

Dear Commission Members,

I was unable to be recognized by "raising my hand" during the August 8th meeting presumably because of a PACTV snafu so I am forwarding my comments concerning term limits:

I was very dissappointed concerning your decision not to implement term limits. Your argument about the "best" people who have the most "experience" being allowed to run over and over again is not solid in my opinion. "Experience" is a learned attribute and not a schooled one. The only way experience is achieved is by a person given a chance. The following is a real life example of getting experience that I'm sure all of you have gone through;

I am a recently retired electrical engineer who has worked for 45years. My "experience" consists of designing electrical power distribution systems for chemical plants, power plants, mission critical facilities, biotech facilities and pharmaceutical facilities. The only way I was able to get "experience" was by someone hiring me. Later on in my career I became a mentor for young engineers just starting out. I was able to help them get "experience" in their young professional life while guiding them and helping them to learn. In return I was able to learn from them as well.....and get new ideas!

This example is how term limits can be beneficial in government. By allowing board members to run and possibly get elected for multiple terms does not allow for new ideas. True it is up to the voters to elect who they feel the best candidate is, but I truly feel that there is no harm by limiting a person to two consecutive terms, sit one term out and then they are eligible to run again. Face it, people vote by name recognition and who has the most signs scattered around.

No town board will have a complete turnover in any one election. However, when a two term member must sit out for one term, this will allow for a new and possibly younger person to get elected. This person will get their "experience" and be mentored by other board members, but will bring new fresh ideas to the town.

The town cannot afford to be the same old same old if we want to move forward.

On another note, I was thrilled that the commission voted to have seven members....five with two at large. My idea for the two at large members is that the town should be divided as close a possible by precinct population only. Start at the north end and south end of town and add precinct populations until the town is divided approximately in half by population. Keep this as simple as possible and do not get involved in dividing precincts or dividing the town in half by some imaginary line.

Thank you,

Ken Cristofori