

First Selectman

From: DeAva Lambert <deava.lambert@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 2:46 AM
To: Andreas Bisbikos; Rosemary Coyle; Denise Turner; Jason LaChapelle; Deborah Bates
Subject: 05/18/23 BOS meeting

Dear Colchester Board of Selectmen,

I was away on the date of this meeting, but I just had the opportunity to watch the full meeting recording that was made available on Monday afternoon. I wish to bring some things to your attention regarding some occurrences at the meeting, not necessarily in the order of the agenda:

1. Rosemary, many, many times you have commented about following Robert's Rules of Order in conducting the BOS meetings. However, at the end of this meeting, you and Denise blatantly ignored those rules and improperly and usurpingly ended the meeting without a vote. From Robert's Rules of Order, Article III, #17:
 - o "The motion to adjourn, like every other motion, cannot be made except by a member who has the floor. When made by one who has not risen and addressed the chair and been recognized, it can be entertained only by general consent." Denise made the motion, but she did not have the floor, nor did she receive general consent. Andreas had the floor; Rosemary interrupted Andreas, and Denise interjected with the motion to adjourn, which Rosemary seconded without any consent to the motion having been given.
 - o "Before putting the motion to adjourn, the chair, in most organizations, should be sure that no important matters have been overlooked." After the improper motion was raised and seconded, Rosemary exclaimed **out of order** that the meeting was adjourned. Andreas responded, "We don't have to," inferring that Citizens Comments remained to be addressed on the agenda.
 - o Rosemary's response to that was, "Oh yes you do; motion to adjourn takes precedence." She improperly referred to the precedence of the motion to adjourn as stated Robert's Rules: "The privileged motion to adjourn takes precedence of all others [others being other motions], except the privileged motion "to fix the time to which to adjourn," to which it yields. It is not debatable, nor can it be amended or have any other subsidiary [12] motion applied to it; nor can a vote on it be reconsidered. It may be withdrawn." Andreas was not making a motion. Andreas was addressing the improper motion and bringing attention to matters overlooked (the remaining agenda item of Citizens comments).
 - o "If there are announcements to be made they should be attended to before **taking the vote**, or at least, before announcing it. If there is something requiring action before adjournment, the fact should be stated and the mover requested to withdraw his motion to adjourn. The fact that the motion to adjourn is undebatable does not prevent the assembly's being informed of business requiring attention before adjournment. Members should not leave their seats until the chair has declared the assembly adjourned." **A VOTE ON THE MOTION DID NOT OCCUR!!!** Rosemary impudently exclaimed after she seconded Denise's improper motion that the meeting was adjourned, which is the role of the chair, not a member, making Rosemary once again out of order. Then Rosemary, Denise, and Debbie just vacated the meeting. The proper thing would have been for Andreas to continue the meeting to address the remaining agenda item as agreed upon by the BOS members.
2. This was an appalling display. Denise, Rosemary, Debbie, and Andreas should all be ashamed, especially for your constant and flagrant disregard of proper procedure. **YOU'RE ALL OUT OF ORDER!**

3. I should be shocked, but I'm not, that the BOS members (not the First Selectman), especially the veteran ones, do not understand § C-1105a of the Colchester Town Charter that dictates the procedure for the Annual Budget Meeting, which is "for the purpose of considering the annual Combined Budget"; "At the Annual Budget Meeting, the Town Voters in attendance may reduce, but not increase, the Board of Selectmen Budget and/or the Board of Education Budget upon the passage of a proper motion(s)." The function of the meeting is for the Town Voters to vote on *motions* concerning the Board of Selectmen Budget and/or the Board of Education Budget. The Town Voters are either voting on a *motion* to send the budgets to the Annual Budget Referendum as approved by the BOS, or they are voting on a *motion* to reduce either budget as dictated in Paragraph C of this section, prior to voting on a motion to send them to referendum (unless the reduction exceeds the stated cap, in which case the Annual Meeting must be continued to a second meeting held no less than two business days following the first meeting as specified in Paragraph D of the Section). The Town Voters are not actually voting YES or NO on the Board of Selectmen Budget and/or the Board of Education Budget and neither budget "goes back" to the Boards of Finance and Education as Rosemary has misconstrued. That happens as a result of the Annual Budget Referendum. Andreas was absolutely correct in relaying Paragraph E of the Section, which states, "The Annual Budget Meeting [as so moved by the Town Voters] shall be automatically continued to the Annual Budget Referendum, at which the budgets of the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Education **as recommended** by the Annual Budget Meeting, shall be presented to the Town Voters for final approval or disapproval."

