



# Town of Colchester, Connecticut

127 Norwich Avenue, Colchester, Connecticut 06415

## REGULAR MEETING of BOARD OF FINANCE

AGENDA – June 7, 2017 – Town Hall – 7:00

### REGULAR MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 17 Regular Meeting, May 23 Special Meeting, May 25 Special Meeting
4. CITIZENS COMMENTS
5. CORRESPONDENCE
6. DEPARTMENT REPORTS
  - a. Tax Collector
  - b. Finance
7. FIRST SELECTMAN
  - a. Transfer requests
  - b. First Selectman's report
8. NEW BUSINESS
  - a. Board of Finance Review
    - i. Responsibilities of Members
    - ii. Authority of Board of Finance
    - iii. Policies, By-Laws, Handbook, Charter
    - iv. Meetings
    - v. FOI - Meetings
    - vi. Review BOF Objectives and Initiatives
9. OLD BUSINESS
  - a. Budget Discussion
    - i. Revaluation
    - ii. Communications
    - iii. Other
10. LIAISONS' REPORTS
11. CITIZENS COMMENTS
12. ADJOURNMENT

RECEIVED  
COLCHESTER, CT  
2017 JUN -2 PM 1:00  
*Gayle Furman*  
GAYLE FURMAN  
TOWN CLERK

Correspondence for June 7 BOF Meeting

May 30, 2017

Deanna Bouchard  
16 Meadow Drive, Apt 3  
Colchester, CT 06415 VIA  
EMAIL

Ms. Bouchard,

We are in receipt of your email request for information, under the Freedom of Information Act, dated May 25, 2017, for information pertaining to correspondence received by Board of Finance Chairman Tarlov from 5/23/2017 - 5/25/2017.

We will do our best to respond to your inquiry in a timely manner and will advise you as soon as they are available.

Regards,

Tricia Dean  
Executive Assistant to the First Selectman  
cc: Rob Tarlov, BOF Chairman

---

From: Brian Martin <b189martin@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 8:17 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Re: Budget Issues

Thank you Rob. I appreciate the update.

I apologize for the email referencing false information.

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 8:06 PM  
To: Brian Martin  
Subject: Re: Budget Issues

The budget moved forward with the previously approved 250K reduction.

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

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 11:57 AM  
To: Brian Martin  
Subject: Re: Budget Issues

You are not the only one who received the same information.

Normally, in the past, unless new information was learned at the Public Hearing, the budgets were then approved without change. It has been that way for my previous 7 budgets, but I do not know what to expect tonight.

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

From: Brian Martin <[b189martin@gmail.com](mailto:b189martin@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 8:44 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Cc: Board of Finance Members; Ronald Goldstein; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Budget Issues

Rob,

Thank you for your response. It seems that the person who attended the meeting and shared the information might have been misinformed. I am interested to hear how the discussion goes tonight with regards to the Education budget.

Thank you very much and have a great day.

Brian

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:14 PM  
To: Brian Martin  
Cc: Board of Finance Members; Ronald Goldstein; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Budget Issues

Brian,

Although I attended the meeting by phone, and didn't catch everything, I do not believe there was any discussion or mention last night on those numbers being further reductions in the school budget. We never got as far as discussing the school budget as we discussed the amount of State revenue cuts we would assume in illustrating the mil rate and whether we would use unassigned fund balance in the budget, before adjourning the meeting to another meeting tomorrow night at 7:30.

1,000,000 was the motion for the amount of State revenue reductions we would assume and 500,000 was a motion for the amount of fund balance we would use. The first passed 4-2 and the second failed 3 -3, although we had further discussion later in the meeting on both. Neither of these motions was related to the expenditure budgets.

A motion was made to approve the Town budget as voted on last week, but the motion did not get a second.

Tomorrow night we will continue discussion on the revenue assumption and the use of fund balance and also likely take action on the BOE and Town expenditure budgets.

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

From: Brian Martin <[b189martin@gmail.com](mailto:b189martin@gmail.com)>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 2:07 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Budget Issues

Dear Mr. Tarlov,

I am deeply troubled and very concerned about the news of a potential \$500,000-\$1,000,000 being cut from the Board of Education (BOE) budget. This news directly effects me as a parent of 3 young children growing up in the town of Colchester, as a teacher who is well aware of the need for proper funds to run a school district, and as a Colchester high school and youth coach who knows the benefits of enriching education with co-curricular activities.

Since I have lived in Colchester, I have not seen much support for the BOE budget. This, in my opinion, is embarrassing. At some point, you need to look at what you're doing and realize that the world is changing around us and thus education is changing as well. Education needs to be invested in as it is the means to educate our youth. As other schools in other districts invest in their youth and education, Colchester is slowly falling behind.

It seems a lot of residents feel like cutting from the BOE budget is the only answer. This forces the people in education to pick out things that they can cut to save money on. Over time, after years and years of cuts, the list of items to cut from the budget is getting smaller and smaller. At what point will there be nothing else to cut?

As a coach, I see sports on that list way too often. Athletes and athletics are a vital part of school. Athletes are taught more than just their sport, but about teamwork, discipline, community service, and other important life skills that people don't even consider when thinking about cutting a sport.

*In fact, numerous studies have linked extracurricular participation to higher grades, higher achievement test scores, higher civic engagement and lower rates of delinquency and substance abuse. Isn't that exactly what we want?*

If this is the direction the town is going to choose to go, then the school district will be fighting an uphill battle. Beaten down already from all of the budget cuts they've had to deal with for years, they will be out numbered and not prepared to deal with the next generation of learners. People will flock to other towns and other districts to give their families the best chance at a good education and schools who offer the athletics their kids are interested in. Sadly, I will be one of those parents. My wife and I moved to Colchester in part because we wanted our children to be able to go to high school in the town we lived in. But if Colchester cuts the sports my kids are interested in, we will be sending them elsewhere.

Sincerely,  
Brian Martin

--

Brian Martin  
NFA Mathematics Department  
Bacon Academy Head Boy's Lacrosse Coach  
CT Cardinals Club Lacrosse Coach

---

From: Witkovic, Renee <Renee.Witkovic@hhchealth.org>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 7:32 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Andrea Migliaccio  
Subject: BOE Budget

As a concerned citizen, I would like to see the BOE budget remain as is without any further cuts. Please allow the citizens of Colchester to vote on this budget.

Thank you,  
Renee Witkovic

Sent from my iPhone

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message, including any attachments.

---

From: peter & eileen sposato <sposato58@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 5:35 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; abiskos@colchesterct.gov; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: BOE budget

I would like to express my opinion that the discussion of the BOE budget end; and that the figure for the BOE budget agreed upon at the May 17th BOF meeting not be changed. ...in other words; keep your powder dry.

Sincerely,

Peter Sposato R.Ph.

---

From: Joyce Maine <mainejoy2002@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:55 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Cc: Thomas Kane; Stefani Lowe; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Andreas Bisbikos  
Subject: Re: Both sides have spoken

Thank you Rob for answering my e-mail and sharing your opinion on the thinking behind the YES voter not getting the chance to get all that they ask.

If we are heavy on insurance, we might consider asking more contributions from the employees. I don't know what their co-pays or contributions are to the insurance program but I am told it's a "Cadillac" program. I hear also that we are now contributing to an employee annuity! It never ends. I think if we want to spend more in one area, we need to cut back somewhere else, much like we have to do at home when we are on fixed incomes.

Joyce

From: Robert Tarlov <BOFChair@colchesterct.gov>  
To: Joyce Maine <mainejoy2002@yahoo.com>  
Cc: Thomas Kane <tkane@colchesterct.gov>; Stefani Lowe <slowe@colchesterct.gov>; Andrea Migliaccio <amigliaccio@colchesterct.gov>; Roberta Lepore <rlapore@colchesterct.gov>; Andreas Bisbikos <abisbikos@colchesterct.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:07 PM  
Subject: Re: Both sides have spoken

Joyce,

Thanks for writing.

As you said both sides have spoken.

We are a diverse group serving a diverse citizenry and it can be challenging to reach consensus that everyone is happy with, and often that comes with much debate.

Reaching a compromise that balances the needs and wants of a very diverse population with their ability and desire to pay for those services is a challenge.

This year, as in the past, the biggest debate has been on the school budget. Supporters of the proposed budget wanted BOE to cut nothing from the Administration's budget, BOE cut \$246,125. The same group asked us to cut nothing. We cut another 250,000, more than the previous 3 years combined. Supporters of a leaner budget wanted us to cut more than that. Others may feel differently, but to me we reached compromise with the two elected boards cutting almost \$500,000. Most of the budget increase left now is the insurance increase.

I have always felt, and have stated so for many years, that 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 on the next referendum. Those supporting a higher budget can show up, vote YES, but if the budget passes, they cannot get back what we have already cut before the first referendum.

Rob

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

---

From: Joyce Maine <mainejoy2002@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:24 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Both sides have spoken

May 25, 2017

To all members of the Board of Finance:

Please consider the voices of the 143 people who signed a document presented to the BOF May 23, 2017 stating that they cannot support a Referendum that will increase their taxes.

Colchesters' yearly increases continue to create a hardship for many residents, especially Senior Citizens. As Margaret Thatcher said: "The problem with Socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money" and that appears to be the direction Colchester is heading towards. As we know, the State has already reached this abyss.

Listen to both Yes and No voters and find some compromise. Both sides have spoken.

Thank you,

Joyce A. Maine  
Colchester Resident

---

From: Comcast <gillerlane@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:44 PM

To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Re: Tonight's BOF Meeting

Rob

Thanks for the quick reply. I was unable to attend Tuesday's meeting as I was traveling. Thanks for clearing up what was discussed. Understandably the most recent meeting minutes were not available when I checked the town website this morning. It will certainly be interesting to see what happens tonight. Again, appreciate all of your hard work as well as the fact that your role as BOF Chair takes up a considerable amount of your personal time- I think some folks forget that!

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: LYNN GOODWIN <lymagoo@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:34 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Education budget

Chairman Tarlov,

I am writing in support of NO cuts to the Education budget. There has been overwhelming support of our school system at both BOE and BOF meetings. The comments have been to fund our schools, and put the money towards our children and their education.

Many of us are bringing our children to sporting events, scouts, concerts, or just giving them dinner and helping with homework. We are trying to attend as many meetings as we can. There are many of us yes voters very upset with the direction that our town has taken over the past few years.

Please hear us, if you have to vote through cuts, please do not go over the recommended 250,000. That is WAY too much, but at least it will allow us to maintain the little we have left.

If you vote through a 0% increase, people will send their kids to magnet schools and move out of Colchester. Please do not let this ruin our town.

Sincerely,  
Lynn and Paul Goodwin  
Residents of Colchester

Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App

---

From: Donna Duckworth <dduck81796@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:23 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; replore@colchester.gov  
Subject: Another reason to vote YES!!!

Dear Board of Finance,

I am emailing you as I will be unable to attend the meeting this evening and I would like to show my support for the FULL education budget. I understand the magnitude of the funds that will potentially not be received from the state and there is no doubt that Colchester and many other responsible communities will feel the pain of the complete mess that the state has



created.

With that being said, I still fully support the FULL education budget as the children of our community need to be afforded all of the opportunities that we were afforded as children. I moved to Colchester in 2009 because we felt the town could provide a public school education that was exceptional. I grew-up having had many options available to me as a child. I loved knowing that music, and drama were courses that I could study and build on in college. There were sports, multiple languages to study like Latin, Spanish, French, and Italian. Clubs and after school programs that allowed for students to build bonds with one another and to learn how to work together as a team. Those opportunities helped round me into the person that I am today and will forever be some of the best memories of my life.

