## Town of Colchester, Connecticut

127 Norwich Avenue, Colchester, Connecticut 06415

Board of Finance<br>Regular Meeting Minutes<br>May 17, 2017

Board of Finance members present: R Tarlov, TKane, S Lowe, A Migliaccio, A Bisbikos, R Lepote.
Others present: First Selectman A Shilosky; Board of Selectman members D Mizla, R Coyne; Board of Education Members, R Goldstein, B Bernier, D Kennedy; Superintendent of Schools, J Miathieu; Director of School Curriculum, C Hughs; CFO M Cosgrove; Town Clerk, G Furman; Tax Collector, M Wyatt; Director of Public Works, J Paggioli. Citizens, students.

Chairman Tarlov called the meeting to order at 7:04.

## Additions to the Agenda: none

Tom Kane motioned to approve the minutes, Roberta Lepore seconded, with the comments made by Stefani Lowe that the minutes did not reflect that some citizens spoke against BOE budget increases. Motion passed 5-0 with A Migliaccio abstaining.

Citizen Comments - Many people spoke in favor of moving the proposed BOE budget to referendum without Board of Finance reductions. Some spoke in support of making cuts to the BOE budget. One person felt we should be discussing budgets until we knew the impact of the State budget on Town revenue.

## 2017-2018 Budget.

There was a brief discussion of the BOE budget and the requested list of potential cuts to achieve a 400,000 reduction in that budget. Chairman Tarlov then stated votes needed to be taken as what would be presented at the May 23 Public Hearing.

S Lowe motioned to reduce the proposed BOE budget by 600,000 , second by A Bisbikos. With a 3 3 vote, the motion was not sustained with Bisbikos, Lowe and Migliaccio in favor and Kane, Lepore and Tarlov against.

S Lowe motioned to reduce the proposed BOE budget by 550,000, second by A Bisbikos. With a 3-3 vote, the motion was not sustained with Bisbikos, Lowe and Migliaccio in favor and Kane, Lepore and Tarlov against.

T Kane motioned to reduce the BOE budget by 250,000 , second by A Bisbikos. The motion was approved 4-2 with A Bisbikos and S Lowe voting against.

T Kane motioned that the Town proposed budget be reduced by 51,180, seconded by A Migliaccio. Motion passed 6-0.

A Bisbikos motioned that should state revenue come in below our assumptions, that there would be no automatic supplemental billing, and that there would be Board of Finance review and subsequent taxpayer approval needed. Second by S Lowe, motion passed 6-0.

Tax Collector - M Wyatt reviewed tax reports and suspense list. Most were the result of taxpayer deaths and court orders. R Lepore motioned that the Board approve the Tax Collector's suspense list totaling $\$ 20,844.41$, second by A Bisbikos, motion approved 6-0.

Finance Department - CFO M Cosgrove reviewed the 4/30/2017 Town's YTD financial results.

Transfers. T Kane motioned, with a second by S Lowe, that 20,000 be transferred from 13205-40101 (Facilities/Regular Payroll) to 13205-44208 (Facilities Professional Services) to conduct various deferred maintenance issues in Town Hall, previously included within the Capital Plan. Motion passed 6-0.

First Selectman's Report - nothing to report

Upcoming Agenda Items - tabled

Liaison Reports - T Kane reported on the April 20 School Building Committee meeting, S Lowe reported on the Ag Commission meeting, A Migliaccio on the BOE meeting, R Tarlov on Youth Services meeting, May 4 Board of Selectman meeting, May 11 School Building Committee meeting and May 12 C-3 meeting. A Bisbikos reported on the Economic Development Commission meeting.

Citizens Comments - several people thanked the Board for compromising on the school budget, several people were critical of the Board for not cutting the school budget further, another comment criticizing moving the referendum date from $6 / 22$ to $6 / 13$.

T Kane motioned to adjourn at 9:30, seconded by R Lepore, passed 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Migliaccio




| Govemor's Proposal: | Invoice for state Teacherpension Fund: | \$2,01,212 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Net Change in Ecs and Special Education Seimbursemen: | $(6,967,414)$ |
|  | Nowich Tution: | \$307,900 |

From: Meaghan [meaghanerin@hotmail.com](mailto:meaghanerin@hotmail.com)
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 8:06 PM
To: Robert Tarlov
Subject: Last nights meeting
Hello Rob,
As I sit at home tonight, correcting piles of student work, trying my hardest to stay awake and get it done so my students can get it back as soon as possible, I am not able to get last night Board of Finance meeting out of my mind.

I would like to send a calm and professional email regarding this-but since I'm tired, you are getting an honest one. I apologize if this email comes across as a personal attack or an attack of the Board. But if I don't share my views, then is feels like a disservice to both you and all those at the meeting. You deserve to understand how the audiance perceives your decisions.