"This is a Democracy and not a Dictatorship" as Rosemary stated. Democracy includes conducting voting on town matters in accordance with the Town Charter, and misinterpreting the Town Charter by anticipating or promoting that Town Voters have the ability at the Annual Budget Meeting to vote down the budgets and send them back to the Boards, which they absolutely DO NOT, is a miscarriage of democracy!

4. It does not matter if the Attestation that the owner of EZ-AIR does not specify that his business must be in good standing because the ARPA application eligibility requirements do. Because the business was not in good standing at the time of the

application, it was not eligible for the grant as stated in the grant program document, just like the building he erected was not eligible for the permit he received to construct it (and that permit should have been revoked). It's not a compliance issue; it is an issue of ineligibility. It doesn't matter at all that the 3 layers of review missed that pertinent detail. Ineligible means not eligible regardless of who didn't do what or didn't know what. Therefore, the owner of EZ-AIR must be required to repay the grant money that he received in error. The owner is not required to attest that he meets the eligibility requirements as a caveat of the eligibility requirements being enforced. If you don't believe that, Jason, just ask Brett Favre, who had to return all the TANF grant money he received on behalf of Mississippi State because his business was ineligible to receive it. And that is a more apt analogy than the nonsensical one that Debbie put forth, "It's like if you got into a car accident and the police say that it was your fault, but you're saying, 'No it wasn't my fault,' the police is [*sic*] gonna give you a citation for the accident." (I fail to see the connection there).

I have previously commented on the complete ineptitude of certain the members of this Board, but most of you remain so arrogant and obtuse that you don't even attempt to improve your knowledge or understanding and just spend most of your time in these meetings posturing. Please, for the good of the town, if you continue to operate in this fatuous manner and have no further inclination to improve your knowledge, communication, or behavior, I implore you to not run again. This town needs more knowledgeable and effective people representing it.

I request that this correspondence be included in the meeting documents.

Sincerely,
DeAva Lambert

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

First Selectman

From: James Shuman <ellanpops@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 11:30 AM
To: First Selectman; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; Denise Turner
Subject: Send it back!

Dear Board of Selectmen-

I am writing this letter today to urge you to send the proposed education budget back to the BOE for further work. I request this for several reasons-

1- The Board of finance sent you a budget that they admittedly don't understand. The members of the BOF could not tell you the mill rate change with this budget. They could not even figure out how much of the BOE's budget they were cutting before sending through to you. It wasn't until the last second of the meeting that a number was thrown out, and it wasn't even the one that they were discussing for the past two meetings.

2- The republican majority of the BOF board can't even agree on it. Art abstained because he didn't feel comfortable voting for it. That needs to raise more than an eyebrow on your end. He is a town legend. He has dedicated his life to this town and he would not vote for this proposed budget. Let that sink in-

3- There is no support for this budget. Even your board members who called into the meetings continuously called the barebones budget crowd the "minority voice". There is a very strong and vocal part of this town that believes that this budget is not satisfactory and will vote no on if it is allowed to proceed to referendum.

4- Following up on point 3- if you really are "safeguarding" the town from spending too much money, perhaps you need to consider the cost of having multiple referendum votes. We are a strong voting block and will not be quiet and will vote it down.

5- I and many others who feel strongly about this promise that we will not vote for anyone that votes to put this budget through. It is an irresponsible budget that will have significant and long-lasting negative impacts on this town, the children of this town, and it will negatively impact ability to attract families that pay taxes to this town. While this might not mean much to you it does to me.

While I numbered these and put the ones that I thought YOU would find more compelling at the top of the list, the importance to me as a voter reads backwards.

