

Charter Review Committee (CRC)
Town of Groton, Groton, MA 01450 978-448-1111

Meeting Minutes - May 4, 2016
At Town Hall

Present: Jane Allen, Robert Collins, John Giger (Finance Comm), Michael Manugian (Chair), Bud Robertson (Vice-Chair [for CRC], Finance Comm), Stuart Schulman (BOS)

Not Present: Michael McCoy

Recorder: Stephen Legge

Visitors: Judy Anderson, Anna Eliot (BOS), Scott Harker, John Petropoulos (BOS)

Call to Order: Chairman Manugian called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

Approval of Meeting Minutes:

The minutes of April 27th were reviewed.

Mr. Manugian moved the minutes of April 27, 2016 be accepted as amended by Mr. Manugian. Ms. Allen seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Administrative:

Mr. Manugian said a current status of all submissions made was included at the top of the agenda for tonight's meeting. The update is as follows:

- 31 submissions have not yet been presented by the public;
- 14 submissions have been presented but not yet completed and are still being discussed by the Committee; 155 have been completed; there are a total of 200 submissions, of which one was added on April 27th;

Of the 155 completed,

- 45 submissions have been accepted by the Committee;
- 98 submissions have been dismissed with no changes to the Charter recommended;
- 12 submissions have been referred to other town governing boards with no changes to the Charter recommended.

Presentations by (or from) the Public (Submissions # 47, 48, 50, 51 and 64):

Submission # 47, by Michael Manugian, proposes changing the Charter Review Committee's required first public hearing (Section 7-6) from within 30 days to within 45 days. Mr. Manugian feels the present window of time for the committee to get organized and develop operating procedures is a too short.

Submission # 48, by Michael Manugian, proposes that an appointed charter review committee contain in its membership no more than one selectman, no more than one member of the Finance Committee and no more than one member of the Groton Dunstable Regional School Committee.

Submission # 50, by Michael Manugian, proposes that posting of warrant articles by the Selectmen be followed immediately by making the article available to the public, in Charter Section 2-5. Mr. Manugian's proposal is intended to apply only to citizen's petitions and not to regular warrant articles.

Submission # 51, by Michael Manugian, proposes modifying language in Charter Section 2-7(a) to ask the moderator to announce to voters at Town Meeting who is officially acting on behalf of Town officers or officials who are unable to attend the meeting.

Submission # 64, by the Finance Committee, proposes to remove Charter Section 2-6(b) because it is not necessary to the process of moving warrants along and reviewing them.

Presentations by (or from) the Public (Submissions # 88, 117, 130, 134 and 135):

Submission # 88, by John Giger, proposes to modify Charter language in Section 2-11 to require the same language concerning reports to be provided to voters involving financial articles at Spring Town Meeting also be provided to voters at Fall Town Meeting and special town meetings.

Submission # 117.1, by Connie Sartini, proposes defining the term "designating a deputy" in Charter Section 2-7.

Submission # 130, by Scott Harker: Mr. Harker presented an extensively rewritten draft of Charter Section 7-6 which lays out the periodic process of reviewing the Charter. He stated the current language is vague and misleading. One problem he refers to is that any group of seven citizens can petition Town Meeting to change the Charter.

Ms. Allen asked why Mr. Harker proposes an eight year review period. Mr. Harker answered he wants the words "no sooner than eight years" to avoid a constant change process.

Ms. Allen asked about level of involvement of the Selectmen in this process. Mr. Harker said he wanted the Selectmen completely out of the Charter review process.

Mr. Schulman questioned the language in Subparagraph (j) requiring a 2/3 vote of Town Meeting to allow the Charter review process to continue. He believes that idea conflicts with the intent of the Charter to require a periodic formal review.

Mr. Robertson questioned in Subparagraph (c) the requirement that a newly appointed member be permanently replaced if they fail to attend the first meeting of the review committee. He feels this is extreme.