In today's day and age, if these students aren't given the tools and options to grow into well rounded young adults, they will stand no chance against the competition as they apply for college and ultimately enter the work force. If we want our town to be a desired community, then we need to maintain our school system with the funds necessary to continue to educate our children. It is a competitive world. We need our children to be given the same opportunities that other towns in Connecticut and across the world are receiving. I am willing to take the "hit" and pay higher taxes while we get through this mess the state created knowing that we are giving our children the tools and opportunities they need.

Again, I would like to be on record stating that I fully support the FULL education budget and will be voting YES on the first referendum.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Donna A. Duckworth  
15 Hi Lea Farm Road  
Colchester, CT

(Mother of Gianna Duckworth, age 13)

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Debbie Grottale <debgrotto@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:21 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore  
Subject: Budget cuts

Dear BOF,

My name is Debbie Grottale and I have lived in Colchester for 24 years. I moved here in 1993 during the numerous voting that was taking place for the current, then new, BA and a swimming pool. I should have known then that it would be a constant battle to get anything related to the education budget passed in this town. My husband and I have raised our 4 children in this community. My 2 oldest both graduated from BA and are in college. I currently have a 10th grader and an 8th grader. All of my children have had wonderful experiences in the Colchester school system even with all the budget restrictions. I believe that is due to the caring & compassionate teachers and administration we have been so lucky to have. Our schools can not afford a bud let alone a million dollar cut. I am asking you to allow the original BOE budget that was proposed to be set forth for the referendum. Let the people of Colchester vote for this. The NO voters can always vote NO and the budget can then get decreased. The YES voters do not have that luxury. Please allow us to try and get this budget passed as is. Don't take money away from the schools before it has to be. Let the people vote.

Thank you for your time.  
Debbie Grottale

---

From: Tina Everett <teverett\_5@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 4:07 PM

To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Rlepore@colchester.gov

Subject: To whom it may concern

I was born and raised in this town and have four children of my own active in school sports as well as recreational sports the town offers and I am so thankful to be apart of it all! I have coached numerous sports over the past 13 years and have run a few as well and all volunteer. I enjoy the countless hours I have spent of my own personal time to be there not only for my own children but everyone else's. As a coach we help shape our youth to be more responsible and dedicated young adults. And so much more. We need to all work together and support our athletic programs and our teachers. I personally can not Thank the Colchester school systems teachers and counselors enough for all they have done for my children and continue to do for the kids! It takes a village to raise a family. I am thankful for our village and by working together as a TEAM

Together  
Everyone  
Achieves  
More!

After all it's not about us adults it's about our children, grandchildren and their future! Find cuts somewhere else! Please!

Thank you  
Tina Everett

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

---

**From:** Robert Tarlov

**Sent:** Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:23 PM

**To:** Comcast; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Andrea Migliaccio; Stefani Lowe

**Subject:** Re: Tonight's BOF Meeting

Michael,

I am unable to predict what might happen tonight, but on Tuesday the Board did not have a discussion on the budgets and no motion was made on the school budget.

The meeting discussion and motions were on what reduction of state revenue we would assume (1,000,000) and a proposal to use 500K of fund balance. The first motion was passed. The second motion failed. These two revenue issues impact the mil rate we will illustrate, but neither revenue nor the mil rate are voted on at referendum. When a motion was made on the town budget, some wanted to revisit the revenue assumption we had voted on and that was when the meeting adjourned to the already scheduled May 25 meeting.

Rob

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

From: Comcast <[Gillerlane@comcast.net](mailto:Gillerlane@comcast.net)>

Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 2:51 PM

To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Andrea Migliaccio; Stefani Lowe

Subject: Tonight's BOF Meeting

Good afternoon,

I am writing to you regarding tonight's Board of Finance special meeting. First of all, I would like to thank all of you for your service to our town as members of the Board of Finance, please know that I do recognize that you have a difficult job in front of you and that you are balancing your positions on this board with full time careers.

That being said I was extremely disappointed that the Board of Finance has decided to rescind their May 17, 2017 vote to reduce the proposed education budget by \$250,000 and are now considering cuts that would total \$500,000-\$600,000 (some are saying as high as \$1M). While I understand the need to be prudent when considering tax increases I have a difficult time comprehending why you would decide to ignore your vote given the show of support from parents, teachers and students leading up to the May 17th meeting. The decision to reconsider the 4-2 vote taken on May 17 lacks transparency. What prompted this reversal in course? I have attended several meetings this year and I have read the minutes and attachments from every meeting that I was unable to attend. In addition, I am a fourteen year resident of Colchester and am very familiar with the history surrounding our budget process. I have heard all of the arguments in support of a zero or minimal increase in our school budget. I have listed a few below along with my perspective on these arguments

- "Not everyone has skin in the game when it comes to the education budget." I could not disagree more and quite frankly was shocked to hear that come from a member of the BOF. When it comes to the quality of education in a town everyone has "skin in the game." Colchester's history of difficult budget processes is well known beyond our community and the perception is that we do not fund schools and that our schools are lacking. That perception transforms into reality for prospective residents when they are in the process of buying a home. They will shun Colchester and move to a town that they perceive to have better schools. Over time that will continue to have a negative impact on property values and as property values decrease the tax revenue will also decrease, however, the cost to run our town and schools will only continue to increase. A well-funded school system with a diverse curriculum and diverse activities, athletics and clubs is a true asset that will allow a town to grow and flourish.

- "Enrollment is down and therefore the budget should be reduced." We are all well aware of the storm brewing on our horizon, an inept state government has been underfunding our pension system since 1939 and has been mismanaging state education funding for the past thirty years. It is no surprise that they will be transferring this liability onto the town governments. Colchester is at a real crossroads – the worst thing we can do is overreact and create devastating cuts to the school budget that will have generational impact. Rather we need to consider how to wisely invest on making continued improvements in our schools.

- "You need to be responsible for everybody in town...." Certainly a comment we can all agree on and one that was relayed to the BOF during the May 17th meeting and included in a Riverast News Bulletin article on May 19 from a gentleman who was disappointed that the proposed budgets were too robust given the situation in the state government. My perspective is a bit different.....let's not forget that everybody includes our children, they deserve better than what we are giving them. I was very interested to hear and read that under the current proposed budget 75% of our residents would realize a reduction in their property taxes, only 25% would receive increases. In contrast 100% of our school children would be negatively impacted by not only additional cuts you will consider tonight but also by the previously voted on reductions of \$250,000. I believe that our current situation falls well short of being fair to "everybody", and in particular our school children.

- I have heard and read several comments that seem to indicate that one of the reasons why the BOF is considering additional cuts tonight is because of our referendum history. Specifically that past history shows the current proposed cuts are not sufficient enough to get a referendum passed. I understand it is difficult to eliminate personal experience from the decision making process, that being said I find this argument for additional cuts particularly troubling and quite frankly, illogical. With all due respect, I do not believe that it is the function of the BOF to guess what the outcome of particular budget will be. Past year's processes and results should not have any bearing on the decision making process for a current year. That line of thought eliminates the possibility that you would consider new information or recognize the fact that there could indeed be a

transformative or profound change of opinion and reaction by a constituency. It also creates an artificial floor that is unfair to one side of the issue. I am not aware of any law that requires that we pass the budget on the first, second or even third try. While the prospect of multiple referendums is certainly not ideal, the democratic process demands that we take our time to ensure we are giving proper consideration to both sides. I have been at several meetings and have spoken to many who attended the meetings I have missed – this year there has been greater turnout and greater support for little to no cuts in the education budget. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that the BOE actually increased the initial budget they proposed after hearing reaction from voters. I strongly believe that is sufficient evidence for the BOF to submit the budget that was voted on during the May 17 meeting. We need to take a conservative and prudent approach to this process. Please let the voters decide!

Lastly, it has become quite evident during this process that there is a real divide and lack of trust between the BOF and BOE. I can tell you that there are many of us who are disappointed with the relationship between the two boards and are concerned that it negatively impacts the process and only increases the rhetoric that exists between the opposing sides on this issue. I am not pointing fingers at the BOF and will relay the same thoughts to the BOE. I would encourage leadership from both boards to work toward fostering a better and more trusting relationship for the good of our town. I know that managing personalities can be difficult, however, thirty years in corporate America and volunteering on the boards of many non-profit organizations tells me that with the requisite effort this relationship can be improved.

Again, thank you for your hard work and commitment to our town.

Respectfully submitted

Michael Gillerlane

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:28 PM  
To: Scott Dimock; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Re: budget referendum

Scott,

Thanks for letting us know your thoughts. We are a diverse group serving a diverse citizenry and it can be challenging to reach consensus that everyone is happy with, and often that comes with much debate.

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

From: Scott Dimock <scottjdimock@gmail.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:19 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: budget referendum

Colchester Board of Finance:

I believe the Board of Education has presented a responsible budget. In my opinion it should be sent to referendum without further reductions.

Thank you,  
Scott Dimock

---

From: Parker, Mary Ann <MaryAnnParker@bhhsne.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 1:37 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Cc: Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Re: BOF

Rob  
Thank you for reaching out and clarifying!  
I hadn't expected a reply it was very much appreciated.  
Mary Ann

Mary Ann Parker  
REALTOR LICENSE 0751665  
Berkshire Hathaway Home Services  
New England  
Chairman Circle Top 2% Nationally  
Top Selling Agent  
11 Hayward Ave  
Colchester Ct 06415  
office 860-537-6699  
cell 860-883-9949  
fax 860-537-0285

From: Robert Tarlov <BOFChair@colchesterct.gov>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 1:20 PM  
To: Parker, Mary Ann  
Cc: Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Re: BOF

Mary Ann,

There has been some misinformation about Tuesday night's meeting as several people have written to me about the 500,000 to 1,000,000 cuts.

Although I attended the meeting by phone, and didn't catch everything, I do not believe there was any discussion or mention Tuesday night on those numbers being further reductions in the school budget. We never got as far as discussing the school budget, as we discussed the amount of State revenue cuts we would assume in illustrating the mil rate and whether we would use unassigned fund balance in the budget, before adjourning the meeting to another meeting already that was already scheduled for tonight at 7:00. We changed the time to 7:30 so that all BOF members could attend.

1,000,000 was the motion for the amount of State revenue reductions we would assume and 500,000 was a motion for the amount of fund balance we would use. The first passed 4-2 and the second failed 3 -3, although we had further discussion later in the meeting on both. Neither of these motions was related to the expenditure budgets.

Tonight we will continue discussion on the revenue assumptions and the use of fund balance and also likely take action on the BOE and Town expenditure budgets. I do not know what other members may propose for tonight, but there was no direct discussion or motions on the school budget Tuesday night.

Declining enrollment has had a lot of discussion. The school has reacted to the changes, but not to the extent that many feel is adequate. However those who take the gross budget, divide by the number of kids receiving their education in Colchester school buildings and then compare the result to years past use a simplistic equation that overstates the true increase and ignore so many things. I also feel it is important people know what kind of results we get, what kind of "bang to we get for our buck?"

Rob

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

---

From: Parker, Mary Ann <MaryAnnParker@bhhsne.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 12:40 PM  
Cc: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: BOF

Good Morning

First I want to thank you I know this isn't an easy task and you donate so much time and put up with a lot of mean people to put it bluntly.

I have been to most of the BOE meetings and missed the last meeting. I had thought erroneously that you had asked for a 450,000 cut but have heard that you have now asked for 500,000 to 100,000 cut. I am just bewildered on why every year we hammer away at the school I raised 6 children here my last graduates this year. I watched so many wonderful things happen a new high school renovations at the schools So many wonderful things .

My kids are very active in many sport and still are in their adult life.

Indoor track is an important sport people think its just kids running in the halls but its one of the only sports ANYONE can join and be welcomed and guided by their peers. These kids need something to do to keep on track either for social skills, time management, staying in shape for their personal health or to be ready for the spring season. You cant run cross country in the fall and then take 4 months off before you start conditioning again.

