

**Raymond Ethics Committee**  
**February 10, 2004**

- I. Co-chairman Pat Larney called to order a meeting of the Raymond Ethics Committee on Tuesday, February 10, 2004, at 6:30pm at the Raymond Town Hall. Also present were:

Sandy Ellis, Co-chairman  
Gretchen Gott  
Emery Landis  
Marilyn Semple

In addition, present were Raymond Police Department officers:

Brian Allaire  
Andy Cszmadia  
Thomas Hennessey  
Eric Tine

There was one member of the public present. The meeting was televised by RCTV. The cameraman was Craig Fauth.

- II. The minutes of January 13, 2004 were reviewed. Marilyn suggested that the last names of the attendees at the training session be added to the minutes. Marilyn made a motion to approve the minutes as amended and Emery seconded the motion. Sandy abstained and all others voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed.
- III. Training session: The members of the Raymond Police Department attended the meeting for the purpose of their annual ethics training. The code was reviewed and discussed with particular attention to items such as conflict of interest and gifts. The officers stated that they have a very comprehensive set of rules as part of their standard operating procedure and suggested that the committee might want to review those procedures. It was also noted that the officers are union employees and as such have some different requirements.
- IV. Old Business:
- A. Pat Larney will send another letter to all boards, etc. reminding them that those members who have not attended the training sessions that the code calls for annual training. Pat will also again contact the Town Manager to make arrangements for the employees and remaining Department Heads to receive their annual training.
- B. Role play training session: A scenario was presented by Joyce Wood, who took the role of the complainant (Joyce Q. Public) at the request of the Ethics Committee for the purpose of training. The scenario was that the complainant stated that a member of a land use board accepted free carpet cleaning from a local business. The value of the service was greater than \$25.00. An alternative scenario was that the member accepted free carpet cleaning from a local business at a time when the business had an application pending before the board. There was discussion among

the Ethics Committee members regarding the process for filing a complaint. Receipt of a complaint is acknowledged with in 10 days of receipt. Committee members discussed several possible next steps:

1. Placing the complaint on the agenda for discussion. Members asked does the complaint need to be verified as being complete i.e. all avenues of relief exhausted and a specific section of the code identified as having been violated? Is this done in public and if so is the respondent notified that the matter will be discussed only in terms of the process, not the content of the complaint. Is the complainant required to bring proof of the completeness of the application i.e. attempt for relief at the appropriate level prior to coming to the Ethics Committee? Or does the Ethics Committee take responsibility for verifying that the complaint form is complete? Is the complainant's word of such sufficient? Some members expressed concern that if this is done publicly, then deemed not to be complete as provided for in the code, then information is made public prematurely. There was discussion about the fact that once a complaint is made, it becomes part of the minutes, so is public information. No consensus was reached on this point and more discussion is needed. During this discussion, members suggested that we ask Dunbarton Ethics Committee members about this question.
2. After the complaint has been verified as complete, the committee would then schedule a pre-hearing session to establish the groundwork for the actual hearing of the complaint. This pre-hearing would establish names of those involved, the nature of the complaint (but not the substance of the case), the logistics of the actual hearing and the scheduling of others requested to be present at the hearing by the committee.
3. The hearing would then take place at another time as scheduled and according to the process agreed upon during the pre-hearing.

V. New Business

- A. Regarding articles in "On the Common:" Currently, there is no money in the budget for articles. A request for money has been added to this year's budget.
- B. Annual Report: The Ethics Committee does have a submission for the report written by Pat Larney.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10pm.