Mr. Harker defended his significant expansion of Section 7-6 saying it takes more than one paragraph to describe how to do an overall charter review. It needs more details.

Mr. Collins asked Mr. Harker's intent in Subparagraph (h) and (i).

Ms. Allen, referring to the same paragraphs, asked the purpose of removing the Charter Committee from the presentation process and turning responsibility over to the Town Clerk for presentation and review at Town Meeting. She also questioned the logic of dismissing the entire charter review committee if Town Meeting failed to muster a 2/3 approval vote (Paragraph (k)).

Mr. Giger asked for clarification of the issue of citizen's petitions. Mr. Manugian confirmed a citizen's petition (ten people) can initiate consideration of a change to the Charter.

Mr. Harker stated his intent is to eliminate this option.

Mr. Manugian asked why a special town meeting is required in Paragraph (h).

Mr. Harker's intent is to limit the Special Town Meeting's considerations to only the presented Charter changes.

Mr. Manugian asked why Mr. Harker proposes to disband the charter review committee if the change process is not completed in one year. Mr. Harker replied that his language allowed the Charter Committee to request a single change to extend the process if that were necessary.

Mr. Harker's revisions were copied and distributed to the public present at the meeting. Visitor Ms. Eliot asked what is broken and needs to be fixed.

Submission # 134, by Jane Allen, requests that the number of signatures required for submission of a warrant article at town Meeting in Charter Section 2-6(a) be increased to reduce the likelihood of frivolous proposals.

Mr. Manugian believes this idea meets the test of "manners of governance" which are fair game for charter change. Last fall he had asked Attorney Lauren Goldberg, an acknowledged expert on Massachusetts Charters, if changing the number of signatures required for a citizens' petition warrant article would be considered by the legislature or attorney general. She said that this type of change would be considered.

Submission # 135, by Jane Allen, refers to Charter section 2-7 asking who are "town officers". She is wondering if this term applies to vice-chairs, all members of a committee or board or to staff members of a department.

Presentations were completed at 7:50 PM.

Discussions of Submissions # 47, 48 and 130, Made this Evening:

Submission # 47, charter review committee – first public hearing:

Mr. Collins agrees with the need for more time. He suggests 60 days.
Mr. Schulman agrees with the need for 60 days.

Mr. Manugian said one reason to extend time is that appointing authorities need more time to make appointments.

Mr. Collins asked what is meant by “public hearing”. Does the first meeting of the committee to organize and establish its own operating procedures qualify?

Mr. Giger believes the first public hearing is defined as that meeting when the public is invited and able to offer input. He clarified that the 30 days in the current Charter is measured from the time of the first organizational meeting.

Mr. Schulman proposed to combine discussion of Submission #47 with Mr. Harker’s proposed revisions to Section 7-6 (Submission # 130).
There was a consensus of the Committee to roll together a discussion of # 47, 48 and 130.

Mr. Collins moved to change 30 days to the first public hearing to 60 days. Ms. Allen seconded.

Mr. Manugian said he thinks it better to stick to 45 days, providing some constructive pressure to get things moving. Mr. Robertson liked this idea.

Ms. Allen noted the appointment of the charter review committee is not tied to the Spring Town Meeting date.

A vote was taken on the motion to extend to 60 days: the motion was approved 4 – 2 with Misters Manugian and Robertson voting no.

Submission # 48, restricting membership on the committee to one from each of the BOS, Finance Committee and the regional school committee:

Mr. Collins moved to accept Submission # 48. Mr. Robertson seconded.

Mr. Giger: Why is the Groton Dunstable school committee invited to be on the charter review committee? There is no one on the current Committee from the school committee. Committee members explained that the school committee was allowed to appoint one member of the Charter Review Committee, but that there need not be a school committee member on the Charter Review Committee.

Mr. Schulman commented that four of five selectmen expressed interest in being on the Charter Review Committee but only one was appointed .

Ms. Eliot said the BOS designated three people for the Committee, but only one of their own members, so as not to dominate.

