicz. Also present was Mayor Ronald McDaniel.
4. Public Hearing
Chairman Jaskiewicz opened and introduced the public hearing:

TOWN OF MONTVILLE
NOTICE OF ORDINANCE HEARING

The following Ordinance, copies of which may be obtained at the office of the Town Clerk during office hours, was introduced at a regular meeting of the Town Council held December 14, 2015 and a public hearing thereon and for its consideration by the Town Council will be held at Montville High School Auditorium, January 14, 2016 at 6:00 P.M.

Ordinance Establishing the Montville Police Department

The Town of Montville hereby ordains, that:

Section 1. Police Department Established and Police Department Functions

- (a) Pursuant to powers given the Town of Montville by the Connecticut General Statutes, including without limitation by C.G.S. § 7-148(c)(4)(A), and powers given the Town Council by the Charter, there is to be established hereby an Administrative Department of the Town of Montville to be known as the Police Department (“Department”). The head of the Department shall be the Chief of Police (“Chief”), who shall be a Department Head per Charter § 408. .
- (b) The Department shall have the authority to perform all functions and take all actions that an organized municipal police department in the State of Connecticut is allowed by federal and state law to perform and take and generally shall provide for police protection, and perform criminal law enforcement activities within the limits of the Town of Montville and, to the extent allowed by state and federal law, outside its limits. Without diminishing the foregoing, the rights and duties of the Department shall include:
 - (i) Crime Prevention – The Department shall preserve the public peace, prevent crime, detect and arrest offenders, protect the rights of persons and property, and enforce the laws of the State of Connecticut and where appropriate the ordinances and regulations of the Town of Montville;
 - (ii) Traffic Enforcement – The Department shall administer and enforce laws regulating, directing, and controlling the movement of vehicular and pedestrian traffic;
 - (iii) Training – The Department shall operate training programs to maintain and improve the efficiency and competency of the employees of the Department;

- (iv) Weapons Disposition – The Department shall establish a procedure for the sale, destruction, or other disposition of all weapons or other articles used in the commission of crime or coming into the custody of the Department, in accordance with the requirements of state and federal law; and
- (vi) Lost Property – The Department shall establish and implement a procedure for the sale of unclaimed, lost or stolen articles coming into the custody of the Department
- (c) Police Officers shall have the powers and duties with respect to the service of criminal process and enforcement of criminal laws as are vested in peace officers by federal and state law, including without limitation by C.G.S. §§ 53a-3(9) and 54-1f.

Section 2. Chief of Police

- (a) Appointment. There is hereby created the non-classified position of Chief of Police. The Chief shall be appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Town Charter, and need not be a resident of the Town of Montville.
- (b) Powers and Duties. The Chief of Police shall be accountable to and under the supervision of the Mayor, and shall perform duties including but not limited to:
 - (i) Having general management and supervision of the Department and of the property and equipment used in connection therewith, in accordance with policies or procedures of the Public Safety Commission and/or the Police Department, and consistent with all requirements of federal and state law;
 - (ii) Prescribing rules and regulations not inconsistent with the administrative policy created pursuant to Charter § 408 as the Chief deems necessary or expedient for the proper operation of the Department and, to that end, keeping informed of the latest administrative practices;
 - (iii) Initiating and implementing a continuing program for instruction and training of Department personnel;
 - (iv) Having general authority and control over all Department employees and overseeing scheduling, assignments, and proper fulfillment of all assignments, tasks, and duties of the Department;
 - (v) Within the powers granted to Town of Montville Department Heads by the Charter, and pursuant to the General Statutes and any Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Town of Montville and AFSCME, Council #4, Local #2504, and under state and federal law, taking all personnel actions the Chief deems appropriate including without limitation assigning and reassigning personnel, supervising personnel, imposing discipline, and making recommendations for hiring;
 - (vi) Developing and implementing a system to maintain and preserve records with respect to law enforcement and other activities of the Department and its personnel;
 - (vii) Reporting on the operation and affairs of the Department to the Public Safety Commission, the Mayor and the Town Council at such intervals, as each shall require; and

- (viii) Working with the Public Safety Commission to prepare the Police Department's annual budget for submission to the Director of Finance pursuant to Charter § 408.
- (c) The Chief may be assisted in the execution and performance of his/her management duties by non-union personnel including, but not limited to, Assistant or Deputy Chiefs and Captains.
- (d) Removal of Police Chief. Dismissal of the Chief shall be pursuant to the provisions C.G.S. § 7-278.