I vote- every time

Jim Shuman

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

First Selectman

From: Michael Dubreuil <dubreuilm@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 2:00 PM
To: First Selectman; Jason LaChapelle; Deborah Bates; Denise Turner; Rosemary Coyle
Cc: BOE@colchesterct.org
Subject: Citizen Comment Tonight @ BOS

To the Board of Selectmen,

I will try to make citizen's comment tonight; however, I have a very important event to attend. Tonight is the JJIS Spring Concert, the band is led by the incredible Ms. Knickerbocker. For the past several months she has opened the doors to JJIS before school started to provide additional instruction to our children, including my son. This is the teacher whom the BOE threatened to cut if they didn't get their 10% increase. Needless to say, that move certainly stoked my passion this budget season.

Below is my citizen's comment, you may throw it in correspondence if you wish.

- Mike

Michael Dubreuil
Woodbine Road

For a decade student enrollment has declined and per student spending has increased faster than inflation. The Board of Education has refused to explain why. They refuse to answer questions on a lot of issues. This has created discontent in the community.

I have heard many parents speak passionately about support for the education budget and specific features like full-day kindergarten. We hear you and support you 100%. The problem is there is no community buy-in for the Board of Ed's top dollar number. This is because the administration is setting the budget priorities, not the citizens through our elected Board of Ed members.

Just today (May 18, 2023), the Board of Ed sent a letter to the community outright telling us they have surrendered the citizens power to the "administrative team" who prioritized reductions. That administrative team is not accountable to the citizens. They prioritized administrative bloat and threatened to take away full-day kindergarten!

We didn't elect these people, we didn't hire them, and we weren't invited to their coronation. The citizens need to take back OUR school system from the bureaucrats. A draft plan for that can be found in correspondence and I hope to work with all of you in achieving this.

In accordance with the town charter, the Board of Education and Board of Finance have completed their work. I humbly ask the Board of Selectmen to set a date for a town meeting.

Thank you.

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

First Selectman

From: Susan Adams <srsolom1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 3:33 PM
To: First Selectman; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; Denise Turner
Subject: Please read before meeting tonight

Importance: High

Dear Board of Selectpersons

I am writing to ask you to vote to send the budget back to the BOF as it is too low and not adequately meeting the needs of our children and schools.

The value of a quality education is the reason I moved to Colchester in the first place. Colchester is falling far behind the surrounding communities in their educational experiences. If we continue this trend and let our schools lose even more programs families will move away or never move into Colchester.

What are we lacking? Many nearby towns offer steam programs within the school day, Challenge and enrichment classes within the school day, language starting in grade 1 and up, as well as vibrant music education. These are all programs that have been cut or never implemented into Colchester schools. Having programs such as these attract new residents to their schools, growing their school and town population.

In today's educational landscape it has been proven that our children are in dire need of Social and Emotional Learning support. Many of our kids are in crisis, due to high anxiety, depression, and stress. The pandemic has brought the nation's attention to these needs. The possible reduction of a school counselor, a social worker, and support staff during this time of high needs for our students would be devastating. Our children need as much support as we can give them at home and at school. Having professionals available to assist our children when they are in need of emotional support is vital to their success in school and in life. It is essential we keep the counselors and social workers as support for our students when they need them.

In a world where our children are struggling with mental health concerns, shouldn't we as adults do everything possible to give them the tools that they need to cope with the modern world?

Please consider the health, well-being of both our children and the town of Colchester.

Push the budget back to the BOF as it is too low with the directive that they need to allow the BOE to create a budget that will adequately meet the needs of our children and schools. If you do this, then our children will have the tools that they need to flourish and attract new residents to our town.

Please consider the health, well-being of both our children and the town of Colchester. If you vote to allow this minimal budget through, you will doom our town to losing even more if its population and more of its tax revenue. Please take action on this important issue and vote to push the budget back to the BOF for being too low, do it for Colchester's well-being.

Sincerely,
Susie Adams
150 Oak Farm Drive

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

First Selectman

From: Michael Dubreuil <dubreuilm@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 21, 2023 2:18 PM
To: First Selectman; Jason LaChapelle; Deborah Bates; Denise Turner; Rosemary Coyle
Subject: Comments on the previous BOS Meeting

To the Board of Selectmen,
I'd like to express my disappointment with the previous meeting and how member's personal emotions were prioritized over the citizen's business.

I wish this email wasn't as partisan as it is; after all this is an email about procedure. Unfortunately, one particular political party is driven by emotion and incapable of civility. I believe Robert's Rules were violated and the citizens were deprived of a dialogue on the Town Meeting process.