A vote was held on the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Submission #130, a rewrite of Charter Section 7-6 by Mr. Harker - comments made as a whole:

Mr. Schulman said the rewrite was too long and too detailed.

Mr. Roberts said he agreed although there were some good points made.

Mr. Schulman was concerned with the degree of involvement of the Town Moderator.

Mr. Collins commented the rewrite does not mandate a periodic charter review. He said it could theoretically not be reviewed for 50 years under these provisions.

Mr. Giger is not satisfied with the idea that the charter review committee turns over its report to the Town Clerk and is then dismissed prior to the final presentation process. In his words, “it does not look too exciting [to be a member]”.

Mr. Manugian suggested going through the four-page draft, paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. Schulman suggested, regarding Para. 1, a review of the Charter should be required no later than ten years after the previous review.

Mr. Robertson said he liked the original wording with only a few minor changes.

Mr. Collins is concerned the present language allows changes every two years – he believes changes should be allowed only every 8-10 years. Ms. Allen noted our Department of Public Works was a major change in the way we governed and the Charter was changed early to reflect this. Why would we have waited until 8-10 years?

Several Committee members questioned the need for alternate appointees mentioned in Para. (b).

Mr. Giger mused that our jury system provides for alternate jurors, but they sit in on a trial and hear everything from the start. If alternates were to be named but not involved until needed, what good would it do to name them in the first place?

Mr. Robertson said the way our current Committee works is fine – we don’t need alternates.

Mr. Schulman took issue with the appropriateness of Mr. Giger’s analogy of the jury system.

Para. (c): no one advocated for this wording which allowed for immediate replacement of appointees who miss the first meeting.

Para. (e): it was considered that this wording (required number of public hearings) already existed in the current Charter.

Para. (f), handing off the final report to the Town Clerk: several members felt this would result in a final presentation from someone who had limited understanding of the entire Charter Review process.

Mr. Schulman commented the proper output of the Charter Review Committee is a Charter as a whole, amended, not just each amendment considered alone.

Mr. Collins felt that the Committee members should have an active and significant role explaining and selling the Charter changes recommended at Town meeting. He particularly took

issue with the idea of arbitrarily disbanding the Committee at the one year anniversary date of its beginning. Mr. Schulman asked when does the Committee disband.

Para. (h): Mr. Schulman approves at least in part the idea of submitting the Charter changes recommended at a Special Town meeting, where the Charter changes are the only thing under consideration.

Mr. Manugian said we need to look carefully at the MGL's requirements specifically governing the end of the process where the Committee's final report is being reviewed and approved by a town meeting and modify our schedule accordingly.

Action Item #1: Mr. Collins offered to review the requirements in the MGLs for the end of the process for charter change.

Ms. Allen suggested we revise wording in the Charter from the required "Spring Town Meeting" to "town meeting" in general so as to provide more flexibility to future charter review committees.

Mr. Giger added we should not worry about the extra cost of special town meetings because this process only happens once every ten years.

The Committee reached a consensus to put Paragraph (h) language on hold for now.

Para. (i): There were no advocates for this language (Town Clerk standing in for the charter review committee at Town meeting).

Members questioned the need for Para. (m) which provided for "out of cycle" charter amendments.

Action Items #2 and 3: Mr. Collins offered to draft language for Submissions #47 and 48, approved by the committee tonight.

Mr. Schulman moved to dismiss Submission # 130 with no changes to the Charter. Ms. Allen seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Schulman, acknowledging the work and thought put into Mr. Harker's proposal, moved to consider changes (Section 7-6) to the presentation and approval process for the amended charter at the end of the charter review committee's cycle of work. Mr. Robertson seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Discussions of Submissions # 50, 51, 64 and 88, Made this Evening:

Submission # 50, referring to the public posting of warrants resulting from citizen's petitions, upon receipt by the BOS.

