

Correspondence for March 6 BOF Meeting

From: deee bouchard <deeedeee1963@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 8:59 AM

To: Art Shilosky

Cc: Robert Tarlov

Subject: Real Estate Purchase

Gentleman,

I am writing to inform you that the recent vote taken at the 2/20 BOF meeting, in which the BOF voted to approve the town real estate purchase of 108 Mill Street, Colchester, CT, is in direct violation of the Colchester Town Charter Article C-1107a (B) which reads as follows:

Note - the Charter is clear that the BOF has authority to approve the purchase "FOLLOWING" the recommendation by the BOS. The BOS had not legally voted to recommend the purchase prior to the vote of the BOF, therefore the vote taken by the BOF is invalid and illegal according to both the Town Charter and CGS as proper procedures set forth in our governing document and applicable state law were not followed.

I remind you that the people of Colchester recently voted to amend Article C-1107a under question #3 on the Charter Revision Referendum - which explicitly set forth the manner in which real estate transactions are to be conducted and approved for purchase using taxpayers dollars.

I also want to reiterate my objection to the Town's purchase of 108 Mill Steet, on the grounds that the BOS did not publicly disclose an inspection document listing any such hazards which may exist on the property; nor did the BOS present any documents or public information detailing the cost of demolition and or remediation of any hazardous materials on the property.

If I do not hear back from the Town of Colchester within seven days, I will assume that the BOS has made the decision to violate the Town Charter any any applicable State Law governing this process and will pursue my rights under due process.

Sincerely,

Deanna Bouchard

From: Robert Tarlov

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 12:59 PM

To: deee bouchard

Cc: Art Shilosky

Subject: Re: Real Estate Purchase

Deanna,

Based on the minutes of the February 7th meeting of the Board of Selectmen, the purchase of the land was approved by them with an amount not to exceed \$45,000.

It was on that basis, that I put it on our February 20th agenda.

Rob

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

From: Jeffrey Koonankeil <jkoo9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:34 AM
To: Robert Tarlov
Subject: Town Charter

Hi Rob,

My name is Jeff Koonankeil and I am a resident in town. I read the article about the Town Charter revision and was hoping you could clarify something for me. I would like to know who was commissioned to actually change the language in the charter. It seems from the article that people are unsure how this happened, but someone had to instruct someone to make the revisions.

I am happy to take a phone call from you if that is easier for you.

You can reach me on my personal cell phone at (860) 331-9146.

Jeff
14 Penee Lane

Text Messages:

Dee / Rob

Dee:

Members present: Gregg LePage, Ursula Tschinkel, Sheila Tortorigi, Don Philips, Monica Egan and Betty Wagner.

Member excused: Michael Hinchliffe.

Guest: Selectman Rosemary Coyle.

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman LePage.

2. Additions to the Agenda. None.

3. Approval of the Minutes of the January 11, 2017 meeting.

Motion by Mr. Philips to accept as presented. Second by Ms. Tschinkel.

Vote: Five in favor. One abstention due to having been absent for that meeting.

4. Citizen Comments. None.

5. Review town department information provided by the First Selectman.

The commission members had reviewed the descriptions and had questions regarding whether these would better fill the needs of the town by being included in ordinances instead of the charter. Selectman Coyle will take the question to the Board of Selectmen.

6. Review draft of financial section of Charter.

The commission completed its review of the financial section of the Charter. Ms. Egan will meet with the town CFO to review it.

7. Continue reviewing "Red Lined" Charter version.

The commission reviewed what has been completed and agreed to finish its review at the next meeting.

8. Citizen Comments. None.

9. Adjournment. Motion to adjourn by Mr. Philips. Second by Ms. Tschinkel.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:06 p.m.

The next meeting will be February 8, 2017 in the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Wagner, Secretary

2017 JAN 27 PM 1:51
TOWN CLERK

Read all of the CRC minutes and requested a copy of the red line spreadsheet yesterday, but thanks for sending, we need to be sure we don't miss anything.

http://www.colchesterct.gov/Pages/ColchesterCT_Dept/CTC/Charter%20Revision%202017/Explanatory%20Text.pdf

If you need me to do any research just let me know.

You know I'm a stickler when it comes to truth, transparency and fairness, especially in government processes.

Thank you.

Along with the spread sheet there was a written Explanatory Text that was published by the Town Clerk. Unfortunately with the new website, none of the prior links for information are working.