My daughter at 5 feet took first place in states her senior year in pole vaulting and at 27 she is still pole vaulting. In her spare time. She helps out at the Bacon meets And did track all tru college She majored in nutrition and helps people learn to exercise and eat healthy she learned an appreciation for this with her involvement in sports . All 3 of my boys did indoor track.

And dont get me started on cutting Lacrosse I was part of Lacrosse at the start My son now coaches the Jv with Coach Loskant who started it. He is going to college to be a science teacher between school and work he makes every game and practice. My kids learned how to give back to the community in ways that the community gave to them and more.

But over the last 4 years It has been a constant battle its embarrassing now when a buyer asks me about the school system that I used to say was wonderful. I would mention our teachers of the year. Our elementary school teacher that implemented a new reading/spelling program that she was teaching across the country. So many wonderful things happened.

But now we are cutting and cutting we are no longer offering our children what my children had.

I Sold a house this spring and the buyer went on Facebook one of the community sites to meet people and learn about the town. She asked me what the heck was going on. And she is a teacher in Marlborough. Our property values will decline as people opt for other towns or send there kids to magnet school.

If there weren't any sports when my kids went I would have sent them to a magnet school why stay here? The magnet school's offer sports.

And then begins a bigger problem

I spoke to my builder yesterday and said you better vote yes and he said why do they spend so much money when they have 800 kids less. OMG he gets his stuff off of facebook over the years as well as other people i have talked to When your kids graduate you lose touch with whats going on. This has created a huge problem for our town .

I wish we had a group of people like the NO group that could dispel the fake news that goes around its very damaging

So in my opinion I wouldn't cut anything from the school budget  
If it doesn't pass then cut the lower amount

**Learn to negotiate.**

And lets get a face book group that can negate this false information going around!!!

Thank you everyone for all your hard work and especially for listening to me ramble on in this wordy letter.

Mary Ann

Mary Ann Parker  
REALTOR LICENSE 0751665  
Berkshire Hathaway Home Services  
New England  
Chairman Circle Top 2% Nationally  
Top Selling Agent  
11 Hayward Ave  
Colchester Ct 06415  
office 860-537-6699  
cell 860-883-9949  
fax 860-537-0285

---

From: Wendy Maurice <awonder20@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Saturday, May 27, 2017 10:50 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Re: School Budget

Thank you, Rob. I appreciate the difficult task the board has. Thank you for the countless hours you put in for the town.

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 3:32 PM  
To: awonder20@yahoo.com  
Cc: Andreas Bisbikos; rlapore@Colchesterct.gov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Re: School Budget

Hi Wendy,

Thanks for letting us know your thoughts. We are a diverse group serving a diverse citizenry and it can be challenging to reach consensus that everyone is happy with, and often that comes with much debate.

This year is even more challenging, not because the State has not voted but because of the major changes being considered. We vote without having a final number almost every year and now the State even cuts their numbers after they voted and we are well into our fiscal year.

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

From: Wendy Maurice <awonder20@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 1:00 PM  
To: rlapore@Colchesterct.gov; Andrea Migliaccio; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Robert Tarlov  
Subject: School Budget

Please go forward with the current budget that includes \$250,000 in cuts to education. After no increase in education spending last year, these cuts are deep enough already.

I do not agree with cutting more just in case the State changes the amount of money we receive. The budget needs to go to a vote now so that we have a budget going forward. The budget has been well thought out and voters should have their say at the ballot box.

No one on the BOF should be holding up this vote. Individual members with personal agendas should not be holding the town hostage over this. Please, let us vote on the current budget.

Respectfully,

Wendy Maurice  
60 Linwood Drive Unit C  
Colchester, CT 06415

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2017 5:07 AM  
To: Susan gains  
Cc: Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Town of Colchester Budget

Susan,

I agree with you. The excess cost of this raise above what everyone else was receiving under the Town's Compensation Policy should have been shown. Although the Board of Finance does not create or make these presentations, I realize from doing many public presentations in my "real" career that sometimes the presenters don't realize what is important to the people attending the presentations and omit things that many want to know, and should know, and include things many don't care about, and, sometimes they just miss things. More diligence needs to be had to be sure new initiatives, both additions and reductions, impacting the budget are included. Knowing Art Shilosky, this was an oversight not a deliberate omission.

Board of Finance did discuss this raise at 2 or 3 budget workshops.

When I first learned of the raise, the employee's request was about 10%, and her request was based on what other towns our size paid for the position, what other department heads were earning, as well as her performance in taking the Program Fund balance from -51,081 to a +150,000 since 2012, when previous to this, the expenses of the programs regularly exceeded the income. She turned this around by implementing cost control measures and despite a reduction in revenue, took the annual



results out of the red. She has implemented other initiatives that have saved the taxpayers money and is now working on increasing revenue.

As projecting the cash flow of the Program Fund has become more predictable, the Board of Finance and the First Selectman have been working with the Recreation Manager in the creation of a 5 year plan for the Fund. In the plan are a number of future items to be paid from the Fund rather than being paid from budgets funded by our taxes.

- Park Ranger (would be a new position)
  - Vandalism has become a major problem at the rec complex and is costing the town a lot of money to repair. Presence of security during some of the hours when this occurs could reduce this.
  - For the collection of fees from people from other towns, including many who are often bussed in by the other towns' Rec departments, for the use of our water park. Our park is consistently listed in CT magazines, websites and newspapers as one of the top 10 free things to do in CT. These fees will produce additional income for the town or deter out of town use reducing our expenses and a less crowded experience for Colchester residents.
- Equipment and Improvements at the Rec Complex to avoid using the taxpayer funded budget.

Because of the success of the Program Fund over the the last 3 - 4 years, Board of Finance members have been meeting with the First Selectman, CFO, and Recreation Manager on a plan to transfer expenses out of the taxpayer funded budget to the Program Fund. The current success of the Program Fund is not from fee increases paid by Colchester residents for the programs, but as mentioned above, from expense reductions. The first transfers of some of these expenses is beginning this year as we have removed \$16,159 from the budget which will now be paid from the Program Fund, no longer using taxpayer dollars.

The Town had had a merit based pay system before creating the Town's Nonunion Compensation Policy which has been used in the last 3 budgets. In this current situation, the First Selectman was concerned that a talented employee could get a position at a higher pay in another town and negotiated the increase down to 7.09% or 4.84% more than what everyone else was receiving under the Policy.

When Board of Finance first learned of this raise, I did some research on other towns and found that, both before the additional raise (64,408) and after (67,876), the position's salary was in the middle of the pack, with some a lot higher and some a lot lower. The comparison was difficult as not all recreation positions were the same. Unlike our Rec position, some were Parks and Rec, some ran far less programs than ours and many did not have non-taxpayer funded events like our 57 Fest and Concerts on the Green run by the towns.

As you likely heard on the tapes you referenced, I informed the First Selectman, CFO and the rest of the Board of Finance, that this employee would not be eligible for the standard raise in the next two budget years. The policy states than any employee that negotiated their pay in one of the two prior budgets is not eligible for the annual raise. Although we are paying out additional dollars over the next two years by the third year and beyond, it is about \$120/year or a little less than 2/10 of a percent. This is the difference:

The is no way to know if the additional raise not been negotiated, if we would have lost the employee. I can only rely on the judgement of the First Selectman.

In looking at the previously taxpayer funded expenses, as well as future ones, that are/will no longer in the budget because of the positive results of the Program Fund, together with the real impact of this raise, I personally, supported this additional expense, but as you point out, it should have been included in the presentation's proposed changes.

I realize that small expenses add up, but this expense by itself does not change the mil rate as .01 is needed to move it up or down, and this expense in the first year is .0025, second year is .0013 and in the third and beyond .0001. For me it isn't about the money as the amount is small and the value received larger, but about the fact that the raise should have been shown as an offset to the correlated benefit to the taxpayer that was shown. Something that has been a very good net result for the taxpayer, became a negative by its omission.

I don't doubt that there might be other things in the budgets, both positives and negatives that were not included in the presentation as there are a lot of moving parts, and ensuring inclusion of all that viewers will feel is important is challenging. The full proposed budget presented 2/28 is on the web site and the 5/25 one should be completed and posted soon. The same with the BOE budget. The past adopted budgets are also posted. Transparency through available information is not the problem, but the ease of comparing over 300 pages of ledgers to past years is. It's an arduous task. As a volunteer on BOF, I do this line by line comparison as I need to be informed in when making decisions on the budget, but the taxpayer has neither the time or patience, or sometimes the aptitude, to do the same, so relies on presentations for the important facts. Hopefully the new online transparency (opengov.com) software will make it through the budget process as it will allow taxpayers, as well as myself and other Board of Finance members, to do much easier comparisons without having to rely totally on presentations.

Rob

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

---

**From:** Susan gaines <susanclsetohome@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 26, 2017 1:04 PM  
**To:** Robert Tarlov  
**Subject:** Town of Colchester Budget

Mr. Tarlov,

Thank you for your reply. In a time when the community is asking for transparency & the BoF is saying they are being "completely transparent" to have a salary increase of 7.09% in the budget & not have it listed anywhere in the budget presentation is misleading to say the least. What else is buried in this bare bones budget?

You are looking for cuts and making difficult decisions?

I cannot in good conscience support a budget with a salary increase as exorbitant as 7.09% about a \$5,000 raise and I feel it is irresponsible for the BoF to accept it and its sneaky to bury it somewhere in the budget where the community cannot find it without an email to the Chairman!

I am contemplating going to the River East to let the community know what is really going on! How sad for the Town of Colchester!!

Good Luck!

**From:** Robert Tarlov  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 25, 2017 12:49 PM  
**To:** Susan gaines  
**Cc:** Art Shilosky  
**Subject:** Re: Colchester Town budget

Yes this increase is still in the Town budget.

The town policy provides for nonunion employees to receive an annual raise equal to the average of the contractual raises being received by the union employees. This 7.09% was higher than the 2.25% she would have been received this year under that policy. This raise was negotiated with the First Selectman, but as I reminded everyone at the meeting, that anyone who has

negotiated a raise in the previous 2 budget years is not entitled to a raise under the town policy, so for the next 2 budget years (after this year) her pay will be frozen.

Although there is no way to tell if the 2.25% will be higher or lower over the next two years as different union contracts are negotiated each year, the 7.09% is equal to about 2.36% per year.

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

From: Susan gaines <susanclsetohome@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 12:29 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Colchester Town budget

Dear Chairman Tarlov,

I have been a resident for 25 years. I have not been able to attend the budget meetings & have resorted to finding out my information on the Town budget via the Town website. I have read the minutes and I have listened to the recordings. There was quick mention of an increase in salary for the Recreation Manager in the minutes. When I listened to the recording and heard the increase was 7.09%!!!! Is this accurate and is it still in the budget? I did not see it removed but then again I didn't see it added either.

I will wait to make my comments until I receive your reply.

Thank you.

Susan

---

From: Jason Duckworth <jbduckworth@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 11:19 AM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore  
Subject: Education budget - Voting YES

Dear Board of Finance,

I am emailing you as I will be unable to attend the meeting this evening as I am traveling for business and I would like to show my support for the FULL education budget. I understand the magnitude of the funds that will potentially not be received from the state and there is no doubt that Colchester and many other responsible communities will feel the pain of the complete mess that the state has created.

With that being said, I still fully support the FULL education budget as the children of our community need to be afforded all of the opportunities that we were afforded as children. I went to public school and had many options whether it was sports, arts, library hours and books, foreign languages and other curricular and extra curricular activities. Those opportunities helped round me into the person that I am today and serve as some as my best memories.

