

Submission Received: Contact Us

Kathy Tanner via Colchester CT <cmsmailer@civicplus.com>

Wed 10/19/2022 7:41 PM

To: Franchesca Brown <fbrown@colchesterct.gov>; First Selectman <selectman@colchesterct.gov>

Submitted on Wednesday, October 19, 2022 - 7:41pm

Submitted values are:

Subject: Budget/Financial

Message Details:

Thank you for a concise and informative budget meeting by the Board of Finance. I do have several suggestions about the suggestion box after voting. I do like having a paper available at the door with the listings of:

Too high

Too low

Adequate (another word could be acceptable or affordable))

Comments: This may explain why the individual voted as they did. The comment may give specific ideas of what the voter was happy/unhappy with.

- Signage about the upcoming referendum date/time could also be put up at
- the intersection of RTS 16 and 149
- the on/ off ramp to RT 2 at 149
- on/off ramp at Old Hartford Rd. and Mill Hill Rd.
- intersection of RT 85 and Lake Hayward Rd.

The signs could be generic to be used again- BUDGET REFERENDUM (with sticker with date).

Thank you for letting me offer some suggestions. Again, thank you for your hard work.

==Please provide the following information:==

Name: Kathy Tanner

Email: kathytanner01@gmail.com

Phone: 860-450-9579

Address: 28 Gem Dr,, Colchester,CT

Organization:

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www.colchesterct.gov/node/16/submission/11746>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Steve Fedus LLC

October 17, 2022

To: Colchester Board of Selectmen

On Wednesday October 12 the Hartford Courant ran an article about a developer who wants to build 168 apartments in town off Norwich Avenue. They want a tax abatement or C-TIP for ten years. I understand that the EDC has endorsed this project. It is my opinion this project is not right for the site and not in the best interest of Colchester and its citizens.

EDC endorsements for C-TIP are traditional only for commercial and industrial projects where there would be a net increase in jobs. If the rules are changed every developer will want a tax abatement.

This site may be a good location for multifamily but with 168 units it is just too crowded

Yes Colchester needs more multifamily housing, especially "affordable". This site with 17 units designated affordable does little to address that.

There are also some serious traffic concerns. Cars from this project all must enter and exit on Norwich Avenue. At peak times 300 plus cars will head for the center of Colchester to get on Route 2 or Route 16.

Colchester taxpayers should not be subsidizing apartment developers. There are many Developers that would build Apartments in Colchester without a C-TIP if given the opportunity.

We should encourage economic growth and affordable housing by changing some of our restrictive building and zoning rules and expanding our water and sewer system.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Stephen M. Fedus". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'S' and 'F'.

Marli Rudko: Correspondence for Board of Selectmen meeting, October 20, 2022

Marli Rudko <marli@rudko.com>

Mon 10/17/2022 7:59 PM

To: Deborah Bates <dBates@colchesterct.gov>; Rosemary Coyle <rcoyles@colchesterct.gov>; Jason LaChapelle <jLaChapelle@colchesterct.gov>; Denise Turner <dturner@colchesterct.gov>; First Selectman <selectman@colchesterct.gov>

I, Marli Rudko, would like this email to be included in the upcoming Board of Selectmen meeting, this Thursday, October 20th, 2022 as correspondence in relation to the recently agreed upon FOI Log review process in which that log will be presented to the Board of Selectmen at their meetings. All supportive documentation is available upon request.

The FOI process is an integral part of government, granting citizens a level of much needed transparency to have a window into public information for which, unless exempt, they are entitled. I am very pleased that finally there will be a spotlight on our own FOI procedure for the activities of Colchester's town government for which the First Selectman's office is responsible. I am very troubled at the lack of respect for this process the current administration has exhibited for the past six months. For a First Selectman, who ran on several tenets, one of which was transparency, I find it disconcerting that this fundamental governmental process is being made a mockery of.