This is from FB when I posted the town link to the Explanatory Text:

Posted October 2017

Click the link below to read the Explanatory Text of what is actually changing in the Town Charter. I feel strongly that this is an attempt by Colchester's Politicians to usurp the Power of the People.

http://www.colchesterct.gov/Pages/ColchesterCT_Dept/CTC/Charter%20Revision%202017/Explanatory%20Text.pdf

Hopefully this gets resolved quickly

Also I have to go back and listen more carefully to Art's explanation about WHY he asked.

I swear he mentioned something about asking to the Atty's once before too - when he asked about Malloy's Cuts & we were told the BOS had the power to make cuts without going through the BOF.

So, if that is true did the BOS know this for a while?

Do you have a copy of that written opinion? I know we had several conversations & I was pushing you to fight it, but you told me Art told you, the sole power to make adjustments to the Budgets rested only with the BOS & the BOF had no power - according to the Atty.

It would be interesting to go back and read that opinion, if it exists.

I also asked for the explanatory text yesterday. The current legal opinion was a result of a difference in opinion he and I had the Friday after the budget forum, when he brought up the over the charter change. I still think the attorney is wrong and have another attorney looking at it, too. I think no one realized the unintended consequence of removing that word otherwise it would have come up last year this time. I still maintain that nothing else changed in the charter for the budget process and the charter is silent on the process up to the annual meeting where the process has remained the same, therefore I say statutes should prevail. How can one word removed, with no other language added so fundamentally change a process that has been in place for over 30 years? The powers of BOS are enhanced with no language changes doing so?

I don't recall getting an opinion in 2017. The implementor language was pretty clear. I had a phone conversation with Ritter at that time and also reviewed with another attorney. Our beef was that they did not even use us in an advisory capacity. Opengov was part of mitigation plan. BoF reviewed the implementation of that plan monthly to ensure they followed the plan, and met the numbers using the opengov cut.

Matt Ritter & S&G are pretty thorough when it comes to written opinions, especially knowing their opinion can be appealed to Superior Court.

I would venture - that he had all supporting documents on the Charter from his Firm's file & I guessing he reviewed how & why the change was made.

Note that they also changed and added the language "combined budget"

which is interesting because the term "combined budget" was added to the glossary and includes both Town & BOE Budgets.

Essentially this wording - interpretation by Ritter - strips the BOE of ALL power on both budgets.

Which is why I think you need to explore WHO, WHY and WHAT explanation was given about the change.

The Atty's at S&G who work on Charters are experts when dealing in charters. It is hard for me to truly believe this was a simple oversight.

Again, I am going back and listen more carefully to Art's words more carefully. If he indeed referenced a prior opinion, I will FOI that opinion.

"Strips the BOF"

Quick FYI - I've been At Town for about 4 hours reviewing minutes, charters, explanatory texts, spread sheet etc.

In the 4/19/17 redline copy of the charter the developing is still in the charter.

In the next redline copy dated 6/14/17

the word "developing" has been deleted.

Rob: Think I have a solution.

Good to hear.

Note* The change was made under question #1

And According to

Summary Sheet

Type of change is "Clarification"

See attached

Also note the BOF is missing from the distribution list - copies of the new charter that was sent out by the Town.

While I think an immediate workable solution is the optimum goal so the BOF can move forward in the budget process. I believe an investigation into who was involved (Atty suggestion versus committee suggestion) and why this change was proposed is warranted at this time. Greg Lepage should have turned over his "charter workbook" to the Town Clerk.

The work product documents, notes, etc are public documents and should be archived.

This is what has been done previous.

Public trust in the Boards and commission/committees that serve the town is paramount for a fully functioning democracy.

IMHO

Call me a crazy,

But...

I have pondered what transpired between 4/19/17-6/14/17 that -

If the change to BOF duties was in fact initiated by the CRC -

And I remember the special BOF meeting

and the reaction of certain members.

The words in these letters definitely raised my suspicions...

M Egan's letter of 5/24 is particularly interesting.

Also review your BOF Minutes of 6/7/2017.

Addressing BOF Review:

I also noticed Betty Wagner was in attendance. Which I find odd, as she was not at any other budget meeting, she was on the CRC.

Rob: When I read the CRC minutes, I thought the same re: Betty Wagner.