In today's day and age, if these students aren't given the tools and options to grow into well rounded young adults, they will stand no chance against the competition as they apply for college and ultimately enter the work force. I am willing to take the "lumps" and pay higher taxes while we get through this mess the state created knowing that we are giving our children the tools and opportunities they need.

Again, I would like to be on record stating that I fully support the FULL education budget and will be voting YES on the first referendum.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Jason Duckworth

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

---

From: Blakley, John <john.blakley@siemens.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 10:39 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Town & School Budgets

Mr. Tarlov,

While I am neither a "Yes" or "No" voter I am a town resident and property owner whose interest is in fiscal responsibility. I believe through all of the back and forth that has taken place over the last several months that we are at that place. I have been to several of the Board of Ed meetings as well as several of the Board of Finance meetings and of I am of the opinion that the Board of Ed and the Selectman have done the best they can given the circumstances and now at the grandstanding stage.

While I will be unable to attend tonight's meeting my daughter and wife will be in attendance and ask that we push through the nonsense and put the current proposals (both town and Education) to a referendum and let the entire town have a say as opposed to the handful that attend the meetings in order to hear themselves talk. Putting this off any longer only brings us into the summer months and vacations. I would hate to see one side or the other lose because people are out of town.

Thanks for your time and I look forward to putting this behind us

Regards,  
John Blakley

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 10:30 AM  
To: deee bouchard  
Cc: Andreas Bisbikos; Stefani Lowe; Thomas Kane; Stefani Lowe; Roberta Lepore; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: BOE Budget Questions for BOF to Review for 5/25/17 Meeting

I have forward your questions to Ron Goldstein.

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

From: deee bouchard <deeedeee1963@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 10:26 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane

Cc: Andreas Bisbikos; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: BOE Budget Questions for BOF to Review for 5/25/17 Meeting

Dear Chairman Tarlov,

According to an article in the Norwich Bulletin (5/24/2017), the Colchester BOE recently voted to appointed Karen Loiselle-Goodwin as interim Superintendent for CPS beginning July 1st, 2017. Also according to the article, Loiselle will be paid \$688/day which is the same rate that Superintendent Mathieu currently earns.

Note (as of 10:00 am 5/25/17 there are no BOE minutes posted for me to confirm these facts, thus my purpose for including the quote from the Norwich Bulletin below)

Loiselle Goodwin will be paid on a per diem basis, Goldstein said, and will earn \$688 a day, which is the same rate of pay Mathieu earns.

My questions for the Board of Finance to review:

- 1) If Ms Loiselle is currently collecting a pension from the CTRB, it appears that she is subject to the "Post Retirement Reemployment 45% Rule" as governed by CGS 10-183v.
  - 2) Current salary of Superintendent = \$167,000 / 688 = 242.73 (does the Supt only work 242/3 days/year?)
  - 3) If Ms Loiselle is subject to the 45% Rule, should she be earning the salary of our current Superintendent?
- The reason I bring this to the attention of the BOF is that, if the 45% rule does apply, this could potentially be an area for substantial savings (annuity,health insurance,etc) in the 2017/2018 BOE Budget.

C.G.S. 10-183v, provides that a retiree receiving retirement benefits from the TRB may be reemployed in a Connecticut public school assignment (meaning an assignment that the State of Connecticut Department of Education, Certification Bureau has established as a position requiring certification issued by them) and receive no more than forty-five per cent of the \*maximum full-time annual salary rate for the assigned position". The compensation is limited to the cash salary of such retiree and shall be fixed at an amount at least equal to that paid to other active teachers in the same school system with similar training and experience for the same type of service. Connecticut public school teaching service is defined as employment in a position for which certification issued by the Connecticut State Department of Education is required (this includes Charter Schools, Magnet Schools and Technical Schools) or employment as a member of the professional staff of the State Department of Education or any of the public state colleges or universities.

Have a happy day 😊

Sincerely,  
Deanna Bouchard  
Colchester, CT

Additional Information for you to review

[http://www.ct.gov/trb/lib/trb/formsandpubs/PRE\\_GUID.pdf](http://www.ct.gov/trb/lib/trb/formsandpubs/PRE_GUID.pdf)

---

#### CT TEACHERS' RETIREMENT BOARD

www.ct.gov  
ct teachers' retirement board. 765 asylum avenue hartford, ct 06105-2822 . toll free 1-800-504-1101 local (860) 241-8401  
fax (860) 622-2845

---

For a number of reasons, some retired teachers may be interested in continuing to work in education after retirement. Retired teachers receiving pensions from the CTRB may be reemployed in a position eligible for CTRB membership and continue receiving their pension income if certain criteria are met.

In order to continue working within the system and receiving a pension, a member must receive less than 45% of the highest salary paid for the same position within the district. In order to avoid this salary limitation, a member must be employed in one of the listed Subject Shortage Areas or Priority School Districts for the given school year. If you or someone you know may be

considering reemployment after retirement, please follow this link for more information and a current list of Subject Shortage Areas and Priority School Districts:

#### 2017-18 Subject Shortage Area or Priority School District Reemployment

A retired member may be reemployed in a designated Subject Shortage Area or in a school in a Priority School District and continue to receive pension income for a period of one school year. (With prior approval by the Teachers' Retirement Board, such reemployment may be extended for an additional school year.) The employing school district must submit a [Subject Shortage Area or Priority School District Reemployment Form](#)(PDF 104KB) to CTRB prior to the reemployment of the retired member. While reemployed in a designated Subject Shortage Area or a school in a Priority School District, such former teacher shall be eligible for the same health insurance benefits provided to active teachers employed by such school system. During this period of reemployment, a health insurance subsidy payment will not be issued nor is the reemployed member eligible to participate in a TRB Health Plan.

The Commissioner of Education has designated the following Subject Shortage Areas for 2017-18:

- Bilingual Education, PK-12
- Comprehensive Special Education, K-12
- Mathematics, 7-12
- Occupational Subject, Vocational Technical High School
- School Library and Media Specialist
- Science, 7-12
- Speech and Language Pathologist
- Technology Education, PK-12
- TESOL, PK-12
- World Languages, 7-12

The Priority School Districts for 2017-18 are not available yet.

The Priority School Districts for 2016-17 are:

- Bridgeport
- Danbury
- Derby
- East Hartford
- Hartford
- Meriden
- New Britain
- New Haven
- New London
- Norwalk
- Norwich
- Stamford
- Waterbury
- Windham

---

From: Lawrence, Kathryn <Kmlawre@connecticutchildrens.org>

Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 9:48 AM

To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Roberta Lepore; Andrea Migliaccio

Subject: BOE Budget

Good morning, I am writing this email to ask you to consider sending the BOE Budget through as is with no further cuts. Please give the citizens of Colchester the opportunity to vote on this budget as it stands without the cuts. Please do not assume this

budget will not pass. There has been more community involvement now than ever. Again, I urge you to send the budget through without cuts and let the people of Colchester vote on it.

Thanks,  
Kathy

Kathy Lawrence  
Administrative Assistant III  
Office of Grants & Sponsored Programs  
Connecticut Children's Medical Center  
282 Washington Street  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Phone: 860-837-5771  
Fax: 860-837-5826

\*\*Connecticut Children's Confidentiality Notice\*\*

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message, including any attachments.

---

From: Tricia Dean  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 9:39 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: FW: FOI REQUEST

Morning Rob,

Can you let me know if there are any documents received by the Board that will be discussed tonight?

Thank you,

*Tricia Dean*  
Executive Assistant to the First Selectman  
Town of Colchester  
127 Norwich Avenue  
[tdean@colchesterct.gov](mailto:tdean@colchesterct.gov)  
P: (860) 537-7220

From: deee bouchard [mailto:deeedeee1963@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 9:25 AM  
To: Tricia Dean <tdean@colchesterct.gov>  
Subject: FOI REQUEST

Ms Dean,

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 5/25/17 BOF meeting.

Please notify me when these are records will be available to pick up in-person PRIOR to the BOF meeting 5/25/17.

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.

Have a Happy Day :)

Sincerely,  
Deanna Bouchard

---

From: Banning, Chuck <C.Banning@theday.com>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 8:51 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Tonight's Board of Finance meeting

Rob,

This is an incredibly critical time for families raising children in our town. I've seen passionate debate from both sides on the current budget issue, but I urge you – as a Board of Finance member – to accept the recommendation of the Board of Education and allow the residents of Colchester to vote on a budget that includes \$250,000 cut ... and nothing more.

Since moving to Colchester in 2004, I've consistently been a proponent of the education budget because of my vested interest of having three children in the school system. But I've also come to respect opponents for their views and ability to get out the vote. That said, the Board of Finance has seen a tremendous uptick from concerned voters who want to preserve the education budget this year, and those voices have proven they deserve the opportunity to decide on this important referendum through their vote.

Before moving to Colchester, I lived in Clinton, and continue to follow its town news through former neighbors and social media. After following the rhetoric leading up to Clinton's budget vote on Wednesday night, I thought both town and educational budgets were doomed. Surprisingly, the education budget passed, but the town budget failed. It was a major surprise.

I'm confident the voters of Colchester will surprise you, too, but at the very least deserve the opportunity to decide on the budget presented to you on Tuesday night. I urge you to put that budget in the hands of the voters.

Thanks for listening,

Chuck Banning  
48 Miller Rd.

Chuck Banning  
Sports Editor  
The Day (New London, CT)  
c.banning@theday.com  
(860) 701-4441



---

From: Julie Reiss <juliereiss@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 8:29 AM  
To: Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Robert Tarlov  
Subject: School budget cuts

Good morning,

As a long time resident of Colchester, with two children at the schools, I urge you to minimize the cuts to the school budget. Our children need to be competitive at the collegiate level. Further cuts are a detriment to their education and will affect the property rates here in town. If the schools are not properly educating the children, people will not want to move to this town. Causing further decline in the enrollment and more houses sitting on the market without owners.

My husband works in Groton and I work in Windsor Locks. We have chosen to live in Colchester because of the services the school provide. However, if the school budgets continue to decline we will be forced to relocate to get better education for our children. The extra commute will not be worth it. We are already at the hairy edge of that decision and this may push us over.

I understand your job is to vote for what is best for town. Educating our youth and providing high standards for our schools is of the utmost importance. I urge you to consider my vote as you cast your vote on this matter.

Julie Reiss

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Rachel <rachelblakley@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:56 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Education Budget

Hi,

I would like the opportunity to vote on the budget before it any additional cuts are decided on. It was my understanding it was going to vote at \$250,000.00. I have found out this may not be the case. I don't believe our town can afford anymore cuts if we want to remain competitive for our children's future.

Sincerely ,  
Rachel Blakley

---

From: Jo-Ann <jpholmes32@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:26 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Roberta Lepore; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio  
Subject: Send the \$250,000 to vote

Dear Board of Finance Members,  
As a supporter of the Education budget, I am disappointed that there was no vote to send the budget to referendum as planned

on Tuesday night. To table it to another night, with no public announcement or advertisement, is disingenuous to this community.

It has been a long five months (as I know you all are aware). The community has come out in force, including students, and has been involved in endless meetings. The supporters of education refuse to be bullied and will not go away no matter what antics are played by some members of the board or the community.

The \$250,000 that was initially voted on should stay.

Thank you,

Jo-Ann Holmes  
5 Gary Ln  
Colchester

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Mike Egan <ctbridgeboy@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2017 9:25 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Re: Replyto: Budget tricks

Rob, you obviously put a lot of time into this position and have worked things out this that legally you are entitled to be an elected official in Colchester. But there is a reason for those rules in the first place. You spend half of your time in another State. The rules are that someone in another Town doesn't serve on these boards. It is not a question of the effort you put in or your legal residence. If your board cut services OR increase taxes board members should also be part of that shared sacrifice. Although I don't agree with the opinion, that is why alot of residents do not want a Town Manager in Colchester.