I have always maintained that many Boards in this town do not follow Robert's Rules on adjournment. In practice in Colchester, at the conclusion of a meeting, a member motions to adjourn, another member seconds the motion and the meeting is adjourned. I don't believe this strictly follows Robert's Rules; however, if the agenda items are complete it's not a big deal. However, it's a totally different situation if the agenda items are not complete. After a member seconds the motion to adjourn a majority vote is REQUIRED to adjourn. As a chair, if you don't require a majority vote you're just allowing the minority party to throw a temper tantrum and disrupt the business of the citizens.

I am extremely concerned that the Democratic party has misled the citizens with the belief that at the town meeting the citizens can vote to send the Board of Education budget back for consideration of the Boards. This action is completely unsupported by the town charter.

At the end of the last BOS meeting Mr. Bisbikos and Mrs. Coyle were discussing this topic. I believe Mrs. Coyle was offering the opinion that the citizens "approve" the budget and send it forward to referendum, or backward to the boards. She offered no supporting facts that referenced the charter or state law. Then Mrs. Turner and Mrs. Coyle unanimously ended the meeting. This is unfortunate because it creates the appearance that this matter is unsettled; unequivocally it is settled, Mrs. Coyle is wrong, and she was just playing politics.

If Mrs. Coyle or Mrs. Turner believes the citizens can send a budget back; they need a legal opinion from the town attorneys that supports this. Since they chose to end the meeting instead of providing anything of substance that supports that opinion, I believe the DTC should pay for a legal opinion from the town attorney.

I will offer my analysis, starting backwards.

C-1105a. Annual Budget Meeting.

E. The Annual Budget Meeting shall be automatically continued to the Annual Budget Referendum, at which the budgets of the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Education as recommended by the Annual Budget Meeting, shall be presented to the Town Voters for final approval or disapproval.

The meeting is automatically continued to a referendum, "as recommended by the Annual Budget Meeting." Which implies the citizens at the Town Meeting will approve the budgets and send them forward to referendum. However, we need to review the procedures for the town meeting.

C-1105a. Annual Budget Meeting.

C. At the Annual Budget Meeting, the Town Voters in attendance may reduce, but not

increase, the Board of Selectmen Budget and/or the Board of Education Budget upon the passage of a proper motion(s) (as hereafter defined)...

The charter defines the allowable motions at the town meeting. The only valid motions are to decrease the proposed budgets. There is no valid motion that sends the budget backward in the process, or even forward to referendum. Any "citizen approval" of a budget is completely ceremonial and performative in nature. At the town meeting, there is no valid motion that supports Mrs. Coyle's position.

Due to passions and the citizens being misled by the Democratic party I believe there is a high probability for unruliness at the town meeting. The moderator must be able to control the meeting. In accordance with CGS 43 CA 297 Section 7-8, peace officers are required.

Thank you for your consideration,
Michael Dubreil
Woodbine Road

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

First Selectman

From: Ihor Rudko <irudko@rudko.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 21, 2023 9:41 PM
To: Denise Turner; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; First Selectman; Andrea Migliaccio; Mike Egan; Mike Hayes; Art Shilosky; John Thomas; Tim Vaillancourt
Subject: Colchester 2023 Proposed Budget

Dear BOF/BOS,

As a longtime resident of Colchester, and a senior citizen on a fixed income I am totally repulsed by your unmitigated disregard for the wellbeing of the citizens of this community. Our community is made up of roughly 45% of citizens that are 55 and over. This budget conveys how out of touch you are with the residents of this town.

Inflation has diminished our fixed incomes to a point where we have to make a choice between food and medical expenses. Each year for at least the last ten years I have witnessed, what can be best described, as a scene from one flew over the cuckoo's nest and it relates to both parties. But this year's budget shenanigans take the Oscar. Putting forth the LARGEST tax increase in Colchester history at a time of significant economic hardship is abhorrent, you all should be ashamed!

Ihor Rudko

Colchester Road

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

First Selectman

From: PAUL BUREAU <paul_bureau@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 7:06 AM
To: Denise Turner; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; First Selectman; Andrea Migliaccio; Mike Egan; Mike Hayes; Art Shilosky; John Thomas; Tim Vaillancourt
Subject: Public Statement on Budget

Dear Colchester BOF and BOS,

Inflation has skyrocketed, interest rates have jumped, and energy costs have risen with no relief in sight. Yet the Colchester Board of Education (BOE) brazenly approved a \$4.13 million increase, equivalent to a 9.83% increase in spending.