Rob: On C-1105a (C), what question #, and type does spreadsheet say?

Let me check

C-1105a (C) was made under question 3

I don't have that page of the spread sheet

I only copied 1 page

But it shows if under question 3 according to Explanatory Text Worksheet

Gayle alluded to the fact that she didn't think the Atty made the suggestion.

I'm probably going to FOI all correspondence documents - CRC member notes, especially Secretary Betty, Chair Lepage & Monica

Monica & Maggie met on several occasions

8/24/16 minutes show the commission reviewed
Article VI C601-C603

I could be wrong, but having dealt with Ritter on several occasions, I find it hard to believe he would render a legal opinion before discussing the issue with the S&G Atty that provided legal oversight and guidance on the charter. He's a astute Atty and I'm guessing he looked into why and for what reason the change was made. If it was a simple grammar change with unintended consequences, I would have imagined he would have stated that in his opinion??

So, it could be plausible that removing the word "developing" had exactly the intended consequences desired by the Charter Revision Committee.

If this is indeed true, as a citizen, I feel the CRC posed a question that lacked full transparency and furthermore I feel the CRC failure to disclose the change in the BOF duties and powers -concerning their authority on the budget process may indeed be evidence that the CRC perpetuated a fraud to Colchester electors?

When I read Ritter's opinion - because the term "combined budget" was added - I interpret this to mean the BOF would not have ANY authority to amend - the BOS Budget, nor would they have ANY authority to amend the BOE Budget.

Although the question asked by Art & BOS was only concerning the BOS Budget - I believe the addition of the word "combined budget" in section C-601c of the Charter (I feel the term is improper as we vote on 2 separate budgets)

Would also remove the authority of the BOF to amend the BOE Budget.
That premise should be extremely alarming to ALL citizens, electors and taxpayers.

Section 11
Found in BOF
Minute Packet
9/7/17

Do not see 1105a (C)
Says: adding new sections

The entire chart is in the minutes

I meant to say Agenda packet 9/7/17

Rob: Did you mean BOS agenda package?

Rob: I have enquired about BOE budget as I believe State Statute is pretty specific on the BOE. The fiscal authority of the town has that responsibility.

Rob: Legal opinion is predicated on voter intent.

Yes 9/7/17 BOS Agenda package

I disagree that CGS trumps the charter when it comes to the budget. The Courts have upheld the Home Rule Act ruling that local budget matters are an area of local concern therefore a Town Charter supersedes GCS.

See attached <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2014/rpt/pdf/2014-R-0019.pdf>

If the Atty opinion is to stand, it is reasonable to interpret the language as stripping the BOF of any authority on the "Combined Budget"
(Both BOS & BOE)

Which means we must fight and make the argument that "voter intent" was NOT to approve amending the BOF's authority on the budget approval process.

Can you call a special meeting and invite Greg Lepage to answer questions? I think the BOF needs to hear from the CRC Chair to explain what the rationale and intent was in removing the word "developing".

The fact that Art and the BOS did not address the issue at their 2/21 meeting is very troubling or perhaps the Atty advised them not to comment?

I'm curious what you think after reading the OLR Report.

Defining Colchester's budget development and budget approval process into a legal codified document - which details procedures, responsibilities and authorities of all involved in the process is a must at this point.

Yes the Charter trumps CGS, however, other than 2 BOF public hearings and the annual budget meeting the Charter does not cover the budget process. The CGS is general on BOF and does not either, but specific regarding BOE budgets. A LCD is an option worth considering but not sure it can comply with Charter. Although a policy, MOU or temporary injunction might work and is needed for this year, we need something with more permanence and certainty beyond. A BOS policy will not do that. I've been exploring other options as well.

While I understand your reasoning on CGS and BOE budget process. I think an argument could rationally be made and perhaps will be - that the new charter language - which strips BOF authority over the BOS Budget, could be applied to the BOE as it now reads "combined budget". Ritter writes deleting of the word developing, "demonstrates an intent to limit the involvement of the BOF in the creation of the 'Board of Selectman's budget proposal'

However, the charter does NOT mention the specific words "BOS budget proposal" in Article VI - C-601 C. it reads:

"Combined Budget"

Combined budget is defined in the Charter:

"The combined projected expenditures of the Town, including the BOS Budget AND the BOE Budget"

If Ritter applies the limit of BOF authority over the BOS Budget - one can't sever the intent to limit authority over the BOE Budget.