The Board of Finance has stated at meeting how they listen to the residents. How they want people to come to meetings and share their views. When a citizen spoke up at a recent meeting saying she didn't feel the Board was listening, she was interrupted by two board members claiming they were listening. But your actions demonstrate otherwise. I would like to assume that this is not your intention, but my optimism is diminishing as the weeks go by.

Last night, you rolled your eyes when RoseMary Coyle and I had our hands raised. You asked for no clapping because it extended the meeting. From past history of these meeting this year, the Board should be aware that in order to have the Public Discussion that is on the agenda, the agenda must be shortened so that you do not feel you need to rush through the comments. Citizens feel that you have not reassured them-they feel you are not going to listen to their points. So they to come to the meetings again and again to voice these views, in hopes that you will hear them and respond appropriately through action.

I have yet to hear the reason on why we need to cut the $\$ 400,000$. The public has had the ooportunity to express their views and have done so. Some members of the Board have expressed that taxes need to be lowered so that people don't lose their houses (if you are losing your house due to financial reasons, the property tax increase is unlikely to be the reason). Yet you told me last night that approximately $75 \%$ of homeowners will have a decrease in taxes due to the reevaluation. Your concern was the businesses. The businesses who were hit hard in the revaluation. So we are going to cut middle school sports and Spanish electives in order to appease businesses who are upset with the reevaluation? Why don't we look at the root of that issue instead? I am not sure that cutting $\$ 400,000$ will have a large effect on the taxes the businesses will have to pay.

The Board did not respond to the comments that many people made regarding the likely increase in magnet school funding if these cuts are made. Does the Board agree with this kind of thought? Disagree?

Last night, you refused to vote and did not ask the other board members if they wanted to vote. Your reasons? One: You wanted to have time to look at the cuts. Two: You were tired. Three: Although you did have quorum, not all members were present.

Regarding the first reason: the Tier 1 cuts were presented months ago. When you asked for a $\$ 400,000$ cut, Rom told you that it would be mostly from the Teir 1 list. That was said at the meeting. The public heard it and was able to look back at the Teir 1 cuts to see what was being cut. Was the Board not able to do this? While you might not have known the details, you should have had a good idea heading into the meeting so that you were ready for discussion and voting-especially when we are concerned that the referendum is so late. This reasoning makes it appear that the Board simply wanted to push off the vote.

I'm tired too, Rob. I'm tired of going to meetings to share my views and to listen to the viewpoints of countless others, just to feel like I am being dismissed. I'm tired of votes being pushed back instead of happening in front of the people who you are representing. I'm tired of games being played. Because in all honesty, that's what it feels like. I have always respected you and admired your leadership and contributions to the town but I'm losing my hope \& optimism.

At each of the crowded Board of Finance meetings, you have explained the history of the recent referendums and how we ask you not to cut it in hopes to get it passed. You then explain that each year, the town doesn't pass it on the first try. I know I shouldn't take that personally but it's hard not too. I never promise that it will pass first try. No one promises that. Is it a goal to get it passed first try? Yes! Of course! And every year we spend more time engaging voters and citizens. I think this budget process is proof of that. But is that something to be memtioned as if it is a failure of the citizens in the room? I know that is not your intention but it is the preception of many. That the Board has trusted us in the past and we have failed them so why would you listen to us again? As I said, I understand this is not your goal-but it is how it is precieved. These are citizens who are spending their free time working for what's best for our town and children. They deserve to feel appreciated and valued for their work instead of feeling that since they were not able to be $100 \%$ successful in the past, their voices will no longer be listened to.

And I know I am wrong for sending this email. Wrong because it will not help my cause. Wrong because by sharing my frustration with you I am perpetuating the "us vs. them" mindset that has developed throughout this process. And the deeper that mindset gets, the deeper it seems that we both dig in our heels.

So let me step back a bit. I am okay with you making cuts. As long as they do not effect what you have heard the people speak up about. Cutting $\$ 400,000$ is cutting too deep. But if you feel the need to cut something, I can understand that.

I understand it is unlikely you will be running again after this current term. And while I completely understand that, I was disappointed to hear that. While this email may suggest otherwise, I always appreciated your experience and calm leadership. Thank you for reading this and thank you for all you do.

Meaghan Kehoegreen

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Sunday, May 7, 2017 4:09 PM
To: Meaghan
Subject: Response to your e-mail
Meaghan,
I appreciate your candidness.
Although other board members may agree with some of my thoughts, I am speaking for myself.
I've heard people state over the last several meetings that Board of Finance always slashes the BOE budget. The actual history shows otherwise. Board of Finance has only made modest cuts, and most of the cuts have been as a result of the budget failing to pass at referendum. In the last 2 years, after listening to meeting attendees, we did not reduce the proposed amount in 2015 and we increased it in 2016.