Section 3. Effective Date

- (a) The effective date of this Ordinance shall be as provided in Charter § 312(C), however, the existing department shall not be abolished and the Police Department created by this Ordinance shall not come into existence until the day on which the person appointed Police Chief is sworn into office.
 - (i) On the day the Chief is sworn in the existing police department shall cease to exist and its employees and officers shall be at that time be employees of the Police Department created by this Ordinance.

Dated at Montville, Connecticut this 15th day of December 2015.

Lisa Terry
Montville Town Clerk

Chairman Jaskiewicz asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak regarding the proposed Ordinance and requested they do so within the three-minute time limit.

Rocco Basilica, 7 Hunters Run, who has resided in the Town since 1997 and has served as a member of the New London Fire Department for 27 years, spoke in support of an independent police department (IPD). He commended the State Police, but felt that the Town has outgrown the State Police support. He has found Lt. Bunnell and the Montville Police Department to be courteous, professional, and supportive and has had only positive experiences in all of his dealings with them. He stressed the importance of protecting and supporting the Town and its children and the need for a homegrown professional police department that is knowledgeable about and committed to investing their energies into the Town, its issues, and its residents.

Gregory Majewski, 1176 Route 163, a resident of the Town since 1973, spoke in support of the Ordinance. In the past, the primary issue of adopting an IPD has been the cost. The cost for a Resident State Trooper (RST), which was originally 50%, is now 85%, plus overtime. Neither the State Legislature nor the State Government appear to have any control over the finances and have simply been passing on the costs to the municipalities. It would not be surprising for the cost of the RST Program to rise to 100% in the near future, not to mention the additional costs related to the State Police radio upgrades. Such costs, which will continually rise, will be what the State decrees and would result in the Town being part of *their* plan, paying *their* bills, and experiencing its adverse affects. Furthermore, an IPD would help to support the economic development of the Town and encourage the establishment of new businesses, thereby increasing the tax base.

Jeremiah Ross, 41 Carol Drive, a Montville resident since 1994, spoke in favor of the Ordinance. He has had nothing but positive interactions with the Police Department and felt that the Town requires an IPD to support its ongoing growth and offerings. In terms of command & control, it is important to have one system of communication and long-term,

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

consistent leadership with a commitment to the community. Similarly, operationally speaking, an IPD would eliminate the existing overlaps and redundancies between the two systems. These elements, along with the institution of a locally grown police force, would result in irrefutable community pride within not only the Department, itself, but also within the Town, as a whole. The Public Safety Building was built for the future to accommodate an IPD. Additional costs could be mitigated through the receipt of various grants that are only available to IPDs. He encouraged everyone to support the Ordinance.

Jarell Roberts, 79 Massachusetts Road, Oakdale, owner of K9 Corner, Oakdale, spoke in support of the Ordinance. While a detailed Report, including the pros and cons, has been provided, the Report fails to note the issue of the 911-call system with regards to police services. As part of the RST Program, emergency telephone calls are directed to Montville's Dispatching Department, who, after listening to the citizen, re-routes any police calls to the State Police Dispatchers, who must, again, listen to the citizen. This results in the loss of valuable time — especially in cases of immediate or life-threatening situations — due to the transfer and re-explanation of the issue at hand. In addition, a State Police Officer may not be familiar with the local area, again, limiting their ability to arrive at the scene in a timely manner.

Dick Jastremski, 406 Cherry Lane, a lifetime resident of Montville, felt that the Ordinance is a positive issue that should be voted upon by the residents of the Town.

Laurie Wickson, 10 Glendale Road, a resident of Montville since 1977, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance and agreed that the residents of the Town should vote upon the issue. A number of the residents live on fixed incomes and are unable to afford the added expense of an IPD.

Julius Jurkiewicz, 17-A Massapeag Road, a 47-year resident of Montville and an original member of the Public Safety Commission, which participated in a similar study, spoke in favor of the Ordinance. In order to expand the tax base, it is important to provide an incentive for businesses that includes not only the schools, but also the Public Works, Police and Fire Departments, Medical, etc. The establishment of the casinos has not only expanded the workforce, but has also introduced its problems to the Town. As previously mentioned, the State will soon charge towns 100% of the RST costs, which may be followed by their pension costs and eventually lead to the cessation of the Program for a municipality that is able to afford its own Police Department. Referring to the old adage, "pennywise and pound foolish", he stated that the Town had the opportunity to establish an IPD 10-15 years ago, when the costs would have been much less. Another option could be to disband the Town of Montville and separate it between its neighboring towns, who currently have an IPD. He has had positive dealings with the Police, who have been both courteous and professional, and supports the consistency that an IPD would provide. He resents the spending of tax dollars for constant referendums regarding the same issue.