Thus the charter is clearly limiting the BOF authority over the "combined budget" and, because the term is clearly defined in the Charter - the language which limits BOF authority MUST apply equally to both BOS & BOE Budgets.

This would supersede any CGS on the budget approval process.

IMHO of course

This Town has a Charter Crisis.

? Does the BOF have to approve by majority vote to send the Budgets to the BOS in which the BOS votes to set the Town Meeting Date?

What happens if BOF does not vote to approved budgets?

Rob: Although some interpret the new Charter as stripping BoF authority, I do not. It no longer specifically gives us the ability to develop the budget, (BOF never really did that anyway, that was FS and department heads. We reviewed and adjusted as page 49 in the budget book states). There is no specific language leaving us out and no language giving any other board the authority. If one were to read the Charter without the knowledge that developing was removed, I don't think anyone could interpret from the Charter language who is involved in the budget process. The only thing stated is

that BoF will hold 2 public hearings to present the budgets. Why are we doing that if we are not involved? As his entire analysis is predicated by his personal assumption of voter intent, I put little credence in what else he presented.

Ok that's an interesting interpretation.

However, we don't know what we don't know...

Atty Ritter however, has the benefit to review the work product of the Atty whose job it was to provide legal guidance to both current language and subsequent proposed language/changes.

I'm assuming that Ritter spoke with and reviewed documents with the other Atty.

I find it hard (though I admit I could be wrong) that Ritter came to his conclusion based solely upon the new language, without first conducting a thorough analysis of the CRC-Atty work product documents in which there would be evidence as to what the intent of the proposed change and deleting of language entailed?

If Ritter thought for a second that deleting of the word "developing" was a grammatical or technical error that had an unintended consequence (limiting BOF authority) I would have thought he would have addressed that in his opinion, he did not.

When I spoke to Art on Friday he was in the process of calling CRC members. If after speaking with CRC members, he thought it was an error with unintended consequences, don't you think he would have made a declarative statement at the BOS meeting?

BTW - I told Art he should be individually speaking to members as we know from CTOWN history, that power is reserved for the Chairman.

I told him to call a special joint meeting of the BOS, BOF, BOE and the invited the CRC members and ask his questions on the record for full transparency.

He said, "I'll think about it, but right now I'm calling to see what people remember"

Ok - I'm going to try to not obsess researching and reading legal opinions for the rest of the day.

Enjoy your day.

Should NOT.

Just an FYI

Ritter spoke to the ATTY's at the SOTS office about a dozen times - trying to keep CIP off the BOF. That issue is trivial compared to this.

Friday was after the BoS meeting, but if it was me I would mentioned what I was doing or going to do.

Ritter's research - don't assume. No way can I believe he could have reached his conclusion on voter intent through any research. He ignored CRC intent in his opinion, so I can only assume he neither interviewed them or reviewed their notes either.

Correction

I spoke to Art Thursday am before going to the Town Clerks to research

Then even more so he should have announce what was being done to resolve the issue. Silence sends the wrong message

Agree on ART being silent it is definitely sending the wrong message.

On another note having seen and challenged Ritter in action, the lawsuit, CIP & FOI -

He doesn't strike me as sloppy in his opinions, especially knowing it could likely face a challenge in court. Ritter doesn't like to lose and neither does S&G.

Which is why I am still wondering whether this issue was asked prior by Art or the BOS. When I asked Art the question, "did you ask the Atty's about this issue before", he replied, "I could have, maybe I spoke to him (Ritter) about it".

I then asked whether he asked S&G for a written legal opinion concerning the mitigation plan. He said, "No, I don't think

so, we went from the implementer bill, but maybe, I really don't remember, but I don't think so. Are you going to FOI that?"

Rob,
Off course I couldn't stop researching
But I am watching some good basketball at the same time
So...in 1990 a Town Meeting was called as special town informational meeting Three Ordinances were proposed governing the number of members in the BOS and BOE.
The ordinances sought to reduce membership on both boards
BOE from 9 to 7
BOS from 7 to 5
And also pay the BOS.
The proposed membership reductions passed and were sent to referendum. The pay for BOS was defeated.
The town meeting then voted to send the ordinances to a referendum vote on 10/17/90.
You were actually at that Town Meeting.
I imagine they passed at referendum? I was told that Andrew Norton has to get involved at the State level concerning the towns action, but I can not find any documentation. I guessing the citizen may be incorrect. I attempted to reach Andy but was unsuccessful.
These Ordinances were prior to our Town Charter in 1994.
Do you think the Charter could be amended following the same special town meeting/ordinance process, if it is found to be grammatical error ?