And the new Superintendent, on the job since January 2023, is already requesting a \$50,000 increase. Tone-deaf and out-of-touch only begin to describe these actions.

Snubbing their noses at the taxpayers, a sizable percentage who are on fixed incomes and who do not have the ability to increase their incomes, if ever there was a time to show fiscal restraint and respect for taxpayers while balancing the needs of our students, is now. But no, the BOE and the Superintendent attempted to hit a grand slam at the expense of taxpayers; simply despicable and unacceptable. Thanks in part to the Colchester Board of Finance, it voted to reduce the increase to 3.9% as reported by the Rivereast. It remains unclear to me if the revised budget was sufficiently reduced due to the absence of data to help clearly understand how our money is proposed to be spent. In stark contrast to the BOE ask, the town budget proposal is \$10,000 more than last year's budget.

Like our nation, Colchester government has a spending problem. The BOE proposal is one example and another high-profile example is the construction of a new senior center (much needed) at a cost yet to be determined but significantly more than the taxpayer approved cost not to exceed \$9.5 million. Not to exceed means no more than \$9.5 million, until apparently it doesn't. Look for the town to soon ask taxpayers at referendum to exceed the \$9.5 million 'cap' and build a facility that is oversized, too expensive, and located on a parcel of land that is challenging (costly) to develop.

Perhaps as equally significant, town government appears also to have credibility and transparency issues, at least with me. How can Colchester taxpayers have faith in future pronouncements from the BOE and the Superintendent, or the Senior Center Building Committee? I certainly do not. Fleecing taxpayers doesn't seem to be a concern of either of these entities and equally complicit on the senior center project are the BOF and BOS.

In your elected positions on the BOF and BOS, you are in positions which allow you to evaluate proposals from a broader perspective; to take into account the taxpayers who at the end of the day want to feel confident that their money is prudently spent. You have to weigh proposals of groups lobbying for a specific cause against the interests of all taxpayers. I urge each of you to ask the tough questions and demand no-nonsense answers of the special interest groups who propose to spend more of our money; to relentlessly obtain the necessary facts and data to help make wise decisions on how our money is to be spent.

This requires a commitment to all taxpayers of Colchester, and not to select bands of citizens who support a specific cause, a commitment I am confident all of you made during the last election cycle.

Let your actions support your words and do not relinquish to those who are simply the loudest or with whom you may identify politically. Fiscal responsibility is apolitical in a government that truly represents all of its citizens.

Respectfully submitted,
Paul Bureau
308 Stollman Road

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

First Selectman

From: Alyson Darvas <jewelrygirl68@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 7:17 AM
To: First Selectman; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; Denise Turner
Subject: Music for Colchester

As a 20 year resident of Colchester, in an effort to preserve the district band program, I urge you to send this budget back. My son is in the WJJMS band and chorus for the last 2 years and in Jack Jackter before that. It has been an wonderful enriching experience and losing it would be a disaster for these children and our community.

Our community thrives when our children are enriched with the culture that the arts provide. Making this for pay would take this away from a good many families that can't afford it and we lose qualified teachers as well.

In closing, This current budget can't adequately fund the needs of our children and schools.

Thank you,
Alyson Darvas

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

First Selectman

From: Erin C. Kaiser <ecurran313@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 18, 2023 9:00 AM
To: First Selectman; Rosemary Coyle; Deborah Bates; Jason LaChapelle; Denise Turner
Cc: Michael Kaiser
Subject: Re: proposed education budget 2023-2024

Dear Board of Selectmen,

My husband Michael and I are contacting you to express our dissatisfaction with the Board of Finance decision to push forward an education budget with upwards of 1.3 million dollars in reductions. Aside from the creative measures taken by both boards to fund one time expenses, the further reductions are catastrophic to our school system. We are losing staffing, class sizes are increasing, and building maintenance and safety are being compromised. There were several scenarios presented by the BOE to the BOF which would have had minimal impact to the taxpayers in Colchester. And yet the BOF pushed forward the harshest cuts with the largest impacts.