Chairman Jaskiewicz stated that, should the Ordinance go to a referendum, a new policy has been adopted such that only one location — most likely, Fair Oaks, which is geographically located in the center of the Town — rather than all six locations, would be opened.

Shaun Tine, 128 Sharp Hill Road and 907 Route 32, a home and business owner and a concerned and actively involved citizen of the Town since 1970, spoke in favor of the Ordinance. He thanked the Mayor and Town Council for the opportunity to speak this evening and for their diligence, hard work, and research efforts on the topic over the years. He has kept abreast of the issue since the onset and felt that the Council had charged some of the most experienced and well-versed members of the Town resulting in a thoroughly researched report. He has witnessed the growth and transformation of the Town over the years, and felt that, while change is sometimes unwelcome and painful, change, in this situation, is absolutely necessary. The benefits far outweigh the costs, which would amount to one dinner out per year for an average household. And, in adding up all of the costs of the present system, he strongly believed that the Town would be saving money with an IPD. The benefits would include (1)

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

the stabilization of costs – as witnessed over the past six (6) years, the RST Program has risen and is expected to continue to increase, in all aspects, at a similar pace; (2) improved service and savings on procedural tasks; (3) continuity of leadership with one person, who has only the Town's best interest in mind, in charge – keeping in mind that, since 1970, the Town has had over 25 RSTs; (4) dispatching – overall less need for red tape slowing down the process and undermining the system's effectiveness. He added that, as responsible citizens, we need to do what is right for the Town of Montville.

Iris Yoselevsky, Meetinghouse Lane, spoke in favor of the Ordinance, citing the importance of continuity and necessity of having a leadership with the knowledge of the Town's population and geography. Establishing an IPD is part of community growth, as farmlands and woodlands have transformed over the years into housing developments. In addition, a local police force is an important element of the Town's infrastructure that can be attractive to potential industry and businesses. For the sake of reliability, continuity, familiarity, and a stronger infrastructure, she hopes they would vote in favor of a local police department.

Ted Wisniewski, 153 Kitemaug Road, a 73-year resident of the Town, spoke in favor of the issue going to a referendum. Adding that, due to the time it takes for an Officer(s) to arrive at a scene, he/she may not be able to protect you. As such, one should be able to protect one's self.

James Stuhler, 63 Sarah Drive, a 36-year resident of the Town, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, referring to Public Act 15-244, which will become effective in fiscal year 2016, regarding "making appropriations, therefor, and other provisions related to revenue, deficiency appropriations and tax fairness and economic development." Under this Act, the State would provide an annual contribution of \$578,000.00 to the Town. His findings indicate that the establishment of an IPD would increase the Town's expenditures by approximately 22+% and, unless the Town works very diligently to cut the budget in other places, it will forfeit the \$578,000.00 contribution. Along with funding losses from the Mohegan Tribe, the amount would total to over \$1 million. In addition, property tax on vehicles is slated to rise in 2016, placing the Town over the 32 mil limit. Furthermore, he has found the Report questionable in many aspects, including the 2016 budget numbers, which he felt was "vastly loaded" to make the formation of an IPD appear more positively. He also has many questions regarding, what he feels are, inconsistencies within the Report.

John Giddings, 169 Park Avenue Extension, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, citing that the State is losing businesses due to high taxes and, likewise, the Town will begin losing revenue due to taxes, which are "killing this State".

Ed Belinski, 21 Heather Brook Road, a resident of the Town since 1976, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating that the establishment of an IPD would be too costly for the Town, citing the addition of seven (7) to eight (8) police officers, a jail, and the potential lawsuits. He disagrees with the need for additional people, stating that the current people know them and what is happening. The Town should be searching for ways to contain costs rather than to spend more money.