You state that many feel we don't listen. Listening doesn't mean the listener can always agree, and the listeners have other sides they need to be hearing, too. All sides say we don't listen. Jim Kelly stated the other night that Board of Finance will know they have the right number when no one is happy. While he is right, it does ignore the fact that all sides fail to recognize that the other side is unhappy with any decisions we make. Everyone feels
the other side got what they want, and that they didn't. They feel that if they don't get everything they want, we haven't listened.

I believe the "us vs them mindset" is the failure for any side (those who want no reductions and those who believe in the face of declining enrollment that budgets should not be increasing) to try to understand, or at a bare minimum even to respect the difference in opinion of others. When the Board of Finance attempts to find a middle ground, no one is happy and all accuse us of caving in.

I would estimate based on past referendum results that about $1 / 2$ of the people expect us to reduce the proposed budget, with many of them believing the budget should be reduced below the current adopted budget due to declining enrollment, and about $1 / 2$ believe we should be increasing the budget to maintain or improve programs.

Many taxpayers believe, that like the Federal and State governments, Colchester has a lot of waste and unneeded expenses in our budgets and therefore they believe that a budget failing at referendum means that the tax increase will reduce after a second or third referendum, and with no loss in services. Also, some people don't care if services are lost as long as it is not their services.

You asked at the meeting why, if we can't control the line items, we want to see the reductions. For me, I want to see the items that would likely be removed at a given level of budget reduction for two reasons. First i want to know the impact on programs at a given level on reductions. Second, I believe as voters, we need to know the impact of voting NO. Because Board of Education had public discussion reviewing two lists of potential reductions that would result in different budget increases, and now the Board of Finance has continued the same, I believe as voters we should now be aware of what items would likely be removed from the budgets if additional referendums are needed.

I don't know if $\$ 400,000$ is a relevant number. You heard several board members state they believe the number should be higher and several explained their rationale for 400,000 . On January 24 , the superintendent presented two budgets. Recognizing that the $3.25 \%$ increase that the department heads requested was too high and that many taxpayers wanted no tax increase, he produced a list with $\$ 533,262$ of cuts for a $2.26 \%$ increase and a second list with reductions of an additional $\$ 466,216$, bringing the budget increase in at $+1.08 \%$. The Board of Ed did not include many of the cuts from the Superintendent's two lists, and added others, to arrive at a $2.98 \%$ increase. (Norwich tuition income will lessen the tax impact of the increases at any level.)

You reference revaluation in your letter.
I am not sure you stayed until the revaluation discussion in the meeting as I believe you and I talked about revaluation during the break before that. I don't believe there was anything I said to you during the break or later after the meeting resumed that should have been interpreted that I felt we should be "making cuts to the BOE budget just to appease businesses who are upset with revaluation".

While sensitive to the businesses, renters and homeowners impacted adversely by revaluation, and when businesses are impacted, we are all impacted, my concern expressed was that while about $75 \%$ of the taxpayers will have a tax decrease, they have no strong reason to come to the polls. Those with a tax increase, although in the minority this year, will be motivated to vote. With everyone seeing lower taxes after a failed referendum and not believing there will be an impact on services, the motivation is not to show, or to show and vote no.

Yes, I heard what the citizen said regarding magnet schools, and in fact, this was the only specific comment in the meeting minutes. While certainly a risk, I would think that parents will do their research. My research shows that our schools are ranked higher than the magnet schools. For the high schools the SAT scores are lower at the magnet schools, and in some cases significantly, than Bacon. Looking at different rankings for elementary and middle schools, we are ranked a lot higher than the magnet schools within 20 miles of our town.

Although there are many reasons, some of which we have no control over, that students attend magnet schools, there are also many advantages, social, economic and logistical, in addition to school ranking, for attending school in Colchester rather than driving 15-20 miles every day to a magnet school in another town.

The budget schedule is set by the First Selectman, Board of Education Chairman and Board of Finance Chairman. Although the Board of Finance has never voted on the budget schedule, this is a very different year and at our April 19 meeting the Board of Finance decided we would wait until May $17^{\text {th }}$ to make our decision. Although Ron, Art and I changed the dates after the meeting for the Public Hearing, Town Meeting and Referendum so the vote could take place before school got out, it had no impact on the May $17^{\text {th }}$ date. I did add a possible budget vote to our Regular Meeting agenda at Ron's request before he realized it had no impact on the new referendum date, and if you look at our posted minutes, you will see that the Board voted to table the discussion and possible action until the next meeting.

Other towns have already had referendums, many of them because their charters had deadlines for doing so. We have purposely delayed ours, believing that without clarity on the State situation, the budgets would fail. Although nothing has been voted on by the State, I think we have a lot more clarity than two weeks ago, and hopefully will have more before the next meeting, or at least before the Public Hearing or Town Meeting.