I have personally submitted seven written FOI requests (one verbal to Mary Jane Slade, Dept. Clerk) to the FOI Coordinator, Franchesca Brown, for which I assumed would be addressed in a timely manner. Much to my dismay, that wasn't the case. I have been strung along and then ultimately discouraged through an outrageous monetary ask to provide funds for video copies I have requested. I was given an initial estimate, which in my 20 years in the IT field seemed excessive, only to be subsequently hit with a 2,300% increase for the final total. I don't think it's a stretch to claim at this point the First Selectman's office is leveraging the ability to charge as a weapon to preclude me from gaining access. It's important to note that this video needs to be "copied" onto a thumb drive. In my experience copying is of minimal interaction and occasionally checking in to make sure it's still processing. FOI guidelines clearly state (and was confirmed by a staff attorney at FOI headquarters in Hartford) that no charge can be levied for "researching" and "retrieving", although these are the words being referred to when the basis for monetary charges is being explained to me. I was also told by the staff attorney in Hartford I could view the video per FOI guidelines, and I have asked this as well of the town. That request has gone unanswered as well. I will gladly pay for the thumb drive/s that are needed to house this data.

Most recently, I received an email from the Department Clerk in the First Selectman's office, in the attempt to mark one of my video requests as "complete", albeit it wasn't fulfilled. I have since filed a complaint with the FOI Commission. There were still outstanding issues being discussed regarding the "monetary" ask for this request as well, which have been ongoing with the town attorney. You see, in June, the First Selectman forbade me, in a phone call via the Department Clerk (and my husband, Taras – although he has yet to submit any) from submitting ANY FOI requests through his office. Even though CT FOI guidelines give me and my husband that right, we have been prohibited from doing so and I have been forced to communicate with the town attorney. That, in and of itself, is an intimidating process to be subjected to and the discrimination I am experiencing is beyond words at this point.

Because I have a lack of trust in the way my FOI requests (and from what I understand some others as well) are being handled and will be "recorded" in a FOI Log, I am outlining the experience I have endured with the "Bisbikos administration". I will list the date, brief description, any responses and pertinent notes surrounding those requests.

May 5, 2022

Request: Video – interior (first and second floor) and exterior video footage from Monday, April 25, 2022, to Friday, April 29, 2022, from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. each day. Exterior footage focused on the Town Hall dumpster. This is because The First Selectman went around telling people that I was seen throwing "shredded" documents into the dumpster and that he had to get people to go outside and retrieve them. This video will show that this claim was absolutely fabricated. Also, because I have been accused of shredding documents, the

only shredder is in the mailroom and the video will prove that I did not shred any documents. These are just some of the things I am looking to disprove in these false allegations made against me.

I've received no updates from the First Selectman's office, except in the very beginning when I would email for a status, and I would get the "we're working on it response". This one was handed off to the Town Attorney, Matt Ritter. Attorney Ritter, on behalf of the town, gave me an estimate via email of \$175. He asked me to write out a check for \$175 to the Town of Colchester. In good faith, I did. In the memo, I wrote FOI; Video; Pd in full. In all my years of getting "estimates" the final price usually turns out to be a small percentage lower or higher and sometimes exactly what the original estimate is. In this case, it went from \$175 to \$4,025. A 2,300% increase. That is not an "estimate". That is to discourage me from pursuing this video footage. My check was cashed and I would like the videos that I paid for.

Note: This specific request has not been fulfilled.

May 6, 2022

Request: All email correspondence from me to all internal and external points of contact, with the exclusion of nothing.

This is to provide evidence to the claim that part of my termination was due to "concerns regarding your interactions with staff and the public" was concocted to further impugn my character. These emails will prove that I not only was diligent, responsive and very helpful to staff and the public with questions, issues, etc., but I went above and beyond to help out with things that were not part of my job description. I took pride in working for the town. For instance, just one example of many, I helped out a man who volunteered for the Food Bank to track down a few individuals in Youth and Social Services (who were at an offsite event that day) for extra freezer storage to pack away hamburgers. I not only found him the extra storage (one freezer which was on the third floor) but I also helped him unload and stock two freezers full of hamburgers (in which there were hundreds) so that they didn't have to be thrown out.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

May 9, 2022

Request: Entire video of the Human Resources office during normal business hours for Monday, April 25th, 2022, and ending Wednesday, April 27th, 2022. Also Monday, May 2, 2022, starting at 3:50 p.m. and ending at the close of business. Also asked for May 2, 2022, second floor hallway footage.