I know citizens can petition for a Town Meeting, and perhaps force a referendum.
But there has got to be a more expeditious way to get this done.

My research shows that the BOS could appoint a charter review and charter revision commission with a narrow focus. We would follow the same process as over last several years including public hearings and referendum. Because of its narrow scope shouldn't take that long. Not in time for this budget season, but in time for November. This year we take care of with an agreement. We could seek temporary injunction, which we would win. But believe not needed. All evidence shows there was no intent on anyone's part to change how we've been doing things. A new charter amend.ent word give us permanent encyclopedia (permanence) and certainty, but likely not needed.

I knew we could do it that way, but realize the time involved.
A stipulated agreement sounds like a great plan.
With the CR process to follow.
They could add the corrective question to the Nov elections?

Did you uncover new evidence?

Michigan or Michigan State?

Well looks like you have a plan to address the crisis. I hope you are indeed right, that it was just an oversight.
Perhaps we can ask S&G for a credit.
I believe we paid them over \$25,000 for charter work & then add to that approximately \$2000?? for the written legal opinion.
We are going to need the \$\$ with the proposed reduction in our ECS.
Just tell them I'm running for FS & I plan to be a Dictator with the ultimate power they just bestowed on the FS...
that should speed things along - 😊

I know you've read George Hill
Handbook for CT BOF

Maybe send Art a copy
He does read right?

As opposed to just listening to what others tell him about the role/powers of the BOF. I think it will provide Art a better understanding of the importance, duties and role of the BOF in Town Government.

No matter the outcome,
of the crisis, the BOF should ask for - and the citizens & electors deserve a written transparent explanation:

- Who suggested the change
- What was the reason/intent of the change
- Why this change was approved by the Atty's

FYI

I spoke to Art just now.

He said he has been reviewing Chairman LePage's workbook.

He says he has calls & written correspondence into Ritter & is awaiting a legal response.

I explained his silence has, unfortunately fueled speculation, suspicion and anger and that he should have made a formal comment at the BOS meeting. I told him had he done that, he would have gotten out in front of the story and quelled some of the vitriol we are now seeing being posted on FB.

He said he is releasing a statement today.

Went back to look at texts to be sure I responded to all. Missed some and one was not clear.

On Betty Wagner. I misread your text. I don't know why she attended, although I did not find it odd. This was a regular meeting, not a budget meeting. Maybe someone asked her to come because of item 8 a I, ii, iii.

Ok, that makes sense.

I just spoke to Art again

he is releasing a statement shortly, but the matter is not completely resolved as he is still awaiting information and confirmation.

On the Egan correspondence, I do not draw the same conclusion. Because people feel differently than me or than the Board of Finance, I respect the differences and respect the fact they addressed me head on. Much more productive than underground conversations and activities. Often the differences are misunderstandings, lack of information or misinformation of the actions or conversations hanging taken place, other times it's just because we think differently.

I didn't draw any conclusions. I was taken aback buy the tone of the letter and the accusations rendered against you and the members of the board of finance. That is what raised my suspicions, but no conclusion was drawn. I was researching every possible angle as to what had taken place between April-June that may have precipitated the change in the Charter to rescind the BOF authority over the budget process, which was mentioned in the emailed letter. As you know, I've researched many many possibilities,

including who suggested the change, why the change was made and what was the intent of the change.

I suggested the town request the Chairman's workbook as the documents of CRC Chairman are public documents that should be saved and archived.

It appears the First Selectman took my advice and is reviewing the Chairmans workbook and is currently working towards a solution to the crisis.

So hopefully soon, all is worked out; the BOF authority is restored without costing the town more money, and we all can get back to the budget process.

I guess I was the one who drew the conclusions!

We need to ask S&G for a refund!

I am not a fan of S&G as both the Town Atty & BOE. Too much of monopoly and appears political. IMHO

Greg Schuster went with Pullman & Comley for the Town Atty. It may be time to review this issue.