Colleen Rix, 74 Roselund Road, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating that it is something the Town cannot afford and that the resulting budget cuts would derive from those areas that the residents would be opposed to, i.e., education, transportation, roads. With numerous businesses leaving the Town and numerous vacant commercial spaces, the Town does not have adequate revenue to facilitate the extra costs of an IPD. She would like to see the Town grow, not get worse.

John Strong, 134 Richard Brown Drive, a Navy veteran, spoke in support of the Ordinance. He felt that providing the Town with the ability to have control over its costs and other issues was an important aspect of the Constitution and of a representative government where all aspects are kept at the local level.

Robert Manfredi, 9 Heather Brook Road, a 19-year resident of Montville, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating the inability of the current and past Committees to discover any cost

savings resulting from the formation of an IPD. The current report indicates an initial cost increase of over \$1.5 million that would grow over time. The cost would cover staffing increases, including a Chief of Police, a second in command, and five dispatchers, which is currently received free of charge through the State Police. He felt that this evening's Public Hearing is the result of the Committee's failed Report and an IPD would not be in the best interest of the Town, citing that there would be no cost savings, there are no current existing problems with the State Police, and no criminal activity or increase in criminal activity of any kind in the Town. The passage of the Ordinance will result in an increased mil rate to all of the Town's residential and business owners.

Elmer Wittkofske, 18 Wyndwood Road, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating that, while many have noted that the State Police costs will rise, no one has been able to state what that actual cost will be. An independent police force would only add taxes, which is already overloaded. He felt that the Constables, who are here to stay, are doing a fine job and have familiarity with the Town and would constitute the IPD. Due to the recent loss of taxable land to the Mohegan Tribe and loss of businesses, he felt that this was not the time to establish an IPD and agreed that the issue should go to a referendum.

Linda Bradshaw, 39 Leita Drive, a 46-year resident of the Town, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance due to the current high tax rate of the Town and lack of affordability. She felt that the people of Montville should be able to vote on the issue.

Judy Gaetano, 98 Park Avenue, a resident of the Town for over 40 years, agreed with Ms. Rix, adding that, while the public voted in favor of the new Public Safety Building, they were not able to provide any input as to the type of building that would be constructed. The building was constructed with the intention of the Town adopting an IPD, though the people have consistently voted against it. She felt that the politicians were pushing for an IPD, while the people remain consistently opposed to it. The issue should go to the people for another vote and should be included in the budgetary matters of the Town. Their taxes are already too high and the Town receives very little services; she would like to see some benefits for her tax dollars.

Tiiu Propfe, 32 Riverview Road, a 40-year resident of the Town, recalled that ten or so years ago, all of the Departments were asked to tighten their budgets, resulting in the closing of the Senior Center on weekends. In addition, the Youth Services Bureau and the Parks & Recreation Departments continue to work with a shoestring budget. While she would like to see an IPD in Town, she agreed with Ms. Rix and Ms. Gaetano, who stated that the Town should invest the funds into establishing other necessary services. She also questioned exactly how much their individual taxes would rise should the Town opt to establish an IPD, sensing that it would rise more than one dinner/year, as previously stated.

Gary Bern, 20 Dock Road, a 75-year resident of the Town, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating that, while he has had positive experiences with the current Montville Police Department, he could not say the same for the New London Police Department, an independent police force. He felt that the Town would not receive additional protection and fails to see any benefit with an independent police force, which would cost the residents more money, including many hidden costs. He also felt that having the Mayor, an elected official, acting as the Chief of Police is a positive aspect of a Constabulary, rather than a Police Chief who might not respond appropriately to the situation at hand.

Jay Giurleo, 3 Hunters Run, thanked the Mayor and the Town Council and spoke in support of an IPD. He recommended everyone read the Report, which was formed by a quality group of individuals, and clearly states the pros and the cons of both sides. While he felt that it would have been nice to have the costs more clearly elaborated, he understood that this was not the purpose of the Report. He, independently, arrived at the conclusion that the Town's current budget would increase less than 0.5% and whether that would be an increase the Town could tolerate would be under the discretion of the Town Council.

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

Howard R. Beetham, Jr., 60 Riverview Road, a nearly 79-year resident of Montville and 135 years of family history in the Town, felt that now was not the time to establish an IPD. Mr. Beetham served as the Town's First Selectman for 18 years from 1971 when there were four (4) full-time and seven (7) part-time Officers and two (2) Resident State Troopers working in the Town Hall basement serving a Town of 15,663, according the Census Bureau. Today, he estimates the population at approximately 18,600 residents, excluding the prison population. Over the past 45 years, the police department has grown six-fold, yet the population has grown only 20%. In addition, the Town is shrinking due to the allocation of land to the Mohegan Tribe, deeming it non-taxable. Furthermore, businesses, both large and small, are leaving the Town.