This is a tough year, and the issues with the State budget only make it more difficult. But I have issues with the way the process has gone. I have always respected you, but feel that the BOF has overstepped their authority and are micromanaging aspects of the Town and School that are beyond the boards charge. Thankfully the cuts that were previously endorsed in the budgets are those that will go for referendum before the public. Now the citizens of Colchester need to step up and pass this budget or deal with the consequences if it doesnt pass. My youngest is a senior but my step son Max is a freshman at Bacon. I want other families and kids in Town to have the same opportunities and experiences that my son's did. Thats it. Thats why i served and why I still work to support education in this Town.

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 6:23 AM  
To: Mike Egan  
Cc: Board of Finance Members; Ronald Goldstein; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Reply to: Budget tricks

Mike,

Let me start with your last line.

I am a Colchester resident. I am a Connecticut resident and file a Form CT-1040 - Connecticut Resident Tax Return.

Although I travel for business and family reasons, I have done so since before I was elected the first time in 2009 and spend more nights in Colchester than I do out of town. Although I can't attend meetings in person when out of town, I often phone in and conduct a considerable amount of research and analysis each week whether in town or not. I am in Florida this week, I

attended all three meetings by phone, have spent 10 to 15 hours researching other towns, communicating with legislators and answering citizen correspondence, including the last hour creating this response to your letter.

In the time I've been on Board of Finance, I have regularly averaged more 10- 15 hours per week on Town business even when I am not in Connecticut, and during budget season that number rises to 20 - 30 hours per week. I regularly attend 5 -6 Town meetings per month, being a regular attendee at Board of Selectman, Building Committee, Youth Services and C-3 as well as attending about 1/2 the BOE meetings. Add to that Tri-Board, subcommittee meetings. Since 2009, I have missed one Board of Finance meeting, in 2010 when my car broke down on the way to the meeting and of the over 250 other BOF meetings have attended less than 5% of the meetings by phone, all of them special meetings, as were this week's. I would gladly compare this record to any other Town board member, present or past, including yours.

There are many things I am not aware of at meetings. People from all sides, ask why I permit side comments from the citizens, including yourself. These faultfinders are often the people accused of the side comments. In a meeting I am focused on the people who currently have the floor so do not hear these comments and would not be able to hear the ones beyond the front of the room, anyway. I am unaware of who may be receiving texts. It is much easier for people in the audience to watch our actions than I can sitting next to the board members in the same line as me. Unless a Board member is speaking, my eyes are on other people in the room.

Starting with a Public Forum on January 4, we have had nearly 5 months of public budget discussion. In the last 3 months we have had 4 Public Hearings (2/28, 3/6, 5/3 and 5/23) and 5 Budget Workshops which had 14 periods of Public Discussion and 4 periods for Citizens Comments specific to the budget. We also received public comments relating to the budget during our regular meetings where we always have 2 period for citizens to comment. I would estimate that we had about 25 - 30 hours of public discussion spread over more than a dozen meetings. What other boards not only take comment, but answer questions and engage in discussion and debate with the attendees?

As Chairman, I set the agenda. After receiving comments and suggestions for many hours during the budget process, I felt that there had been many opportunities for citizen input, including 2 public hearings and a regular meeting primarily involving budget discussion. Including Tuesday night, I would estimate we probably took about 5 to 6 hours of comment in May alone. As the Chair, I felt we had received enough input and there did not appear to be new ideas coming forth, and it was now time for the Board to have discussion and vote. This was my decision, and realize that you disagree with it, but don't believe I or the Board is showing a lack of transparency at our May 23 and May 25 Special Meetings. If you have additional input or suggestions that the Board has not heard, please send them to us and we will review them and make them part of the public record.

Democratic government can sometimes be messy. When allowing free speech and open government things are often said that not everyone agrees with, and in today's world, often said and received without the respect that differences in opinion deserve. You and I do not think alike, but I have never thought of you as a radical. 5 people attending our meeting who think one way, have the same rights as the 100 thinking differently. With the voters being the final judge it would appear from past results, that those 5 represent the opinion of about the same number of voters as the other 100. Reaching a decision on the budgets is a compromise in an attempt for board to provide services to meet needs and wants of a very diverse population with their ability and desire to pay for them.

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

From: Mike Egan <ctbridgeboy@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:03 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Budget tricks

Dear Chairman,

How is it that you can make a vote in a public session after holding numerous hearings, forums, special and regular meetings only to hold a new vote with no public comment allowed? This is outrageous! Is this the transparency that has always been demanded by the voters in this town? No, it is the cowardly act of a board held hostage to small faction of nay sayers who

distort the facts and play to the fears of fellow citizens. This Board has shown no leadership and has shown itself incapable of performing the functions it is charged with. Members of your committee have bullied and intimidated employees that work for both the Town and School District to enact the drastic cuts they wish to invoke. That is NOT your charge, your charge is to set a budget that meets the needs of the Town and School that can be passed by the voters, not as determined by one of your radical members. We will pass a responsible budget. Then we will eventually vote all of this board out of office starting next November and I will not rest until that is done. And as chairman how is it that you won't take public comments at this meeting yet you allow one of your members to regularly receive text messages from his supporters in the back of the room? Perhaps serving on such an important board is a little over his head and maybe Colchester should have a BOF chairman who actually lives in Colchester.

Mike Egan  
10 Vicki Lane  
Colchester, CT

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2017 6:36 AM  
To: Monica Swyden  
Cc: Board of Finance Members; Ronald Goldstein; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Transparency

Monica,

This process is no different than past years.

The Board votes for the budgets that we will send to Public Hearing.

After soliciting opinion from those attending the Public Hearing, we again vote on the budgets based on the that input. In the 8 budgets I have been involved with, we did the first two the night of the Public Hearing and last 6 at at our regular meeting the night following the Public Hearing.

Because this year the rescheduled Public Hearing is being held on a week that BOF does not meet, we needed to use special meetings. The May 25 meeting has been on the revised budget calendar and I warned an additional meeting on Monday morning for Tuesday night as it appeared we might not have all members in attendance on Thursday. As it was immediately after a Public Hearing that interested citizens would be attending I was not concerned that the less than 36 hour notice would be a problem or seen as being sneaky.

In my eight years, the vote has not changed, but Ron tells me during the time he was on the board, it did at least once.

On Tuesday night, we did no vote or even discuss the school budget. The discussion and motions revolved around how much State revenue to assume in illustrating the mil rate and whether we should use fund balance to do the same.

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

From: Monica Swyden <yogachick@att.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 9:53 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; replore@colchester.gov  
Subject: Transparency

Dear Board of Finance,

You speak frequently about being "transparent." You use the word often and claim to aspire to it. Your current actions suggest exactly the opposite. "Sneaky" is more like it. By publicly voting to remove \$250,000 from the BOE and now considering rescinding that vote is the ultimate move in backdoor politics. The public is under the impression that this issue is at rest and unaware of all of these additional meetings and the possibility of a different action. Wearing down education supporters and forcing people to attend multiple meetings to say the same thing is ridiculous. Your memories are short and you find it convenient to keep your friends informed so that their comments are the loudest and most recent. This is not what democracy is about. The \$250,000 needs to stand.

Thank you,  
Monica Egan  
10 Vicki Lane

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Vincent Rose <vince@etapii.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 8:57 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; rgoldstein@colchesterct.org; Thomas Kane  
Cc: bbernier@colchesterct.org; mtomasi@colchesterct.org; rbesaw@colchesterct.org; dkennedy@colchesterct.org; mvoiland@colchesterct.org; mkoziol@colchesterct.org  
Subject: Letter to BOF re: BOE budget

To Board of Finance Chairman Tarlov, BOF Vice Chairman Kane and Board of Education Chairman Goldstein:

I have been at 90% of the budget meetings for the year starting in January. I've made every effort, despite a heavy schedule, to make every pivotal meeting but this additional meeting due to the inability of the BOF to come to a conclusion on Tuesday has left me unable to attend Thursday. Please do not interpret this as any decrease in my concern nor that of parents of other band members, or other activities for which we could not make other arrangements.

I would like to make a point that I have not heard made in the meetings that I have attended thus far which is the following:

Though I am a defiant defender of fully funding the education budget, I do not want to leave the impression that I am for raising taxes for its own sake. My family has two parents working full-time and every tax dollar removed from our budget affects us and we understand that it affects people on a fixed income even more.

I am all for seeking out waste and redundancy in the system and removing those to make our tax dollars go as far as possible. I have attended five months worth of meetings where I have listened and the other side has had full opportunity to try and convince me that there is waste or redundancy in our budgets. They have failed to prove their case.

I see a budget put forward which is unbelievably lean and where every additional cut drastically affects the quality of education, the morale of our teachers and students, and the ability for us to have a thriving community to attract new citizens, which is necessary to maintain and grow our tax base. I was, therefore, gravely concerned with the latter half of the conversation at Tuesday's BOF meeting.

Since January there has been a process to lay out a proposed education budget to put forth to referendum. After much review, this had more or less been settled with a \$250,000 cut to the BOE and a \$51,000 cut to the Town. This included lengthy meetings and discussions and feedback from hundreds of Colchester citizens with the expectation of level of services provided for the school district for next year. There were at least three meetings of line by line reviews of itemized budget entries and potential areas for cuts which were individually debated and spoken to by the public in attendance and the board members.

What I witnessed on Tuesday was shocking. I saw an attempt to sway that consensus budget proposal drastically by \$500,000 or more, in one foul swoop, depending on how you interpreted the comments from some members of the board of finance. To put

it frankly, in my mind such a drastic right turn at the 11th hour represents a bait and switch especially since this could've gone to referendum without any allowed comments from the public at large.

I understand that there are vast unknowns with respect to actions of the state. We will have to deal with those actions accordingly, if and when the time comes, but I respectfully request that the budget be put forward to referendum at consensus level consistent with the democratic process for the public to decide.

Sincerely,

Vincent Rose  
Concerned Citizen and Taxpayer  
161 Shadbush Drive Colchester CT.

---

From: Patricia Kozlowski <justbekoz@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 7:57 PM  
To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio  
Subject: Fwd: Budget

Dear BOF members,

As a citizen of Colchester I am asking to please give me and many, many other citizens of this town the opportunity to vote for the budget as is, without further cuts. The BOE has provided you with a budget that has been discussed meeting after meeting, over and over. So many parents, students, and townspeople have attended these meetings. You have heard both yes and no voters speak. PLEASE do the right thing and let the people of this town vote on it as is. See what happens. If it gets voted down THEN further cuts will be needed.

Please don't assume and discredit all the effort we have put in to get the voters of Colchester involved in this process. We deserve a chance to vote on it as is, despite the history of past budget voting patterns in this town. This might be the year things change.

Thank you for all your effort and hard work. I know it's not easy.

Hopeful,  
Patty Kozlowski

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Vanessa Prignano <vprignano@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 7:13 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Board of Education Budget

Dear Colchester Board of Finance Members:

The town of Colchester deserves the opportunity to vote on the Board of Education budget without further reductions - Please send it to referendum!

Thank you,

Vanessa Prignano

---

From: nyjets1163@aol.com <nyjets1163@aol.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 6:16 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; blepore@colchesterct.gov; Andrea Migliaccio; Stefani Lowe; Andreas Bisbikos  
Subject: BUDGET

To Mr. Tarlov, Mr. Kane, Ms. Lepore, Ms. Migliaccio, Ms. Lowe and Mr. Bisbikos,

I am demanding that you hear the voices of the multitude of citizens that came out often and early to dispute the cuts to our schools. The two sides will never agree. It is time to move to the referendum without any more cuts. We deserve the opportunity to vote on the budget presented by the Board of Ed, WITHOUT further reductions! Let the people decide! Time to stop the madness!