Mr. Collins proposed postponing public posting until after the validity of the warrant is confirmed by the BOS and Town Counsel.

Mr. Schulman said warrants are often times changing right up to the point where they are put on the floor at Town Meeting. Where does one draw the line on when it should become public? Mr. Schulman explained the BOS's actual process of engagement with town meeting warrants.

Visitor Mr. Petropoulos said the Town Manager makes closed warrants publically available.

Mr. Collins moved to dismiss Submission # 50 with no change to the Charter. Mr. Robertson seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Submission # 51, modifying language in Charter Section 2-7(a) to clarify to voters at Town Meeting who is officially acting on behalf of Town officers or officials who are unable to attend the meeting:

Mr. Collins moved to refer Submission # 51 to the Town Moderator with no change to the Charter. Mr. Robertson seconded.

Mr. Collins added the Moderator should consider announcing or asking who is speaking on behalf of an article on the floor and their authority to do so.

A vote was taken on the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Submission # 64, proposes to remove Charter Section 2-6(b) because it adds no value to the process of moving warrants along and reviewing them. The current process provides warrant language to the Finance Committee soon enough.

Mr. Collins moved to adopt Submission # 64 by deleting Charter Section 2-6(b). Mr. Robertson seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Submission # 88, proposes to modify Charter language in Section 2-11 to require the same language concerning reports to be provided to voters involving financial articles at Spring Town Meeting also be provided to voters at Fall Town Meeting and special town meetings.

Mr. Collins moved to accept Submission # 88. Mr. Robertson seconded. A vote was taken and the motion was approved unanimously.

Action Item # 4: Mr. Collins will clean up the wording in Charter Section 2-11 regarding reporting to voters at town Meeting.

Administrative:

Mr. Robertson volunteered to go to the Selectmen's meeting on the coming Monday night (May 9th) to represent the Charter Review Committee as the BOS review the new Public Records policy which is based on recommendations from the Committee.

Mr. Manugian announced there would be no meeting of the Charter Review Committee next Wednesday, May 11th due to necessary absences of two members.

Mr. Manugian asked if there were any reconsiderations of past decisions wanted by Committee members. None were offered.

The meeting was adjourned with unanimous consent at 9:17 PM.

**** The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 18th, at 7:00 PM. ****

Exhibits:

- A. Undated document received from Scott Evans Harker by the Charter Review Committee on May 4, 2016 concerning Mr. Harker's submission #130
- B. Charter Submission Schedule Worksheet, for Committee planning purposes only, dated May 1, 2016

Exhibit A to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Charter Review Committee, Received 2016-05-04, By John Giger, Clerk

Groton, Massachusetts
Charter Review Committee

Submission #130
Scott Evans Harker

Revision of Section 7-6 (Periodic Charter Review)

(Original):

“At least once in every 10 year period after the effective date of this charter, a special committee consisting of 7 members shall, by an affirmative vote of the majority of the full board of selectmen, be established for the purpose of reviewing this charter and reporting its recommendations to the spring town meeting concerning any proposed amendments which the committee may determine to be necessary or desirable. The committee shall consist of 7 members who shall be appointed as follows the board of selectmen shall designate 3 persons; the finance committee shall designate 2 persons; and the Groton-Dunstable regional school committee and the moderator shall each designate 1 person. Persons appointed may, but need not, be members of the agency by which they are designated. The committee shall meet to organize forthwith after the final adjournment of the spring town meeting. The committee shall hold a public hearing within 30 days after the date on which it meets to organize and at least 1 additional public hearing before filing its final report.”