This is to show that I in fact had two separate meetings with the HR Director on the days listed in April. It will also show that on April 27th, the day I was terminated, I met with the HR Director, Shannon Ramsby before noon. The video will also show that the First Selectman barged into my closed-door meeting and wouldn't leave, intimidating me and forcing me to leave without completing in full the rest of my complaint. It will also provide evidence that I went to the HR office later that afternoon to finish my meeting only to meet Mr. Ramsby in the hallway while he was leaving for the day. I was terminated about an hour later.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

May 9, 2022

Request: Personnel record documentation for me in reference to the two separate HR meetings for the dates, April 25th and April 27th. I also asked for the email submitted to HR, dated April 26th in which I reported a hostile work environment. I was looking to see if any of that documentation made it into my personnel record because when I picked up my personnel file on May 2, 2022, it was not in there.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

May 16, 2022

Request: Colchester Town Hall Employee Handbook and any relevant materials regarding job security; all sources of employee policies; all hiring documents; a critical review of the Colchester Town Hall's employer customs,

practices and precedent. *This one wasn't even acknowledged initially.* I followed up 11 days after submitting it to see if they were going to acknowledge it and the response I received was "the business of the town takes top priority" (the message being, mine is not important) and that "we'll notify you when it's ready". I thought FOI WAS part of town business.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

June 28, 2022 (verbal request)

Went to the Town Hall with Deanna Bouchard to pick up FOI documents that were communicated to her an hour earlier by the Executive Assistant, Franchesca Brown as being ready for pickup. Deanna knew I was interested in seeing these documents as well as they pertain to the day of my termination. She contacted me and I accompanied her to the Town Hall. Upon arriving we encountered the Executive Assistant, Franchesca Brown, while she was leaving the Town Hall. Deanna inquired with Franchesca if they were *really* ready, since this was her third time trying to obtain them. We were brushed off and told that we could go upstairs and ask the First Selectman about them. Upon arriving upstairs, we were greeted by Mary Jane, the Department Clerk, who upon questioning had no knowledge of these FOI documents. Franchesca had locked her office with the documents inside (although she failed to mention that when Deanna was speaking with her outside) and even upon inquiring with the First Selectman if he could unlock her office and retrieve them for us, he declined to do so. He told us through his closed door that we would have to deal directly with Franchesca. Those FOI documents ended up being locked away and inaccessible for either visual inspection and/or copying, even though it was communicated they were ready. That verbal request was not honored according to CT FOI guidelines and as such by law, deemed a denial. Being told that Franchesca was the only one we could deal with, and she had locked them in her office, we decided to do errands around town and try again in a few hours. We figured by then Franchesca would have returned and we could try again. We did go back later that day. She wasn't in her office and we left without documents Deanna was called and told just a few hours earlier were ready for pickup. I never went back to Town Hall after that day for any FOI's because my liberty was threatened a few days later when I was falsely accused in a police report of "stalking" the Executive Assistant that day. At that time, I became fearful of what other malicious accusations would be conjured up to deter me once again from gaining access to public records. I was never charged with that false allegation. That police report was closed due to no supporting evidence for that claim. It was also thrown out of court. But nonetheless, it put me in a state of fear because it was becoming clear to me a pattern of false police reports and intimidation was likely to continue to unfold.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

August 6, 2022

Request: Pared-down version of original May 5, 2022, request of video surveillance of April 27, 2022, with identified areas, i.e., first and second floors and outside perimeter with a smaller subset of time ranges. I also asked for the following bulleted items below and noted that this FOI request does NOT replace my earlier email request of a much broader scope dated May 5, 2022, of interior and exterior video surveillance. That request should still remain open.

- The location of the electronic equipment that houses Town Hall surveillance
- The type of media this video is captured on
- The name of the vendor who would perform video surveillance requests
- Any previous similar requests and their associated costs as shown by vendor invoice
- A vendor invoice for the above referenced video surveillance request

The town attorney replied only providing answers to the last two bullet points (one of which was incorrect in its response) and then ultimately came back with a charge of \$700 for this request. Not sure how a diluted version of my original request which was "estimated" at \$175, comes back at \$700.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

August 12, 2022

Providing clarification to Attorney Matt Ritter on my previous FOI request regarding another FOI request made by Colchester citizen, Amy Domeika regarding video footage for April 27th. I requested in a FOI communication to obtain that very email thread between Amy, Andreas and Franchesca that I had tried to inspect during normal business hours back on June 28th but was denied access to. I still have yet to receive a response from Attorney Ritter as to the status of this request.

Note: This request has not been fulfilled.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit this for the record. I trust that it will shed light on the ongoing struggle I continue to experience just trying to get my FOI requests fulfilled and also the importance that they contain to clear my name of all the manufactured lies lodged against me.

Sincerely,

Marli Rudko

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.