John Geary, 11 Depot Road, who served on the Town Council for ten (10) years, spoke in favor of the Ordinance, feeling that the State's costs will continue to increase. He has had previous dealings with the current Police Department and felt that they would be able to handle the job and continue to help protect the Town.

Matt Lariviere, 50 Massachusetts Road, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, stating that the Town's lack of economic and population growth makes the establishment of an independent police department unaffordable for the residents of the Town.

Alfred Tuchman, 11 Wyndwood Road, an 11-year resident of the Town, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance, referring to the old adage, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it". Having heard a number of complimentary comments regarding the current police force and the apparent lack of actual numbers, he is opposed to the Ordinance and in favor of a referendum.

Cynthia Tennyson, 1676 Bozrah Road, who has resided in the Town for approximately 12 years and is invested in the Town, spoke in opposition to the Ordinance. Stating that the saying, "if you build it, they will come" does not work for a police force and felt that they should concentrate on the economic development of the Town by bringing in new businesses thereby establishing a more solid tax base rather than fixing what is not broken, as was previously stated.

Traci Callaghan, 27 Oak Road, a resident of the Town since 1978, who is raising her family in the Town, is a member of the Oakdale Firehouse and employed by one of the local Elementary Schools, felt that the issue should be presented to the people for a vote and related a very positive experience with the current Police Department.

Dana McFee, 27 Crestview Drive, who is neither for nor against the item, spoke in support of sending the item to a referendum, reiterating that the only way for the issue to go to referendum is for the Town Council to approve the Ordinance and for the people to file a petition to override their decision, sending the item to a referendum.

Mike Hillsberg, 39 Lisa Lane, spoke in support of the Ordinance. Referring to the top three taxpayers in the Town, he stated that the Town has changed over the years, especially in relation to various spinoff developments resulting from the establishment of the Casino. He commended the Town Council's selection of the authors of the Report, which was thoroughly explained and discussed at a recent public meeting. He is in favor of acquiring efficiency for his tax dollars and accountability for the Officers, stating that the high turnover rate of Officers is partially due to the lack of advancement and the requirement for the Officers to answer to two entities (Town and the State). This high turnover rate results in additional expenses for the interviewing and training of new Officers. Furthermore, the Mayor, as Chief of Police, is not policing the Town as a member of the Police Department or formulating policing policies. Rather, he is acting as the Chief of Administrative Officer of the Department formulating administrative policies. In addition, he felt that all three areas of Public Safety, which generally appear to work well together, should be reviewed when considering a change to one of the areas. He spoke in favor of a referendum without any complicated double negatives. With respect to the budget, the current cost for the RST (\$180,000.00), which includes 85% of the costs and 100% of their benefits, will require an additional expense of \$180,000.00 for the

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

acquisition of new State Police radios, though most of the communication is conducted within the Town, itself.

Jim Wood, 43 Leita Drive, spoke in favor of the Ordinance, commended the Constables and stated that the retention of Officers would help maintain the pride and morale of the Department. He felt there would be a cost savings in minimizing the constant need for screening, interviewing, and sending prospective Officers to the Academy. While he believes that there is never a good time, the time to form an IPD is now. Being one of 169 Towns in the State, Montville is lucky enough to be one of the 11 Towns housing a State Police Barrack. He expressed his appreciation to all of the members of the public in attendance and/or spoke on this important issue and engaged in the democratic process.

Brian Devine, 1650 Old Colchester Road, 1492 Route 85, 179 Gallivan Lane, a member of the community since 1964 as both a resident and business owner, spoke in favor of the Ordinance and corrected the gentleman who stated that there was no crime in the Town, stating that he has been a victim of both break-ins and vandalism. Among other things, he favors the accountability an independent police department would provide.

Lynda Jean, 1583 Route 163, spoke in support of the Ordinance, citing that businesses would be more apt to establish a business in Town if they had the support of an IPD. Taxes will continue to rise, regardless, and questioned, if not now, then when.