(Revision):

Groton shall undertake a formal, periodic review (“Review”) of it’s Charter no sooner than eight (8) years from the latter of: 1) the date of it’s Charter’s original acceptance by a Groton Town Meeting; or, 2) date of a Groton Town Meeting’s approval of it’s Charter’s last Review. Groton’s Review process shall be carried out in adherence with the following provisions:

- (a) Review Initiation: Said Review shall be initiated by a Groton Spring Town Meeting’s two thirds vote approving a warrant article, provided with appropriate justification, requesting same, submitted by Groton’s then Town Moderator;
- (b) Charter Review Committee Membership: Upon Groton Spring Town Meeting’s approval of said Review, and by not later than the forth Wednesday following adjournment of said Spring Town Meeting, a Charter Review Committee (“CRC”), consisting of seven (7) individuals, shall have been designated by specific town agencies as follows: Groton’s Board of Selectmen, three (3) individuals and two (2) deemed to be their first choice and second choice alternates; Groton’s Finance Committee, two (2) individuals and one (1) alternate;

Exhibit A to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Charter Review Committee, Received 2016-05-04, By John Giger, Clerk

- and from Groton-Dunstable Regional School Committee and Groton's then Town Moderator, one (1) individual and one (1) alternate, each. Individuals so appointed may, but need not, be members of a town agency by which they are designated. Names of designated individuals, and alternates, shall be communicated, in writing, to Groton's then Town Clerk upon their selection;
- (c) First CRC Meeting: On the fifth Wednesday following said Spring Town Meeting adjournment, all designated individuals shall gather, at a time and location, selected and communicated to them, in writing, by Groton's Town Clerk, to be sworn in by same, and to then organize and initiate their Review of Groton's then existing Charter. If an agency's designate can not attend said meeting, he or she is to be replaced, on a permanent basis, by that agency's designated alternate. (in case of a Groton Board of Selectmen designate, if necessary, that Board's "first" alternate is to be sworn in as its designated replacement). All designated alternates, once sworn in, if not sworn in as a designate replacement, need have no further, direct, involvement in Groton's CRC's Review, unless called upon to replace a, then sitting, CRC member, by their designating agency;
- (d) CRC Responsibility: The CRC shall examine all then existing contents of Groton's Charter to determine what amendments, if any, may be deemed necessary, or desirable ("Charge");
- (e) CRC Public Hearings: During the course of it's deliberations, in carrying out it's Charge, Groton's CRC shall hold not less than two (2) public hearings, each held at a date, time and location to be determined by a majority vote of Groton's CRC's membership;
- (f) CRC Product: The sole product of Groton's CRC's Review, shall be a report consisting of all proposed CRC amendments to Groton's then Charter, determined to be necessary or desirable, and a description of Groton's CRC's reasoning for each ("Report"), to be published and distributed with Groton's then next Spring Town Meeting Warrant. Completion of Groton's CRC's Report shall be communicated, in writing, by it's chairperson, to Groton's Town Clerk. Said communication shall include Groton's CRC's final, publishable draft of it's Report;
- (g) CRC Discharge: Upon submission of it's Report, under Section 7-6(f), above, to Groton's Town Clerk, Groton's CRC's Charge shall be deemed completed, and it shall disband on the sooner of: 1) a majority of it's membership voting, in the affirmative, to do so; or, 2) on it's one (1) year anniversary date of having been sworn in;
- (h) CRC Report Approval Process: Upon receiving notification of CRC Report completion, Groton's Town Clerk, in collaboration with Groton's then Town

Exhibit A to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Charter Review Committee, Received 2016-05-04, By John Giger, Clerk