You state that BOF has had the information since January to make a decision. While I understand that to have been the narrative, it was not the reality. I asked several times that the list be available for Board of Finance before the May 1 meeting. I was told, "You have the list, although there may be some changes, it's the Level 1 List you already saw".

If you look at the list from January that you reference, you will find it has little resemblance to the list presented on Wednesday night. I would be surprised if anyone would have come up with anything close to the May 3 list from that original list. Many believed that BOE had restored all of these proposed cuts from the $1 / 24$ list, they did not, and in fact, included cuts that were not on the Level 1 list in the budget presented on $2 / 28$. To know what was left from that list, one would have to take all the changes proposed on $1 / 24$, then determine which of those were actually restored and which were cut. At the meeting, someone on BOE or the CFO said it's on the gray shaded list, but that was something never presented to BOF. It took me about 4 hours on Thursday night and Friday morning to create a spreadsheet to follow the trail leading to the list presented and had that exercise been done before seeing the list, it would not have led me to the list presented. Last week's list only had 191K of the 533 K on the January Level 1 list, and as it also included level 2 items, it had only 274 K of the original 1000 K on both lists.

Although I realize there was a school vacation, the BOE had 4 weeks to create the list and get it to BOF before 6:55 on Wednesday. I am sure a lot of thought and discussion took place to create the list, but using the claim that BOF already knew what the cuts would be as they had the list, then it should have not taken that long for Administration to "tweak" the list and get it to BOF well in advance of last week's meeting.

It has been our Board's practice that, unless there is time urgency, to not make decisions the night that information is first presented to us. For me, citizens not wanting to attend another meeting does not create time urgency and we have more to gain in making good decisions by waiting until May 17.

I do not make good decisions when mentally or physically tired. I am sorry you feel we are playing games. I take my responsibility as an elected official to represent all taxpayers too seriously to do that. I understand that those attending are tired of having to come back. I too wished we could have had the information available to make a decision 2 months ago, rather than these additional meetings, that have mostly lasted past 10:00, and with citizens still wanting to ask questions after the meeting, kept me outside the building answering questions until after 11:00, once to 11:50. This, however, is an investment of time I believe is owed to the taxpayers and is necessary to make the best decisions.

You stated that I should have had a shorter agenda so that we could have let everyone comment.
The first item on our agenda that night was the School Budget. The second was the Town Budget, which lasted about 5-10 minutes as it was to discuss one additional change, as we had discussed the full town budget before a small audience on April $19^{\text {th }}$. The third item was a general discussion of the budget schedule and revaluation which lasted about 2 minutes.

Although we had a Regular Board of Finance Meeting following the Public Hearing, the agenda was very short. We had one time sensitive item on the agenda. The Board of Finance Meeting was called to order at 9:58 and adjourned at 10:00.

After the school portion of the public hearing had lasted nearly $21 / 2$ hours, and the comments were repeating ones expressed earlier in the meeting, some by the same people who had already spoken earlier, I said it was getting late and we still had the Town budget to discuss and asked if anyone else had comments. After one hand went up, I looked around for more hands and seeing none, then said that this person, who had already spoken several times, would be the last. After he spoke, 3 more hands went up, 2 had previously spoken, and I said OK, last 3. After those three spoke, you and Rosemary then raised your hands. Didn't realize that I rolled my eyes, I guess my frustration after successive failed attempts to move on to the town portion of the agenda. Even after I took your comments, another hand went up in the back of the room, which I did not take as that person had already spoken 3 or 4 times. Many meetings put a time limit on the length of comments and the number of times someone can comment. We did not do that on Wednesday and I don't feel that in a $21 / 2$ hour period, we short changed attendees on an opportunity to speak.

I hear teachers, parents, taxpayers, administrators complain that the meetings are too long, that they need to get up early. I understand as those of us at the front table need to do the same and most of us have careers that, like yourself, require work after the normal work day. Although, as in past meetings, most of the people left when we finished discussing the school budget, about 25 remained even later to hear the discussion and/or comment on the Town budget.

At our May 17 th meeting we will make a decision on the budgets to send to the Public Hearing. This will not be our final decision as that will occur on May 25 after the May 23 Public Hearing. Hopefully next Wednesday, we will have more clarity from the State to give us a higher confidence level in the mil rate estimate that we will present with the budget on May 23. Although I believe that the number of people attending the May $17^{\text {th }}$ meeting can influence the decision, for me, after listening to comments at 2 BOE meetings and 3 BOF meetings, I don't believe there can be anything new said by citizens that will influence my decision. Although I have not made up my mind, it will be the input of other Board of Finance members that night that will lead to my final vote.