Sincerely,

Joseph Sullivan

---

From: Meaghan <meaghanerin@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 6:08 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Budget Process

Hello all,

I would like to express my confusion in the recent budget decisions.

If you make drastic cuts or revenue assumptions that result in cuts to the proposed budgets, then you are taking away the opportunity for town citizens to vote on those budgets. It is the responsibility of the town public to vote in the referendum and decide if they want to accept the proposed budgets or if they want them reduced. By making drastic cuts before sending them to referendum, you are making that decision for the citizens without allowing them to vote. It is not your responsibility to guess or predict what the voters are going to think. By cutting it before sending it to referendum, you are assuming the views of the voters and interfering with the democratic process. Please consider sending a budget to referendum without extreme cuts. Petitions with names of people who are going to vote no should have no value here-the referendum is when we will all have the opportunity to express our vote. If you decide before the referendum to make more reductions, you are not giving those in the town who want to support a fully funded budget the chance to vote yes.

Last week it was a 4-2 vote to cut \$250,000 from the proposed education budget. On Tuesday, after agreeing to assume you will need an additional \$1 million in revenue, you then discussed cutting more from the budget in order to compensate for that amount. Cutting \$500,000 more was discussed. This brings us back to our last meeting. You have not asked the Board of Ed for impact that would make.

You had this discussion after the presentation of the budgets at the public hearing. What was the point of the presentations if the budgets are changing once again? I thought the presentations were so that voters would understand what was being voted on at the Town Meeting. If you change the budgets again, will there be another town meeting? I am confused as to the purpose and the frequent voting. What was the wording of last week's vote? If I get a chance to listen to the audio tape, I will. Did you motion and vote to move the \$250,000 reduction to the public hearing or to town meeting? Has there ever been an additional vote to reduce the budget after the final public hearing? This seems sneaky and odd to me. If you need to make revenue

decisions, they should not be affecting the budget proposals that were just presented. The goal of those presentations was to make people aware of what they would be voting on at the town meeting, correct?

The meetings are getting more and more chaotic and hostile feeling. It's feeling like a very political game-where certain members are catering to certain groups of townspeople who are very vocal rather than trying to make the process fair to all voters. If the town disagrees with the current proposed budgets, they will have the chance to vote no at the referendum. If they cannot afford the increase, they will have the chance to vote no. If they disagree with the spending choices of the school, they will have the chance to vote no. The yes people should be given that same opportunity and be allowed to vote for a budget they support-before reductions make it a budget they no longer support.

Thank you for reading this and helping me understand this process.

Please try to make this process as fair and democratic to all town citizens.

Meaghan Kehogreen

---

From: Val <valiesullivan@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 6:02 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: BOE budget

To the Board of Finance Chair and Board Members,

I am disheartened to learn that in spite of citizens and students attending multiple meetings in record numbers expressing their concern with BOE cuts, you are STILL having the discussion to cut even more! What more do we have to do?! Please show us that you were listening to us each and every time that we turned out to say NO MORE CUTS! It is time to let the people decide in the voting booth, with the budget that was put forth by the Board of Education! Please hear us once again! NO MORE CUTS!

Sincerely concerned,

Val Sullivan

---

From: Kaitlyn Hogan <khogan@colchesterct.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 5:57 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Education budget vote YES

Hello,

I am writing to ask that we the citizens in the Town of Colchester receive an opportunity to vote yes on the proposed education budget without further cuts. Without this opportunity, those in support of the education in our town will be forced to vote yes on a budget we don't agree with.

Please give us the chance to pass this higher number before reductions. The no voters will vote no either way, and their opinion will show in the results.

Thank you for your time,  
Kaitlyn Hogan

Sent from my iPhone



--

Please be aware that email communication can be intercepted in transmission or misdirected. Please communicate sensitive information by telephone or in person.

---

From: MICHAEL MCCUNE <mccunel@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 5:43 PM  
To: Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos  
Subject: budget vote

I am writing this email asking that you send the \$250,000.00 reduction to a vote. I agree that the people in town should have the choice to vote on an education budget that is adequately funded. Then, if it is voted down reduce the budget further. However, if the budget is cut by 1 million dollars, we are not given the choice to fund our schools adequately. I truly feel as though the cuts that have been occurring in the past several years have truly decimated our schools. My son, who is in the 7th grade, has classes that average between 27 and 30 students. He has lost critical instruction time in language arts making it difficult for the teachers to cover the required curriculum. The rooms are overcrowded and reach uncomfortable levels in the heat with so many students crammed into the classrooms. Not to mention the effects of the large class sizes on his education. The high school math teacher recently spoke of class sizes of 28 students for her neediest math students. We are now looking at cutting math positions further at the high school. I moved to town in part due to the outstanding school system. I have seen what the cuts have done to our schools and we are even looking into cutting world languages from our middle school. Other schools offer languages beginning in the elementary grades. I truly believe we as a community need to educate our students and provide them with the education necessary for them to be college and career ready. This can only occur if we fully fund our schools. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter and considering keeping the 250,000 in cuts.

Lynne McCune

---

From: Laurie Lindsey <laurilind@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 5:32 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: 2017 budget

I would like to express my opinion that the discussion of the BOE budget end and that the figure for the BOE budget agreed upon at the May 17th BOF meeting not be changed.

The BOF meetings are not where the budget gets approved or not approved. You should allow the people of this town to vote on what you agreed upon. More people than in any year have attended BOE and BOF meetings to voice their opinion in favor of the presented BOE budget, but you seem to be ignoring those voices.

It is not your responsibility to make a decision for the voter. Your responsibility is to put forth a budget that the townspeople say they will support. Every time you reduce the budget before it goes to vote, you diminish my voice as a voter.

You cannot predict what Hartford is going to do or what the voters are going to do. You already stated at the May 17th meeting that if there is a dramatic change from Hartford, then it is back to the drawing board on this budget. That is a wise approach.

Thank you for your service to our town.

Laurie Lindsey

---

From: Dawn Newton <dksnewton@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:51 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Budget

Hello BOF Member

I have heard that there could be a potential \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 as an additional possible cut from the BOE budget. This is extremely concerning to me and my family as well as many other families I know in town.

My family moved to Colchester in 1999 as we had seen Colchester as a great place to raise kids as the education was good and it was a town that was growing.

Sadly over the past several years all my children, who are now in high school and middle school, get budget wise are cut programs, less teachers, bigger class sizes.

My daughters current math class at the middle school is so full that students actually have to sit at the teachers desk. This is not a positive learning environment.

We can not cut anything more at all from our towns education budget. We can not cut sports either to try to fill in the gap.

We need to invest in our children be it at the high school age all the way down to pre-K.

If anything the Education budget should be increased. Colchester needs to invest in its future residents.

Unfortunately what I see are families moving out of Colchester and moving to towns that are investing in their future generations.

If our town keeps cutting budgets we may be another property with a for sale sign.

The education budget needs to go through now, its already cut enough.

Thank you,  
Dawn Newton

---

From: Dina Graham <dgraham035@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:33 PM  
To: Andrea Migliaccio; Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Budget- NO more reductions please!

Good afternoon,

I am writing to request the opportunity for the voters to vote on the BOE budget without any further reductions. I am not, at all, in favor of any more reductions to the BOE budget and feel it will decimate our school system-especially Bacon Academy.

Please....NO more reductions!!! Please send the budget to referendum and let the voters decide!!

Thank you for your time,

Dina Graham  
Parent of:

Abby-Junior  
Tyler- 8th grade  
Kaitlyn-6th grade

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:03 PM  
To: Joy Tyler  
Cc: rgoldstein@colchesterct.org; Thomas Kane; Stefani Lowe; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Andrea Migliaccio; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Additional Proposed Cuts

Joy,

Although I attended the meeting by phone, and didn't catch everything, I do not believe there was any discussion or mention last night on those numbers being further reductions in the school budget. We never got as far as discussing the school budget as we discussed the amount of State revenue cuts we would assume in illustrating the mil rate and whether we would use unassigned fund balance in the budget, before adjourning the meeting to another meeting tomorrow night at 7:30.

1,000,000 was the motion for the amount of State revenue reductions we would assume and 500,000 was a motion for the amount of fund balance we would use. The first passed 4-2 and the second failed 3 -3, although we had further discussion later in the meeting on both. Neither of these motions was related to the expenditure budgets.

A motion was made to approve the Town budget as voted on last week, but the motion did not get a second.

Tomorrow night we will continue discussion on the revenue assumption and the use of fund balance and also likely take action on the BOE and Town expenditure budgets.

Rob

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

From: Joy Tyler <jttyler2@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 3:32 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Cc: rgoldstein@colchesterct.org  
Subject: Additional Proposed Cuts

I was quite upset to learn this morning that the BOF is now considering asking for a \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 cut to the Board of Education Budget. I was unable to attend last night's meeting as our son plays lacrosse for Bacon Academy and they were in the ECC semi-finals at Montville High School. This news directly impacts me as the parent of 3 children in the CPS system.

When we moved to town from out of state 12 years ago we had three children aged 6-1. We were moving from an area with one of the best public education systems in the country. The quality of the education system was a primary decision factor after considering properties in several area towns, just as it will be for families with young children in the coming years as Connecticut faces a declining population. Currently we have 3 children in the Colchester Public School system. I am a very strong proponent of public schools having grown up in a rural area myself that faced difficult school funding issues and having struggled in my adjustment to college because of an inferior education at the high school level.

Should the BOF ask the BOE for this type of deep cut to their proposed budget I feel we as a family will have to consider other educational alternatives for our younger two children, either in the form of a magnet school or a parochial school. In talking to other parents in town I know we will not be alone in looking for alternatives. Unfortunately, the students graduating from Bacon have to compete with students from towns with well-funded school systems and colleges want to see students that are

well-rounded with sports and club participation a crucial part of that. Aside from that very practical consideration is the fact that students want to go to school where they can play the sports they are interested in. My older son has applied and learned many leadership skills while playing sports in high school. His younger siblings should have that same opportunity. Having traveled to the other ECC Schools for the past 4 years I can say that Bacon Academy already has sub-par athletic facilities relatively speaking and I know multiple families that have relocated from our school district to the East Lyme School district for their athletic programs. Expect that to be a trend that continues if these cuts are made.

Respectfully submitted, Joy Tyler

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:14 PM  
To: Donna Krystofik  
Cc: Robert Tarlov; Ronald Goldstein; Art Shilosky  
Subject: Re: Please - No automatic cuts - let us VOTE !

Donna

Although I attended the meeting by phone, and didn't catch everything, I do not believe there was any discussion or mention last night on those numbers being further reductions in the school budget. We never got as far as discussing the school budget as we discussed the amount of State revenue cuts we would assume in illustrating the mil rate and whether we would use unassigned fund balance in the budget, before adjourning the meeting to another meeting tomorrow night at 7:30.

1,000,000 was the motion for the amount of State revenue reductions we would assume and 500,000 was a motion for the amount of fund balance we would use. The first passed 4-2 and the second failed 3 -3, although we had further discussion later in the meeting on both. Neither of these motions was related to the expenditure budgets.

A motion was made to approve the Town budget as voted on last week, but the motion did not get a second.

Tomorrow night we will continue discussion on the revenue assumption and the use of fund balance and also likely take action on the BOE and Town expenditure budgets.

Rob

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

From: Donna Krystofik <dkrystofik@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 1:00 PM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andrea Migliaccio; Andreas Bisbikos; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: Please - No automatic cuts - let us VOTE !

Please do not approve automatically cutting 500k- 1M from the budget without a vote! We want to VOTE ! Please let us VOTE !