- Counsel and Town Moderator, shall author an article for inclusion in Groton's then next Spring Town Meeting Warrant. Said article shall request that Town Meeting's approval of calling a "Special" town meeting (Special Town Meeting), on a date, time and location, to be established, and published, by Groton's Town Moderator, for the sole purpose of reviewing, discussing and approving any and/or all amendments as may be contained in Groton's CRC's Report;
- (i) Groton's Town Clerk, shall be responsible for authoring any and/or all Charter amendment articles for Groton's aforementioned Special Town Meeting's Warrant, including a final article to be worded as follows: "That this Special Town Meeting vote to approve and adopt Groton's Town Charter, with those amendments as approved by this Town Meeting, and to authorize Groton's Town Counsel to petition the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts to place in Groton's next regularly scheduled municipal election's ballot, a question approving adoption of Groton's Charter, as so amended." ("Article"), or such language as may be deemed appropriate to this Article's intent. When completed, the Special Town Meeting Warrant shall be publicized, by Groton's Town Clerk, in accordance with Section 2-6(d) of this Charter;
 - (j) Should said Article, as provided in 7-6(i), above, fail to achieve a two thirds vote of approval, Groton's Review approval process shall be considered ended, and Groton's then existing Charter, un-amended, shall continue in full force and effect;
 - (k) Should said Article, as provided in 7-6(i), above, achieve a two thirds vote of approval, but Groton's requested ballot question is not authorized by the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, then Groton's Review approval process shall be considered ended, and Groton's then existing Charter, un-amended, shall continue in full force and effect; and,
 - (l) Should said Article, as provided in 7-6(i), above, achieve a two thirds vote of approval, and: 1) Groton's requested ballot question is authorized by the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and, 2) said ballot question, itself, is approved, by a majority of Groton's then registered voters, in it's next scheduled municipal election, Groton's Review approval process requirements shall be considered complete, and Groton's Town Clerk shall present Groton's Charter, as then amended by Special Town Meeting vote, to Groton's Representative to the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for it's approval of said Charter, as then amended, by a "Special Act" of the General Court.
 - (m) "Out of Cycle" Charter Amendment(s): If an adverse situation, circumstance, or set of circumstances, is (or are) considered so significant as to have a profound, detrimental effect on Groton's ability to govern itself, and as to require creation and passage of an amendment, or amendments, to Groton's Charter to correct, a

Exhibit A to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Charter Review Committee, Received 2016-05-04, By John Giger, Clerk

Special Town Meeting, called for that specific purpose, can be requested, in writing, to Groton's Town Moderator, over the notarized signatures of the then chairman of Groton's Board of Selectmen and Finance Committee, and Groton's then Representative to the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Upon receipt of same, steps (i) through (l), above, shall be followed.

- (n) Charter Review Process Modification or Extension: A requested, one (1) time modification to, or extension of, this Review process, as identified herein, regardless of its reason, if requested by a then sitting Groton CRC, shall require a two thirds approval of an article, prepared by Groton's Town Clerk, requesting same, by a Groton Spring Town Meeting. Any permanent modification, if identified as such, shall also require passage of a "Special Act", identifying and approving same, by the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

To the extent any provision of this Section 7-6 conflicts with any other provision of this Charter, or any provision contained in Groton's By-Laws, this Section shall prevail. To the extent any specific provision of this Section 7-6 conflicts with any provision contained in laws of the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, those of that, aforementioned, General Court shall prevail.

Exhibit B to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Groton Town Charter Review Committee Schedule Worksheet

NOTE: This is NOT the schedule of the Charter Review Committee. It is merely a worksheet for planning purposes.

Shaded items are dates set by BOS and are NOT Charter Review Meetings

Questions for the Committee

1. Do we allow people to make new submissions?
2. What characteristics of the Charter do we need to check during the cleanup?
3. Do we request a town hall/govt review during the day or in the evening?
4. Propose meetings only when 6 or 7 members available, ok? Agreed Apr 27, 16
5. Should we propose a ballot vote?