I realize that you have stated at meetings that you cannot promise to get voters out. I agree, and while others have promised, I realize that they speak with passion, but without the experience of past years. Regardless of their limited influence to get voters out, their attendance at our meetings for the last 3 years has had impact and has influenced our decisions. While we shouldn't blame those who participate in these meetings for past failures of voter turnout, I think it is not plausible for them to say they are representative of those not coming to the meetings and that we should ignore those that think differently about the budget. I also realize that in the decision we will make, the people supporting a lower budget are at an advantage. They can show up at the referendum and vote NO, and if successful, get a lower budget. Those supporting a higher budget can show up, vote YES, but if the budget passes, cannot get back what we have already cut.

I hope I have addressed all of your comments. If not, let me know.
Rob
Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance

PS - Yes it is unlikely I will run again. 12 years is a long time. However, we have 6 year terms, so the town is stuck with me for another $41 / 2$ years.

From: Carl Swanback [Cswanback@hotmail.com](mailto:Cswanback@hotmail.com)
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 2:15 PM
To: Tricia Dean; Robert Tarlov; Ronald Goldstein
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
Did I miss something. Appears the date of referendum has been changed and I am only seeing 1 special meeting here?
Also wondering if there is a public hearing set to discuss the mandating of using Norwich Tuition to first fully fund sports, clubs and band/chore? Has the collected signatures been turned in to force this public hearing yet?

Thanks, Carl Swanback

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 2:29 PM
To: Carl Swanback [Cswanback@hotmail.com](mailto:Cswanback@hotmail.com)
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
2 special meetings for Board of Finance $-5 / 25$ and $6 / 13$. 1 Special Meeting for Board of Selectman on 5/25.
I have no knowledge of about a Public Hearing on Norwich Tuition.
Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance
860-608-4293

From: Carl Swanback [Cswanback@hotmail.com](mailto:Cswanback@hotmail.com)
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 3:37 PM
To: Robert Tarlov; Tricia Dean; Ronald Goldstein
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
Thanks much. I heard through the grapevine a petition was circulating as parents are tired of the BOE holding the sports hostage to grow their budget.

Out of curiosity.... It is my understanding the entire middle school is housed in the "old" section of WJJMS and that the projections from this years budget packet indicate that in (I think it was 2025) that almost $50 \%$ of the non-special ed classrooms will be empty based on the current classroom size. An knowing that the addition could have been on JJIS $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{o}$ mixing of grades, where by cutting close to $\$ 1 \mathrm{~m}$ out of the BOE budget annually... is
the addition worth it?
regards,
Carl
BTW, Last years Gross per student spending was an increase of more than $\$ 500$ per student, or the equivalent of adding near

From: Carl Swanback [Cswanback@hotmail.com](mailto:Cswanback@hotmail.com)
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 3:50 PM
To: Robert Tarlov
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
sorry,
$\$ 1.2 \mathrm{M}$ effective increase last year. BTW, I found what would appear to be A substantially inflated line item for which we do get state grant money for in two year increments.

From: Carl Swanback Cswanback@hotmail.com
Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2017 5:15 PM
To: Tricia Dean; Robert Tarlov
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
When is the second public hearing set for?
Carl

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Friday, May 5, 2017 9:18 AM
To: Carl Swanback
Cc: Tricia Dean
Subject: Re: Budget Calendar
The second Public Hearing was May 3.
Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance
860-608-4293

From: Merja H Lehtinen [mailto:ctmlhr@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 3:46 PM
To: Art Shilosky [aShilosky@colchesterct.gov](mailto:aShilosky@colchesterct.gov)
Cc: Tricia Dean[tdean@colchesterct.gov](mailto:tdean@colchesterct.gov); Ronald Goldstein [rgoldstein@colchesterct.org](mailto:rgoldstein@colchesterct.org)
Subject: Letter to BOF, BOE, AND BOS Colchester

Dear Board Members:

I implore you to cut the current proposed 2017-2018 spending levels of the Town and Schools.

Reduce the increased spending plan before it goes to referendum. This is not an equitable, fair, and mindful spending plan for all Colchester citizens and taxpayers. It is biased toward an affluent age and income segment with little concern for others, especially advanced age senior homeowners, who expressed despair.

We are also overburdening the very young on vehicle taxes as well as the elderly seniors on both housing, farms, and vehicle taxes.

The affordability only takes into concern the 100 vocal parents several of you cited as the main reason you annually raise the taxes and spending plan above the past year.

This is shortsighted and not mindful of our diverse tax base and shrinking number of occupied households of all means and students of all ages. Nor is increasing spending or retaining current levels required by state statute.