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: Marlene Blumberger <marleneblumberger@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 11:23 AM

To: Thomas Kane; Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; replore@colchester.gov  
Subject: Budget

Dear Board of Finance Members,

I am writing to support the education budget with no more cuts. It is crucial to let the voters get this passed to support of town's education.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,  
Marlene Blumberger

---

From: Laura <lasoko2017@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:23 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: Budget and Referendum

Dear Mr. Tarlov and other members of the Board of Finance,

I have been fairly vocal in my opinion on the budget at past meetings but I felt I needed to contact you again before the decision is made.

As a student at Bacon Academy I have greatly benefited from the quality of education in our schools, yet I also see how on a daily basis the schools currently operate on an incredibly lean budget. The fact that we are teetering on the edge of these massive cuts threatens education in our town. Our schools are keystones of our community, they are the reason that many young families choose to move to and stay in town. If we cut the budget and lessen the appeal of our schools then we risk losing those families. We also risk losing the Norwich tuition money if the students no longer wish to attend Bacon.

We deserve to vote for a budget without detrimental cuts on June 13. The community has come out in support many times over the months. I understand that 140 people have petitioned for a zero increase budget, but at meetings they have still been the minority. And there are many others who wish to share their support of the Superintendent's Budget with you, it's just that these members of the community tend to be the most involved in the activities you are debating whether to cut. They are parents who drive their kids to games, help them with homework, attend endless functions. This is the start of spring sports after all, please take this into consideration.

Let the community decide whether to pass the budget at referendum: the cuts from the state will not be in on time in any case and as you pointed out last night, if you aim high or stay low with preemptive cuts, either way you will get it wrong. Before determining what you believe the community will do, see what they do and how they react.

Thank you,  
Laura Sokoloski

---

From: Kelly Hahn <abn218@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:21 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov  
Subject: BOE budget

Dear Mr. Tarlov,

I am asking for the chance to vote on the proposed BOE budget with only the \$250,000 being cut. I would love to see the budget not be cut at all but I understand the art of compromise. Please let Colchester citizens vote, all of us.

Respectfully,  
Kelly Hahn  
Homeowner and tax payer since 1998

Sent from my iPhone

---

From: LSH <lsh.hahn@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 10:19 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe; Thomas Kane  
Subject: Please Let the Citizens Decide the Future of our Town

Please do not make any more cuts to the education budget. Please move it forward as is to referendum. The Taxpayers of Colchester have the right to decide the future of our schools and our town.

Luther Hahn  
Resident and TaxPayer of Colchester since 1998

---

From: Robert Tarlov  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 4:34 PM  
To: Lynette Dimock  
Subject: Re: letter concerning BOE budget

Lynette,

Thanks for writing and thanks for all the meetings you have attended, this year and in the past.

Personally, I agree.

I stated this at the last meeting after Tom Kane said the same, and have stated the same in the past when BOF has either passed the budget on to the taxpayers without change or with an increase. I also stated the same in my letter to M. Kehoegreen earlier this month

*"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. "*

Although I realize other board members think differently, I think Tom Kane stated something last night that I have stated in the past. The First Selectman's budget is reviewed, with line item authority, by an elected board (BOF) and then sent to the voters. The Superintendent's budget is reviewed, with line item authority, by an elected board (BOE), and then reviewed without line item authority by another elected board (BOF) that has limited knowledge of how the spending correlates to the programs and services, and then it sends on to the voters. Why the extra step for the BOE budget?

The Charter requires our review but I have repeatedly stated that I believe the BOE budget should go to First Referendum with limited changes made by BOF, as too me, our changes are arbitrary as witnessed by our May 17th meeting when, our reduction

amounts were different, as well as the rationale for reaching them. Other members believe we have an obligation to reduce the budgets.

The current budget is not the budget I would select if I was the only one voting, nor is it for any of the other members. We each see things differently and the final result is a compromise we must make as we try to balance the needs and wants of a very diverse population with their ability and desire to pay for them.

I was on the phone for the meeting last night, so hard to catch everything said, but seemed to me the difference in opinion at this meeting was the amount of State revenue to assume and whether we should use fund balance as a revenue item. We never got to a discussion or voting on the school budget.

Tomorrow night we will continue our discussion on State Aid, Fund Balance and likely make a decision on the budgets to go to Town Meeting.

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

From: Lynette Dimock <slDIMOCK@sbcglobal.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 12:06 AM  
To: Robert Tarlov; Thomas Kane; Andreas Bisbikos; Andrea Migliaccio; Roberta Lepore; Stefani Lowe  
Subject: letter concerning BOE budget

Dear Board of Finance Chairperson and Members,

I am writing to respectfully request that you allow me to exercise my right as a taxpayer in the Town of Colchester by providing me the opportunity to vote on the budget proposed by the Board of Education in the amount of \$40,636,405.00. To say that I am disappointed in the outcome of the meeting on May 23, 2017, is an understatement. The uncertainty of the State of Connecticut's budget has not changed throughout the many discussions at the Board of Finance meetings. Regardless of the current newspaper headlines and reports from various representatives, the situation continues to remain unclear. It is not possible to know which prediction will be accurate. If it were, it would be considered a fact, not a prediction. To continue to guess how Colchester will be effected is futile. To suggest further budget reductions based on speculation is unfair to the voters.

The varied opinions about the BOE budget is a constant. Some support it, some do not. This is the reason for a town referendum. If all voters felt the same way, there would never be the need for a vote. A referendum provides ALL voters the opportunity to either support the budget or not.

Some of the members of the Board of Finance wish to further reduce the BOE budget despite the fact that at the meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup>, you made a decision as to the amount of the BOE budget. "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." I believe the minutes may be incorrect as to who seconded the motion, but, regardless, you were all given an opportunity to vote. Some of you got what you wanted, some of you did not. This is what happens in a democracy.

Now, it seems those of you that opposed the motion, want to revisit the issue. By doing this, you are not only undermining your own process, but your plan only provides *some* of the voters a true opportunity to vote. Let me explain it this way: I support the BOE budget as presented. However, you reduce it by \$500,000.00 or a \$1,000,000.00. With these reductions, I don't support it. What options do I now have? If I vote yes, I am voting for a budget I don't support and one that I believe is detrimental to our town. But, if I vote no, and the budget doesn't pass, you will reduce the budget even further, which I do not support. Neither a yes nor a no vote will produce the outcome I desire. Do you see how you have essentially taken away my right to vote?

Now, let's look at the other side. A taxpayer does not support the BOE budget as presented. This budget gets sent to referendum. They vote no, which shows they don't support it. If enough of the taxpayers vote no, the budget does not pass and you will make further reductions, which they support. They were given the opportunity to vote and produce the outcome they desired.

You owe me, and every other voter who supports the budget, the same opportunity as those that do not support the budget. We deserve the chance to vote to produce the outcome we desire. I do not want the six of you to make the decisions for the voters in this town. That is our right. I am not afraid to allow democracy to produce an outcome. If there are not enough people to support the presented budget, as some of you believe, then it will not pass at referendum. I may not get the outcome I desire, but, I deserve the chance to vote on it.

Thank you,

Lynette Dimock

---

From: Adams, Debra <Debra.Adams@cga.ct.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 22, 2017 2:10 PM

To: Robert Tarlov

Subject: RE: ECS and the State Budget

Dear Rob,

Thank you for your email. I will be sure Sen. Linares sees it when he returns to the office.

You may be interested in the Republicans' alternate budget proposal with an updated ECS formula. The third document (summary) explains how they propose to calculate funding for towns. The last document has updated numbers for the previous three, due to newly released deficit projections.

Best wishes,

Debby Adams

Debra L. Adams  
Legislative Aide to Senator Art Linares  
Legislative Office Building  
Room 3400  
Hartford, CT 06106  
860-240-8800  
[debra.adams@cga.ct.gov](mailto:debra.adams@cga.ct.gov)

**From:** Robert Tarlov [mailto:BOFChair@colchesterct.gov]

**Sent:** Sunday, May 21, 2017 5:59 AM

**To:** Rep. Ziobron, Melissa; Rep. Orange, Linda; Sen. Linares, Art

**Cc:** Board of Finance Members; Art Shilosky; Ronald Goldstein

**Subject:** ECS and the State Budget

Art, Melissa, Linda,

It appears to me that the ECS formula is being used as a political pawn in the governor's budget strategy and personal financial agenda in bailing out fiscally irresponsible cities.

The formula is underfunded and the perception is that it has had years of short term, politically motivated, tinkering with the formula to benefit certain cities and towns.



The Governor's original ECS proposal did not show a positive impact in solving the State's fiscal woes, so why are the allocation changes being proposed with little notice and analysis during a critical budget season? Total distraction.

I have not seen the latest proposals for reallocation to be put forth by the Republicans or the Democrats, but the Governor's latest includes a \$3,000,000 net ECS hit to Colchester, up since his February proposal, possibly because he has now proposed increasing the State's underfunding of ECS.

Last year Colchester taxpayers voted NO on a 0.25% school budget increase, so unlikely they will support a \$3,000,000 tax increase to replace this funding, so we will have to reduce spending for our schools.

To reallocate dollars currently intended and restricted to education to cities that are not required to use those dollars for education will result in less State dollars being spent for education at a time we should be maintaining or increasing that investment. Colchester school administration calculates they will have to release 64 people to make up the shortfall. What is that impact on education? What is the impact on State income and sales tax revenues when other towns have to similarly layoff people due to ECS reductions?

Cities like Hartford will not be using the dollars to improve education nor hire new people, but to pay for their overspending of the past. To me, the Governor is using the judge's decision on ECS reallocation as cover to bail out Hartford and other cities who have not managed their finances. Using dollars needed for Education in Connecticut towns to bail out other cities, is not the right solution. I also believe that without solving the underlying causes of these pending bankruptcies, this will be a waste of taxpayer's dollars.

I don't think my tax dollars should bail out another city and, should the State be using any Connecticut taxpayers' dollars to bail Hartford out when Connecticut may not be that many years from bankruptcy, too?

If Hartford needs to be bailed out, this should come from some other sources. Education dollars should not be used. Any reallocation of ECS money should be used for Education. ECS is not Extra Cost Sharing.

I realize that a judge's order requires the State to revamp their formula, but I am sure his intent was not a solution that balanced the scales by reducing the education spending in 130 towns, and not necessarily increasing it in the towns getting the money. Was the judge's decision based on his opinion that the current ECS formula, which I believe was a result of a Supreme Court decision, is inequitable, or based on his opinion that the State's failure to follow their formula created the inequity. I understand why some towns are over 100%. I don't agree with the past "hold harmless" decisions, but at least I understand them. I don't understand how the towns under 100% range from less than 50% to 100%. Were these the results of years of formula tinkering? Were the selective formula adjustments politically based? Financially based? Economically based?

In addition, there were required actions in the judge's decision other than funding. How many of them have been implemented or are in the course of being so. Even if the ECS reallocations were restricted to education, spending more money in cities where the education systems are failing without other changes will bring the overall State's results down as the more successful towns must reduce their spending due to their reductions in ECS.

While the judge's decision required a solution within 180 days, was that the time limit for the presentation of a plan, or the implementation of a plan? I know this date has been delayed pending an appeal, but 6 months to create and implement a solution is totally unrealistic. Even if it had been possible for the State, how do towns plan for these changes with no lead time?

As in many things the State has done, they have seriously underfunded their own ECS formula, currently at less than 80%. Colchester is slightly above 90%, so underfunded based on the formula, and overfunded based on the State's funding level of that formula. If the formula at the current funding level was applied to bring us down to State's funding level of 80%, we would lose less than 1/2 of the net amount the Governor is currently proposing. So where is the other half of the money going? We are 117 on the Governor's wealth scale, almost in the bottom quartile at 73%, hardly coming in as one of the "haves". Although ECS has increased over the years, not as much as the school budgets, where the inflation costs and the rising costs of the State unfunded mandates, have exceeded the ECS increases. In Colchester, the State has been decreasing their share in covering the local costs of education for many years.