Dee:

As follow up to the discussion at the Board of Finance meeting on 2/20/2019, in regards to the Charter change that took place in 2017, I am working with the Charter Revision Commission members to gather further information from the Charter revision process. I will then make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Finance as to how to proceed on this matter.

Sincerely,

Art Shilosky, First Selectman

Where was this posted/distributed?

I found it on the Town Website and I only looked because Art told me he was going to have a statement.

It was not published on the FS Facebook page nor was there an email.

Thanks

You're welcome

I called BOE yesterday because their Budget wasn't posted online.

It was finally posted about 2pm.

2.51% increase

Do you know if audit is on file to "actual" spending. They to always show proposal against adopted budget. Historically they normally underspend by 2%. So proposal could be over 4% versus actual.

Also I was told the BOE did not address the decrease in ECS funding or Gov Lamont's proposal in town contributions to teachers pension during the public presentation?

Did you attend?

I'm in Florida. Saw on line last night. Will attend on March 7 and 12. Annual audits are on Colchester site on BOF and Finance Dept pages. YTD monthly reports on BOE site under BOE tab/education budget/monthly budget reports

Lucky you.

Snow & cold is forecast all week and into next week here. ☹️

Thank you for the info

enjoy the sunshine. ☀️☐

One more question.

Where would I find the up-to-date balance in BOE Capital Reserve account?

The last audit posted in 6/30/2017

A number I have asked for, too. The audit has that amount on it, but we also have a designated amount of money from year end unexpended funds that have not been transferred to BOE capital reserve yet. The question to ask is what is the total of BOE capital and funds designated for BOE capital.

Just sent an email telling Art, Maggie and Tricia that needs to be posted

Thank you

In reading the BOE Capital Reserve Fund Policy, the BOE has the power to expend funds on..."such other Capital items as the BOE, its sole and absolute discretion, shall determine are required for the improvement of the school district"

What does the definition "Capital Items" actually entail?

Sole discretion only the items in the Capital Reserve Fund. In practice they have asked us to approve. They do need approval for the money in designated fund balance. Capital Items=usually reported as assets on a balance sheet and often can be depreciated over time: include buildings and improvements, machines, equipment, furniture and fixtures, IT hardware. Generally, life expectancy > 1 year.

What about software? purchasing digital curriculum or curriculum updates?

Or chrome books?

Security cameras?

Software - actual software yes. Licenses generally not. Chromebooks yes if used more than one year, however if the plan is to replace every three years, money would need to be put away each year for future replacement. Security cameras yes.

Thanks for the information.

I think you should listen to the BOS meeting on 2/21 if you haven't already done so.

Art is stating Open Gov wants to give us another program due to the issues with the Open Gov??

Neither Art nor Maggie mentioned that fact during the 2/20 BOF meeting. I'm confused,

as I thought Art & Maggie were onboard to

make to program "live" so the public could review the information and become familiar with how the program works.

I listened to the tape on Monday and contacted Art. My understanding is the problem was caused by a Munis update/change, not opengov, and that they have been waiting on the Town since 2/18 or 2/19 to give them access to make the changes needed to begin updating from the new Munis server. The data is current into February. December would have been posted because Maggie had not prepared her January financial statements yet, at which point, if correct, she would make January month end visible on the public site. The offer of an additional program is old news, Opengov volunteered back in the fall to give us an additional service. We subsequently talked at a board meeting about

asking for a change in the contract start date instead, but never brought back to OpenGov because Maggie was not done validating. The transparency software is only one of two programs we contracted, and are paying, for. It represents less than 25% of the annual cost.

I also thought Munis was the issue. I am troubled to hear the BOS somewhat of a negative attitude towards OpenGov. I am also concerned that Art did not raise these issues in the BOF meeting if it was a concern of such magnitude. Citizens need clarity on when they will have access to OpenGov a program we have paid for and were promised access to for this budget cycle.

Thanks for you help in getting answers.

With the breach in town hall computers, I have a feeling, we will be waiting a lot longer for answers and access.

My recollection was that we discussed these upload issues at the BoF meeting and determined it would not be an issue for the public site until the end of March. The only question raised was who had the authority to make the site public.

On another note

After reading the CPS Superintendents proposed 2.41% 1,015,778

Budget Increase =

41,565,122

Is Supt Burt/BOE aware of Lamont's proposed cuts to Colchester?

We are #5 in towns to receive the largest cuts to state aid.