A declining student base and fewer occupied households allows you to maintain. or even cut spending levels.
I believe, in fact, this proposal for increased spending is neither affordable nor fair to all Colchester taxpayers as evidenced by increased foreclosures and signs indicating foreclosure auctions, specifically acreage and homes on New London and Macdonald Roads, including an historic home, which have for the last 50 years and perhaps, always, been stable. Any increased spending is irresponsible in my opinion. Please stop. And also, cut the expenses of hiring out of town lawyers and other collectors. Ee pay the Tax Collector and her staff amply. The job is paid at full time rate for 40 hours per week, not to be delegated to outside counsel. This is the cause, in my opinion, of at last two if not three recent tragedies, based on now deceased individuals who reached out to me.

As a fellow board member and town volunteer since 1992, I can never recall a time when prudence, frugality, and responsibility for others were more critical than today. Based on information and facts, the 2017-2019 town and school budgets are too high and average taxpayers cannot survive compounding at this rate. Do the right thing.

Sincerely,
Merja H. Lehtinen
Colchester CT

From: deee bouchard [deeedeee1963@yahoo.com](mailto:deeedeee1963@yahoo.com)
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 2:34 PM
To: Robert Tarlov
Cc: Tricia Dean
Subject: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

## Chairman Tarlov,

## Under the CT Freedom of Information 1-200 et seq.

I am requesting copies of the following public records:

Any documents, charts, emails, reports, correspondence etc, which will be discussed or mentioned at the 5/17/17 BOF meeting.

Please notify me when these are records will be available to pick up in-person PRIOR to the BOF meeting 5/17/17.

If there are any fees for searching or copying these records, please inform me of the cost. However, I would also like to request a waiver of all fees in that the disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest and will contribute significantly to the public's understanding of the budget process. This information is not being sought for commercial purposes.

Please note that the BOF has committed itself to increasing transparency and in order for citizens to fully participate in the public discussion, it is vital that we are able to follow along with the discussion by having the public documents in hand.

Sincerely,
Deanna Bouchard

Sent from my iPhone

From: Tricia Dean
Sent: Tuesday, May 16, 2017 3:36 PM
To: Robert Tarlov
Cc: deee bouchard
Subject: FW: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

Rob,
Can you send Deanna anything you may have as backup for the meeting. Joan is off this week.
Thanks,

## Tricia Dean

Executive Assistant to the First Selectman

Town of Colchester
127 Norwich Avenue
tdean@colchesterct.gov
P: (860) 537-7220

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 8:37 AM
To: Tricia Dean
Cc: deee bouchard; Art Shilosky
Subject: Re: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17
I will not be able to make copies or get these down to Town Hall today.

There appears to be about 50 pages. Other than the Munis reports, all will be part of our minutes that will be posted on Friday.

The only chart that may be used in a discussion is one that was available at the last meeting and is attached to May 3 minutes. I will bring copies with an update to the meeting tonight.

I have no way of knowing in advance what charts or reports could be mentioned. I bring my laptop which has 8 years of research as well as web access to other information that I have bookmarked and could be referenced should questions arise. I also have no way of knowing what material other Board members may mention or bring to the meeting.

Because other Board members and myself need to refer back to past meeting discussions, I have tried to add unforeseen items that come up in the discussion to our minutes for a record of the discussion and easier access later.

Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance
860-608-4293

From: Dee < deeedeee1963@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 11:18 AM
To: Robert Tarlov
Subject: Re: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

Chairman Tarlov,

Is there a reason this information can not be sent to the FOI Coordinator, so that I can review the requested information \& pick them up during normal business hours at town hall?
Don't you send the Board this information prior to the meetings?

Deanna Bouchard

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 3:52 PM
To: Dee
Cc: Joan Campbell; Art Shilosky; Tricia Dean
Subject: Re: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

Yes. I was working.

The agenda packages go out from Town Hall, not from me. Some of the material comes separately from the Town Clerk's office (our new meeting clerk), sometimes from the Tax Collector and sometimes from Finance. If additional information comes in after the package goes out, new info may come directly from me to ensure it reaches the Board members in time for them to review for the meeting, especially if our clerk is on vacation.

We will post the entire package on the web site with the agendas in the future.

For today, maybe one of the other Board members can forward this information to you this afternoon.

Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance
860-608-4293

From: Dee [deeedeee1963@yahoo.com](mailto:deeedeee1963@yahoo.com)
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 4:56 PM
To: Robert Tarlov
Subject: Re: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

The FOI request was sent to you yesterday to give you ample time to send the requested public documents to the FOI Coordinator so I could pick them up the today, in person, prior to the BOF meeting.
If you had already emailed the package to the Board Members, why didn't you just forward the information to the FOI Coordinator at that time?

I went to Town Hall this afternoon at 3:45-3:55 to pick up the requested records and was denied as you had not sent them to the FOI Coordinator.