Joe dePasquale, 3 Adamo Avenue, a member of the Montville Law Enforcement Committee, which created the Report, spoke with regards the apparent misinformation that has been presented this evening. With a background of 36 years in law enforcement and, as such, familiar with the entity of criminal justice system, he reported that the State Police Colonel currently earns a salary of \$185,000.00 while the Town's Resident State Trooper is earning \$180,000.00. The salary, he clarified, is determined by the Office of Policy and Management, rather than the State Police Department. He urged the public to provide accurate numbers as the Committee worked diligently to create the resulting Report. He favors the issue going to referendum and agreed that there would be a tax increase, but added that those who pay both State and Local taxes are paying for their Resident State Trooper twice, once in their State taxes and, again, within their local taxes. With regards to the crime rate, he suggested reviewing the Uniform Crime Reports for Southeastern CT released by the State of Connecticut.

Al Sholes, 8 Amanda Court, stated that the crime reports for the Town of Montville, published in *The New London Day's* Police Log, is listed under the State Police Troop E and only a small percentage of the crime is actually reported, resulting in the lack of credit for the work of the local Officers.

Jim Moran, 308 Chesterfield Road, a 31-year resident of the Town and 44-year member of law enforcement, spoke in support of the issue going to a referendum. He stated that the Police Department is not the cause of the Town's high tax rate, but it is the schools, which have over \$32 million allocated to their budget, compared to \$1.5 million allocated to the Police Department.

Mike Butterworth, 128 Connecticut Blvd., who served 23 years in the military, 20 years in Corrections, six (6) years on the Public Safety Commission, and ten (10) years with Boat Patrol, spoke in favor of the Ordinance, which, he felt is in the best interest of the Town and its residents. While he commends the State Police Officers, he is in support of a larger IPD to continue to protect its residents from the growing crime as former prisoners, whose numbers are at an all-time high and who are currently residing within the fabric of their community. Some have stated the need for new businesses and industry in the Town, but have failed to recognize that, to support that influx, the need for additional policing will also be necessary.

Denise Gladue, 44 Cook Drive, a 25-year resident, who stated no opinion on the issue and regretted not attending the public meeting, stated the importance of the residents being able to participate in the discussion by voting on the issue.

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

Bob Tringe, 167 Meetinghouse Lane, a resident of the Town since 1966, spoke in support of an independent police department, stating that, while the State Police is a good organization, the Town has outgrown the program and it is now time to move forward.

Vic Lenda, 128 Kitemaug Road, a 40-year resident of the Town, thanked the Town Council for holding the meeting and agreed with Mr. Wood regarding the democratic process and the importance of the public to be present to debate the issue. Hired by former First Selectman Beetham as a part-time Constable in 1977 for \$2.67/hour, Mr. Lenda moved on to work with the State Police Department, where he worked for 29 years in a variety of capacities, including as a RST for three different towns. As a member of the Committee, he reported that the Committee voted to support an IPD for a variety of reasons, not excluding the rising costs of the RST Program, which was, in his time, 50% of the RST's salary, rising to 70% a few years ago, and, now, 85%. In addition, there are rumors regarding an additional rise of the Program to 100%, which he is in agreement with, but not with the added payment of 100% of the Trooper's fringe benefits and overtime costs, which would bring the cost to a total of over \$200,000.00. A Chief of Police would be providing similar duties for half the cost, including benefits. With regards to the staffing proposal, the Department is currently budgeted for 26 Officers; the Committee's proposal recommends 29 Officers, including the Chief.

Gary Murphy, 6 Carolina Drive, a 32-year member of the Oakdale Fire Department and the current Fire Chief, commended former RST Lenda, stating that he is one of the finest Troopers he has ever known. He spoke on the misconceptions of the role of the State Police in the Town, stating that though the State Police Barracks may be located within the confines of the Town, they are not readily available to the Town, itself. He commended the State Police Officers, but felt that it was time for the Town to move on, referring to the growing crime rate, including an increase in violence, especially domestic violence; heroin use, having had to deliver five (5) narcans last month alone, and; prostitution due to the establishment of the Casino. These issues will not be going away. In addition, there are two (2) Officers who are taken off patrol duties to conduct background checks all day for weapons. He also reported that the Governor had proposed eliminating the RST Program entirely. The proposal was tabled due to the backlash he received from the smaller towns. Nevertheless, as recently reported, the State is expected to end the Program for those towns with larger populations, such as Montville, in the near future.