We implore you to send this education budget back to the BOF with additional funding reallocated back to the school system. It is clear that the BOF did not truly consider the will of the taxpayers, as the original budget was never even sent forward to you for consideration.

We are in FULL support of the original budget that Dan Sullivan and the BOE presented at 9.83%. Franky, we would be in full support of a 14% increase if it meant retaining programming and staff positions.

We MUST invest in our community, whether it is education or social services for our community members.

Respectfully,
Erin & Michael Kaiser

On Wed, May 3, 2023 at 4:16 PM Erin C. Kaiser <ecurran313@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Board of Selectmen,

My name is Erin Kaiser and I am both a resident of Colchester and an employee of the Board of Education. I am writing to you to express my dissatisfaction with the Board of Finance decision to push forward an education budget with upwards of 1.3 million dollars in reductions. Aside from the creative measures taken by both boards to fund one time expenses, the further reductions are catastrophic to our school system. There were several scenarios presented by the BOE to the BOF which would have had minimal impact to the taxpayers in Colchester. And yet the BOF pushed forward the harshest cuts with the largest impacts. I implore you to send this education budget back to the BOF with additional funding reallocated back to the school system. It is clear that the BOF did not truly consider the will of the taxpayers, as was indicated by their mockery of the citizens during their comments. Many of the BOF members were smirking and rolling their eyes during citizen comments, eating snacks as if at a movie, and passing notes back and forth between each other, including our first selectman. I am horrified and embarrassed at their insensitive behaviors towards community members.

I am in FULL support of the original budget that Dan Sullivan and the BOE presented at 9.83%. Franky, I would be in full support of a 14% increase if it meant retaining programming and staff positions.

We MUST invest in our community, whether it is education or social services for our community members.

Respectfully,

Erin Kaiser

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

May 17, 2023

Ron Silberman, citizen
Boretz Road
Colchester, CT

To the Colchester BoS, WPCA Members and citizens:

I feel the need to address some important facts that seem to be ignored.

The Water Dept has a large increase coming this year. The need for the WPCA to become involved is more evident now than ever. There are several large drivers of the increase;

- An unreasonable burden of reimbursable salaries of Town employees. 50% of the Public Works Director's salary, 50% of the Public Works Administrative Assistant's salary plus the Full time Billing/Collections Clerk.
- Modernizing our billing and collections processes would cut costs significantly, from 1.5 full time administrative workers to 1 part time person. Our Tax Collector has State of CT WPCA billing & collections certification. The software used by the Tax Dept has a module available that would automate the reading to billing process eliminating the current process. Right now there are interviews in progress for the Billing Clerks replacement without the WPCA or Water/Sewer Commission's input.
- Since Jim Paggioli's retirement and the lack of real Public Works leadership, the workers have refused to perform any digging for water main breaks. In the past, they have responded to these Health emergencies responsibly, the Water Department has reimbursed the overtime and if professional paving was required, a temp patch was completed with a contractor hired shortly

thereafter. This new policy causes a possible health emergency threatening the water quality and endangering the public and unfairly raises the costs significantly for the water ratepayers. The costs for the digging by private contractors has reached in excess of \$35,000 per occurrence and of course, will rise with time. This has caused a huge increase in this line of the water budget.

As for my thoughts on the last BoS meeting and the ambush of Rosemary and Denise; First and foremost, agree or disagree with Rosemary, she never has or I trust will speak to a subject without the facts thoroughly investigated. I surmised her , "I'm on that" comment was simply her way of saying I want to get the facts straight. The fact that this was discussed amongst WPCA members should be expected. As for recusing one's self, I think absolutely our First Selectman should recuse himself. He has terminated an employee without "proven cause", without a hearing and without discussing or getting the facts from anyone on the Water/Sewer Commission. He has never attended a meeting and quite frankly, has zero knowledge of the workings of a very complicated operation. Secondly, Jason LaChapelle publicly stated that he has "discussed the situation with the HR Director and was told the termination was appropriate". Sounds to me another person on the WPCA has made up their mind and their objective analysis is compromised. Jason, please recuse yourself as well.

In closing, my hope again is for the WPCA to get their arms around these issues ASPA, this is the farthest thing from a partisan issue! This is protecting our great Town of Colchester and protecting the Water & Sewer rate payers from an unfair burden.