Deanna Bouchard

Sent from my iPhone

From: Robert Tarlov
Sent: Wednesday, May 17, 2017 6:04 PM
To: Dee
Cc: Board of Finance Members; Art Shilosky
Subject: Re: FOI REQUEST BOF Meeting 5/17/17

I try to check my BOF e-mails once per day when my schedule permits. Your e-mail was sent yesterday afternoon. You know the rules of FOI and understand the time limits. Tricia responded yesterday and I quickly responded to the town this morning before rushing out the door, that I could not get the information to them today. You were copied on that e-mail, which was sent within the 48 hours required that the Town got your request. By that e-mail you knew that I was not able to get the info to Town Hall so not sure why you did not call Town Hall to see if they were able to put the information together for you.

As you know I am not an employee of the town, I do not get paid by the town and I have a real job, which often starts at 4:00am and often lasts past 9 pm when I am not at town meetings. Somedays I have a larger case load than others. Last night I got home at 9:00 and this morning I was doing casework preparing for today's business meetings from the time I got up at 3:45 until I ran out the door. I squeeze my volunteer activities around my business life, and around my family life.

You have a member of your party on our Board. You could have asked her to forward what she has when you realized that I was unable to get the material to the town to meet your time schedule. I am sure she would have forwarded you the information without your needing to send an FOI to the Town. Had you sent me your request over the weekend, I would have had time to send it to you, and would have done so without an FOI request. Once the week gets started, I have little breathing room in my schedule.

As I said earlier, these will be part of the agenda package on the Town website moving forward.

Rob Tarlov, Chairman, Board of Finance
860-608-4293
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## Town of Colchester, Connecticut OFFICE OF THE TAX COLLECTOR <br> 127 Norwich Avenue, Colchester, Connecticut 06415

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { TO: } & \text { Board of Finance } \\ \text { CC: } & \text { Arthur Shilosky, First Selectman } \\ \text { FROM: } & \text { Michele Wyatt, Tax Collector } \\ \text { Date: } & \text { May 1, 2017 }\end{array}$
Subject: Suspense List Recommendations

In accordance with sections 12-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I recommend that the attached list of Personal Property, Motor Vehicles, Motor Vehicle Supplemental and Real Estate delinquent taxes be placed in suspense. I certify, upon information and belief, that the taxes listed have not been paid and are uncollectible, and hereby recommend to the Board that it designate each of the taxes contained as uncollectible. This is not an abatement of taxes and every effort will be made to collect them.

The total amount recommended to the Board of Finance $\$ 20,844.41$

Michele Wyatt
Tax Collector

Dist/MBL
AMT/SUSP
Prop Loc Dist/MBL AMT/SUSE

15 ROBIN RD

| $05-14050-0$ | 00 | $0-0$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $05-14050-0$ | 00 | $0-0$ |
| $05-14050-0$ | 00 | $0-0$ |
| $05-14050-$ | 000 | 05 |


| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $03-\operatorname{COURT}$ ORDERED |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $48.41 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $04-$ DECEASED |
| $588.45 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $03-$ COURT ORDERED |
| $358.78 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $04-$ DECEASED |
| $617.22 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $04-$ DECEASED |
| $451.60 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $03-$ COURT ORDERED |
| $366.92 * *$ |  |  |


| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $03-\operatorname{COURT}$ ORDERED |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| $361.26 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $04-\operatorname{DECEASED}$ |
| $16.11 * *$ |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | $04-\operatorname{DECEASED}$ |

1 NOVELLI PI
539 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
539 AMSTON R
7 RESERVOIR RD
7 RESERVOIR RD
31 NOVELII PI
539 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
539 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
PO BOX 751
203 AMSTON RD
Prop Loc Dist/MBI AMT/SUSP

2007-04-0081962 PHILLIPS BOBBY D 2008-02-0040376 GIBB BROTHERS TRUCKING INC 2008-02-0040426 HAYDEN ANDREW T \& ERANCES V 2008-02-0040677 PHILLIPS BOBBY DALE 2008-02-0040785 SHAEFEER ELASTICS MANUFACTURING INC 2008-02-0040945 WILLARD IRENE 2008-03-0057723 KOSS WALTER J OR 2008-03-0061347 PHILLIPS BOBBY D 2008-03-0061348 PHIIIIPS BOBBY D 2008-03-0061349 PHILIIPS BOBBY D 2008-03-0061350 PHILIIPS BOBBY D 2009-02-0040264 DITUILIO RIC 2009-02-0040370 GIBB BROTHERS TRUCKING INC 2009-02-0040419 HAYDEN ANDPEW T \& FRANCES V 2009-02-0040940 WILLARD IRENE 2009-03-0057877 KOSS WALTER J OR 2009-03-0061479 PHIIIIIPS BOBBY D 2009-03-0063190 SHAEEEER ROBERT