Ellen K. Desjardins, 513 Raymond Hill Road, a resident of the Town since 1960, supports the issue going to referendum since the residents will be expected to pay for the added expense(s).

Rick Gladue, 44 Cook Drive, stated that he has mixed feelings regarding the issue and agrees that the issue should go to referendum and be decided by the people. Due to the costs and other existing priorities, he questioned whether the Town would feel safer with an IPD.

Lt. Leonard Bunnell, 5 Little John Drive, who also began his tenure with the Police Department under former First Selectman Beetham, spoke about the growth of the Town. When he first started working for the Town, there were four (4) traffic lights along Route 32 from the Waterford to Norwich town lines. There are now 14. He urged the residents to think about the volume and growing numbers of activity as 1,300-1,400 calls for service are received each month by the Montville Police Department. In May 2014, the Town Council approved the formation of the Montville Law Enforcement Feasibility Committee to investigate the Town's available options due to the unfunded State mandates, including the RST Program, which is what drives their taxes. While, over the years, the Town has reaped numerous benefits as a member of the RST Program, the financial condition of the State informs us that the costs will continue to climb while services, including the RST Program, will continue to be cut. The Town should be prepared for the inevitable. The Ordinance was initiated to provide the Town with a viable plan. Having attended all of the meetings, he commended the Committee for their hard work.

Town Council Public Hearing Minutes
Thursday, January 14, 2016, 6:00 p.m.

William Bucko, 106 Wildwood Lane, a resident of the Town since 1966 and Co-chairman of both the Public Safety Building Committee and Montville Law Enforcement Feasibility Committee with a background in Construction Management, provided a brief background of the Facility. The members of the Building Committee, which was formed in July 2008, diligently followed their charge and visited numerous public safety buildings located in the CT, MA, and RI. These visits and the meetings they held with the Police Chiefs and Administrators provided the Committee with a knowledge base that is reflected in the current building, which held their Ribbon Cutting Ceremony in January 2013. All of the individuals with whom the Committee consulted emphatically recommended the building complex fulfill the Town's needs for expansion for a minimum of 40 years. As such, the modern facility fully meets all of the elements required for the establishment of an IPD and is a testament of the citizens of Montville who favorably cast their ballots.

Rick Mowan, 32 Webb Drive, a 30-year resident of the Town, retired Navy Veteran, member of the Mohegan Fire Department and Fire Police Association, and who has also worked with the Police Department, spoke in favor of a referendum. He encouraged everyone to visit the Town website and review the records and the data that is provided rather than judging their decision on hearsay.

Wills Pike, 71 Pheasant Run, a resident of the Town for 21-years and Chairman of the Montville Law Enforcement Feasibility Committee, stated that the Committee's final report was designed and formulated to be short and concise. Much of the information that has been published in the newspapers has been incorrect and understands the residents' concerns regarding their taxes. He stated that the Committee strove to maintain their objectivity throughout their discussions, not forming an opinion until the very end. He confirmed that the numbers included in the Report are, to the best of their knowledge, correct and was formulated with the help of the Town's Finance Director and one of the Committee members who is a retired bank executive. He encouraged those who have any questions regarding the numbers to speak with him directly. In addition, he added that significant cost savings could be gained from the unification of the current Fire/EMS Dispatching Department with a Police Dispatching Department. The Town of Montville does not currently have a police dispatch department and the numbers included in the Report reflect that of the formation of a separate department from the existing fire and medical dispatching department, which currently is budgeted for \$340,000.00/year. Furthermore, the proposed budget is less than 10% of the current school budget — a budget that is readily passed, with regular increases. While he supports a strong school system, he also supports a strong Police Department that will serve the people of the Town and ensure their safety and well-being. He commended both the Local and State Police Officers and their dedication. He encouraged everyone to read and review the Report and is open to any questions they might have.

Chairman Jaskiewicz asked three times if there were any additional members of the community who wished to speak regarding the Ordinance. There being none, he reiterated that, in order for the issue to go to a referendum, the Town Council will need to vote to approve the Ordinance, the people will need to petition their decision, and the Town Council can vote to send the issue to a referendum. In such case, only the polling station at Fair Oaks, which is geographically located in the center of the Town, will be opened. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and respectfully voicing their comments.

5. Adjournment

The Public Hearing was closed and the meeting was adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Agnes Miyuki, Recording Secretary for the Town of Montville