If a reallocation in funding is required, it should be decided outside the budget process and its implementation deferred and spread out over several years. This would give towns an opportunity to plan for the changes. The State's action to use ECS as a political pawn has devastated current municipal planning.

Other than moving current ECS funding toward where it should be based on the State's own formula, I urge you to remove the ECS reallocation from the current budget discussion. With all the urgent fiscal problems needing to be solved, this is a large distraction and does not work towards solving the State's fiscal crisis and puts the majority of Connecticut towns in financial turmoil.

To me these are the same tactics used with unfunded mandates. Pass them and let the towns figure out how to pay for them. Here the town's ECS money is being used to fund the legislature's and Governor's desire to bail out the cities. Rather than Colchester having to lay off 64 teachers and other classified personnel due to ECS cuts to help save other cities, the Capital should be laying off State workers and using those dollars to bail out Hartford and other cities.

Over the last 7 years, when Connecticut has been at the bottom of the US states in economic health, Colchester, not a wealthy town by the Governor's measurement, has through the sacrifice of our citizens, steadily improved our fiscal health by increasing our unassigned fund balance, increasing our capital reserves and lowering our debt. Now due to the fiscal mismanagement of the State, Hartford, and other cities, we are expected to throw that sacrifice and hard work away to bail them out for not having the same fiscal discipline as Colchester and other local municipalities.

Pay for the State's objectives and solve the State's problems at the State level, not at the town level, and most importantly, solve the ECS reallocation problem outside the budget process. Except for eliminating the need for the Legislature to find dollars to bail out cities, ECS reallocation in itself is revenue neutral and should not be a State budget issue and, those dollars should only be used the education.

Robert Tarlov  
Colchester, CT 06415  
860-608-4293

Prioritize (A, B, C) (1, 2, 3)		2017 - 2018 BOF Objectives and Initiatives - June 7, 2017	NEXT STEP	NEXT DATE	
A		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review Board of Finance and Board of Finance Members Purpose, Responsibilities, Limits of Authority, Meetings, FOI</li> </ul>		2017	June
A		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How the Town and BOE are using grants</li> </ul>	Andreas to present results of the information received from the FOI requests.		
A	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health Insurance Funding               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revise formula to minimize year to year volatility</li> <li>Create policy - no official funding policy has been adopted.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Maggie/Lockton to present analysis of ideas as to how they will impact next year's funding & future hypothetical trends (was scheduled		
A	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BYLAWS REVIEW</li> </ul>	DONE: October 2016	2017	Dec
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fire Department Strategic Plan Implementation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans for Retention?                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hybrid Department vs Full time ?</li> </ul> </li> <li>Plans to Increase Call Response ?                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hybrid Department vs Full time ?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>			
A	4	<p>Create a policy for funding from operating budget to maintain Unassigned/Undesignated fund balance %? At this point we create by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>luck and in the past there was some loose budgeting on some items. Current interest rates are of no help in having fund balance keep pace with budget increases.</li> </ul>			
B		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continued study of reorganization of Town Hall</li> </ul>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ENERGY PROJECT - Using what we save above lease payments - absorb into operating budgets or capital projects?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create policy as to what lease payments will be used for when they expire in XX/XX/20XX.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Nov	2017
A	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BUILDING REPAIR/MAINTENANCE/REPLACEMENT</li> </ul>	11/18/2015 - Jim P and Ken Jackson presented updated plan	2017	Jan
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a Funding Plan for the Schools and Town Buildings Plans</li> <li>Determine annual funding amounts over the <u>next 5 years</u></li> </ul>	Added to the Reserve Plan		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update Current Equipment Reserve Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heavy Apparatus - it was proposed we factor in as lease purchases (fire engines, ambulances, etc)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Maggie to present updated plan on 1/20/2016	2017	Jan
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AMBULANCE               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review net costs of Services</li> <li>Review annual report for the Ambulance Incentive Program</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Include in Fire Department Budget Presentation	9-Jul	Feb
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication during off budget season. - continue work done on communicating, Informing and Educating the Voter during the upcoming year.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How do we want to communicate?                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informational Meetings?</li> <li>Web Site</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Tom to work on communication pieces for revaluation, mil rates, grandlist, etc.  Links on Art's Weekly Update to new budget communications.		

Prioritize		2017 - 2018 BOF Objectives and Initiatives - June 7, 2017	NEXT STEP	NEXT DATE
(A, B, C)	(1, 2, 3)			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Facebook</li> <li>o TriBoard Discussions</li> <li>o</li> <li>o What do we want to communicate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Declining Enrollment, per pupil spending, test results - Graphs forward to BOE</li> <li>o</li> <li>▪ Fund Balance Policy and History <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (We had a piece previously approved by Board - changes recommended by Maggie were approved)</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Budget and Tax Rate History <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Revaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Unexpended BOE Fund Balances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Graph forwarded to BOE</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Department Fundraising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ People Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Have official document explain benefits package in contracts</li> <li>o STEPS: what are they?</li> <li>o STEPS: a document stating # staff get contractual increases by increase range 1-2%, 3-5%, 6% and higher</li> <li>o</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ List of grants that we have received</li> <li>▪</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Web Page - perpetual page to communicate fiscal information to the taxpayers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Determine how to communicate/what to post <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Charts, Graphs</li> <li>o</li> <li>o</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	opengov.com will present on 11/02/2016 cleargov.com	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Facebook Page <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How do we want to use? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Post information and/or Direct People to Web Site where information will be posted?</li> <li>▪ Allow people to ask questions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Can questions be posted anonymously?</li> <li>o Can questions be submitted through page, without posting, and then post questions and answers?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>▪</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Prioritize		2017 - 2018 BOF Objectives and Initiatives - June 7, 2017	NEXT STEP	NEXT DATE	
(A, B, C)	(1, 2, 3)				
A	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Season Communications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Graphs and a Budget in Brief <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Review BOF graphs and new ones created on 6/24 by Town staff</li> <li>§ Choose relevant graphs: how to best create relevant and objective graphs to be included in a "Budget in Brief"</li> <li>§ Create Budgets in Brief that are similar for BOE and Town</li> <li>§ Having Budget document showing headcount trends for Town and BoE.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	On the web site: full budget, abbreviate budget with just the department total pages and Stan's presentation from 3/31 and tax impact chart.		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SURVEY</li> </ul>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Town budget - 2016 - 2017 process - repeat for 2017-2018? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach to budget - present the cost of those items that are ongoing items to determine the cost of maintaining current services</li> <li>• Have departments prioritize new initiatives and assign cost/benefit to each separate from the above. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Department Review to Begin Review with BOF in October</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Connecting the continuing current services with a dollar amount and % increase. There was a lot of confusion what "maintaining" services actually meant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ New initiatives" calculated separately to see impact on the mil rate. This would also produce the impact on the mill rate if current services were continued (maintained)</li> <li>§ Also if spending were the same as last year, what would mil rate be?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Agreed		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SNOW REMOVAL budget plan: Jim P presented at 10/21 meeting -</li> </ul>	New Policy Created February, 2016		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MISSION STATEMENT - expectations of public, web page</li> </ul>	DONE		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOE: 3 - 5 year plan to adjust to declining enrollment. reviewed at 8/19/2015 meeting - did not address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Should the capital needs of the schools be removed from the BOE budget - discussed with BOE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ The actual building projects are a Town expense, the ongoing maintenance is not.</li> <li>§ The BOE when faced with a decision of capital vs operation has always deferred the capital and maintenance</li> <li>§ BOE cannot do capital planning (funding) beyond the current year.</li> <li>§ Having capital maintenance within the BOE budget removes BOF ability to plan and make these decisions</li> <li>§ The Town has transfers and capital outside the operational budget, BOE does not.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	reviewed w/ Ron and Jeff at BOF meeting  BOE stated they will handle in their budget.		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BOE - do we want to communicate expectations of what we would like to see the budget accomplish?</li> </ul>	done on November 18		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police and 24/7 - Other alternatives - Resident Trooper Program - Rob and Stan met with the Police Commission (July 2015) and communicated that in these times of tight budgets, that the Town could not take on this type of expense without definitive data that would justify the cost.</li> </ul>	Police determined they could accomplish 24/5 within the current budget.		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a policy for approving use of reserve accounts</li> </ul>	DONE		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health Insurance Funding – establish a new policy for calculating annual funding and reserve requirements.</li> </ul>	DONE		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize an agreement with BOS/First Selectman for approving expenditures that require line item transfers before the money is actually spent?</li> </ul>	DONE		

Prioritize		2017 - 2018 BOF Objectives and Initiatives - June 7, 2017	NEXT STEP	NEXT DATE
(A, B, C)	(1, 2, 3)			
A	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Season Communications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Graphs and a Budget in Brief <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Review BOF graphs and new ones created on 6/24 by Town staff</li> <li>§ Choose relevant graphs: how to best create relevant and objective graphs to be included in a "Budget in Brief"</li> <li>§ Create Budgets in Brief that are similar for BOE and Town</li> <li>§ Having Budget document showing headcount trends for Town and BoE.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	On the web site: full budget, abbreviate budget with just the department total pages and Stan's presentation from 3/31 and tax impact chart.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SURVEY</li> </ul>		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Direction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Town budget - 2016 - 2017 process - repeat for 2017-2018? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach to budget - present the cost of those items that are ongoing items to determine the cost of maintaining current services.</li> <li>• Have departments prioritize new initiatives and assign cost/benefit to each separate from the above. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Department Review to Begin Review with BOF in October</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Connecting the continuing current services with a dollar amount and % increase. There was a lot of confusion what "maintaining" services actually meant. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ New initiatives" calculated separately to see impact on the mil rate. This would also produce the impact on the mill rate if current services were continued (maintained)</li> <li>§ Also if spending were the same as last year, what would mil rate be?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Agreed	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SNOW REMOVAL budget plan: Jim P presented at 10/21 meeting -</li> </ul>	New Policy Created February, 2016	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MISSION STATEMENT - expectations of public, web page</li> </ul>	DONE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BOE: 3 - 5 year plan to adjust to declining enrollment. reviewed at 8/19/2015 meeting - did not address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Should the capital needs of the schools be removed from the BOE budget - discussed with BOE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ The actual building projects are a Town expense, the ongoing maintenance is not.</li> <li>§ The BOE when faced with a decision of capital vs operation has always deferred the capital and maintenance</li> <li>§ BOE cannot do capital planning (funding) beyond the current year.</li> <li>§ Having capital maintenance within the BOE budget removes BOF ability to plan and make these decisions</li> <li>§ The Town has transfers and capital outside the operational budget, BOE does not.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	reviewed w/ Ron and Jeff at BOF meeting  BOE stated they will handle in their budget.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ BOE - do we want to communicate expectations of what we would like to see the budget accomplish?</li> </ul>	done on November 18	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police and 24/7 - Other alternatives - Resident Trooper Program - Rob and Stan met with the Police Commission (July 2015) and communicated that in these times of tight budgets, that the Town could not take on this type of expense without definitive data that would justify the cost.</li> </ul>	Police determined they could accomplish 24/5 within the current budget.	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a policy for approving use of reserve accounts</li> </ul>	DONE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health Insurance Funding – establish a new policy for calculating annual funding and reserve requirements.</li> </ul>	DONE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize an agreement with BOS/First Selectman for approving expenditures that require line item transfers before the money is actually spent?</li> </ul>	DONE	