2010-02-0040254 DITULIIO RIC
2010-02-0040359 GIBB BROTHERS TRUCKING INC 2010-02-0040491 LATERRA JULIE 2010-03-0055106 FLETCHER CALVIN 2010-03-0055107 ELETCHER CALVIN

2011-02-0040354 GIBB BROTHERS TRUCKING INC 2011-02-0040609 NOBIE JASON

2011-03-0055089 FLETCHER CALVIN
2011-03-0055090 ELETCHER CALVIN
2011-03-0057649 KIERNAN JOSEPH P
RING INC

203 AMSTON RD
155 WESTCHESTER RD
539 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
244 UPTON RD
7 RESERVOIR RD
19C DOGWOOD LANE
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
203 AMSTON RD
43 CRESTVIEW DR
155 WESTCHESTER RD
539 AMSTON RD
7 RESERVOIR RD
19C DOGWOOD LANE
203 AMSTON RD
70 HORSE POND RD
43 CRESTVIEW DR
155 WESTCHESTER RD
27 CAVERLY MILL RD
112 PARK AVE
13220 GREENMOUNT AVE
155 WESTCHESTER RD
52 B IVY CT
112 PARK AVE
112 PARK AVE
51 RIVER RD

AMT/SUSE

Reason

| $\begin{array}{r} 0.00 \mathrm{Y} \\ 22.09 * * \end{array}$ | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 | - BANKRUPT |
| 755.62** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 119.67** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 627.67** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 1,155.30** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 62.67** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 86.32** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 135.75** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 500.91** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 20.81** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 59.83** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - Deceased |
| 9.78** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 | - bankrupa |
| 1,001.30** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 120.34** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 66.44** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 71.70** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 138.64** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 122.34** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 11.63** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 | - BANKRUPT |
| 1,187.03** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 227.22** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - DECEASED |
| 52.99 ** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - DECEASED |
| 46.27** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 | - BANKRUPT |
| 1,520.93** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - DECEASED |
| 132.48** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |
| 55.87** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - DECEASED |
| 63.65** |  |  |  |
| 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 | - deceased |


| Prop Loc | Dist/MBL | AMT / SUSP |  | Reason |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 112 Park Ave |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 48.96** |  |  |
| 112 PARK AVE |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - deceased |
|  |  | 73.28** |  |  |
| 155 WESTCEESTER RD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | $02-\operatorname{Bankrupt}$ |
|  |  | 1,839.21** |  |  |
| 52 B IVY CT |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04- deceased |
|  |  | 160.18** |  |  |
| 1 ABBOTT RD UNIT 141 |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - deceased |
|  |  | 33.55** |  |  |
| 112 PARK AVE |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 74.29** |  |  |
| 155 WESTCHESTER RD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 - bankrupt |
|  |  | 2,320.26** |  |  |
| 14 QUAIL RD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04- DECEASED |
|  |  | 126.85** |  |  |
| 14 QUAIL ROAD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 45.16** |  |  |
| 55 RENEE DR APT 9 |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04- DECEASED |
|  |  | 251.67** |  |  |
| 33 FORD AVE |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 - BANKRUPT |
|  |  | 15.46** |  |  |
| 33 FORD AVE |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 - BANKRUPT |
|  |  | 15.46** |  |  |
| 33 FORD AVE |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 02 - BANKRUPT |
|  |  | 271.08** |  |  |
| 182 PINE ST |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 52.70** |  |  |
| 14 QUAIL RD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 92.11** |  |  |
| 14 QUAIL RD |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 279.12** |  |  |
| 283 WESTCHESTER RD, APT 1 |  | 0.00 Y | 2015 | 04 - DECEASED |
|  |  | 132.82** |  |  |
|  |  | 0.00 |  |  |
|  |  | 20,844.41** |  |  |

# Town of Colchester <br> General Fund <br> Budget Transfer/Additional Appropriation 

Department: Facilities

Reason for | To conduct various deferred maintenance issues in Town Hall, previously included within |
| :--- |
| Request: |
| Capital Plan. Decision to reallocate future budget years payroll to contracted services for |
| repair has a been included within FY $17-18$ proposed budget. |
| Reason for |
| Available |
| Funds: |



Town of Colchester

## General Fund

Budget Transfer/Additional Appropriation

Department: Facilities

Reason for | $\begin{array}{l}\text { To conduct various deferred maintenance issues in Town Hall, previously included within } \\ \text { Capital Plan. Decision to reallocate future budget years payroll to contracted services for } \\ \text { repair has a been included within FY 17-18 proposed budget. }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Request: |  |
| Reason for |  |
| Available |  |
| Funds: | Part Time Employee has left Town Employment half way through 16-17 fiscal year. |