<i>Date</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Topic(s)</i>	<i>Notes</i>
4/25/16		Spring Town Meeting Day 1	
4/27/16	Committee	Present and discuss 10 of 41 remaining submissions	no Michael
5/4/16	Committee	Present and discuss 10 of 31 remaining submissions	no Bud
5/11/16			no John, Mike, Michael
5/17/16		Town Elections	
5/18/16	Committee	Present and discuss 11 of 21 remaining submissions	
5/23/16		Spring Town Meeting Day 2	
5/25/16			no Bob, John
6/1/16	Committee	Present and discuss final 10 submissions	
6/8/16	Committee	Complete all remaining wording	
6/15/16	Committee	Complete all remaining wording	
6/22/16	Committee	Review draft for wording completeness	
6/29/16	Committee	Review draft for definitions, consistency, etc.	
7/6/16	Committee	Review draft explanations	no Bob
7/13/16	Committee	Review draft justifications	no Bob
7/20/16			no Jane, Mike
7/27/16	Committee	Complete & submit package for town hall/government review	no Mike
8/3/16			no Stuart
8/10/16			no Bob, Mike
8/17/16			no Bob
8/24/16	Committee	Conduct town hall/govt review	
8/31/16	Committee	Respond to town hall/govt review	
9/7/16	Committee	Respond to town hall/govt review	
9/14/16	Committee	Complete & submit package for town counsel review	
9/21/16			
9/28/16			

Exhibit B to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Groton Town Charter Review Committee Schedule Worksheet

NOTE: This is NOT the schedule of the Charter Review Committee. It is merely a worksheet for planning purposes.

Shaded items are dates set by BOS and are NOT Charter Review Meetings

<i>Date</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Topic(s)</i>	<i>Notes</i>
10/5/16	Committee	Respond to town counsel review	
10/12/16	Committee	Respond to town counsel review	
10/19/16	Committee	Draft presentation for public hearing	
10/26/16	Committee	Complete presentation for public hearing	
11/2/16		Post presentation for public hearing	
11/9/16	Public Hearing	Present recommendations for public input – part 1	
11/16/16	Public Hearing	Present recommendations for public input – part 2	
11/23/16		No meeting – day before Thanksgiving	
11/24/16		Thanksgiving	
11/30/16	Committee	Respond to public input	
12/7/16	Committee	Respond to public input	
12/14/16	Committee	Draft wording of warrant articles	
12/21/16			no meeting
12/24/16		Christmas Eve	
12/25/16		Christmas Day	
12/28/16			no meeting
12/31/16		New Year's Eve	
1/1/17		New Year's Day	
1/2/17		Warrant opens (est)	
1/4/17	Committee	Approve wording of warrant articles	
1/11/17	Committee	Draft presentation for public hearing	
1/18/17	Committee	Complete presentation for public hearing	
1/25/17	Committee	Draft presentation for Town Meeting	
2/1/17	Committee	Complete presentation for Town Meeting	
2/8/17			
2/15/17			
2/22/17			
2/23/17		Warrant closes (est)	
3/1/17			
3/8/17			
3/15/17			
3/20/17		Warrant article final wording due to Town Manager (est) Public Hearing with Fincom, BOS (est)	
3/22/17			
3/29/17			

Exhibit B to Charter Review Committee Minutes for 2016-05-04

Groton Town Charter Review Committee Schedule Worksheet

NOTE: This is NOT the schedule of the Charter Review Committee. It is merely a worksheet for planning purposes.

Shaded items are dates set by BOS and are NOT Charter Review Meetings

<i>Date</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Topic(s)</i>	<i>Notes</i>
4/3/17		Warrant sent to printer (est)	
4/5/17	Public Hearing	Present Final Recommendations – part 1	
4/10/17		Warrant posted (est)	
4/12/17	Public Hearing	Present Final Recommendations – part 2	
4/19/17			
4/24/17		Spring 2017 Town Meeting Day 1 (est)	
4/26/17			
5/1/17		Spring 2017 Town Meeting Day 2 (est)	
5/3/17			
5/10/17			
5/16/17		Town Elections (est)	
5/17/17	Committee	Draft package to Atty General	
5/24/17	Committee	Submit package to Atty General	
5/31/17			
6/7/17			
6/14/16			
6/21/16			
6/28/16	Committee	Receive notes from Atty General (if any) Present changes to town hall/govt – part 1	
7/4/16		Independence Day	
7/5/16			no meeting
7/12/17	Committee	Present changes to town hall/govt – part 2	