TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR BOARD OF SELECTMEN

Special Meeting Thursday, February 28, 2019 6:00 p.m. Town Hall Meeting Room 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. 06016

BUDGET PRESENTATIONS - WORKSHOP

Meeting Minutes

*** These Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting ***

Board of Selectmen:

Robert Maynard, First Selectman Steve Dearborn, Deputy First Selectman Jason Bowsza, Selectman Andy Hoffman, Selectman Charles J. Szymanski, Selectman

- ATTENDANCE: <u>Board of Selectmen</u>: Robert Maynard, First Selectman; Steve Dearborn, Deputy First Selectman; Andy Hoffman, Selectman; Charles J. Szymanski, Selectman.
- ABSENT: Selectman Jason E. Bowsza

PRESENTERS:Warehouse Point Library: Al Floyd, Cheryl Karp Ward, Richard Ross;
Capital Improvement Planning Committee: Cathy Simonelli,
Chairman, Bob Mr. Leach, Adam Mehan, Tom Talamini, Bill Towers, Jr.

GUESTS: <u>Town Staff</u>: <u>Town Treasurer:</u> Amy O'Toole

Public: Tom Arcari, D. James Barton.

Press: Press not present

TIME AND PLACE OF BUDGET WORKSHOP MEETING:

First Seletman Maynard called the Meeting to Order at 6:01 p.m. in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT.

ATTENDANCE: See Page 1.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Bill Towers, Jr.: Mr. Towers referenced *Marshal Supplies* in the amount of \$200 under the Selectmen's Budget. Mr. Towers indicated he didn't know how anyone can do a job with \$200; maybe they can buy stamps. Mr. Towers suggested the Fire Marshal should be here asking for a computer so he can have the latest technology for photos and other things.

PRESENTATIONS/B. – Capital Improvement Planning - 910700:

The total Budget request for the Capital Improvement Planning Committee for FY 2019 - 2020 was \$1,602,073, which results in a 63.87% increase.

Cathy Simonelli, Chairman of the Capital Improvement Planning Committee (CIP), and Bob Leach, member, joined the Board. Additional CIP Members present in the audience were Tom Talamini, Bill Towers, Jr., and another member who offered information during the presentation but didn't identify himself.

Ms. Simonelli summarized the Committee's work schedule as they review funding requests and prepare recommendations, which they present to the Board of Selectmen in November. Ms. Simonelli noted the actual project work is about a year away, as funding isn't received until the following July. Ms. Simonelli reported quotes are difficult to obtain, you can't get exact quotes for work, there's no guarantee that the project will ever be done and vendors are not generally interested in developing details for quotes under those kinds of circumstances. Ms. Simonelli indicated the department heads use their experience and get cost information online to develop their estimates and the actual project work is, at a minimum, a year away so they add some small cushion for changes in costs and construction rates. Selectman Hoffman questioned that historically, do you have an idea of how the actuals turn out compared to the estimates provided by the department heads? Ms. Simonelli didn't have that information; she suggested that wasn't in the purview of the CIP Committee. Ms. Simonelli suggested for the CIP they look at the estimate, and work from that. Her personal opinion was that the department heads should have a process for developing estimates for their projects; she assumed that was over-seen by their supervisor. Selectman Hoffman suggested that the actuals vs. the estimates would be relatively easy to track; would that be of value to the CIP? Ms. Simonelli didn't think so; the reality was that's an after the fact thing, not really a part of their purview.

Ms. Simonelli explained they take the projects and prioritize them based on 7 factors to acquire an impartial opinion of each project and how important it is to the Town. The factors they consider are: Is it one of 3 main (government) obligations – public safety, public education, or infrastructure? Is it mandated? Or do we have a statutory obligation to do it? Is it related to public health and safety? How much benefit is there? Is there a cost benefit? Is there an

efficiency benefit? Selectman Hoffman questioned do you have specific criteria that you weigh when you consider your 1 to 10 number? Ms. Simonelli replied no, we talk about them as a group in more general terms, to share information; they come up with a shared ranking for what each of those categories are. Ms. Simonelli indicated there's a whole big formula the Committee reviews; there are different rankings, so they're each going to get a number within that category from 1 to 10 and then the weights for the different categories are different.

Ms. Simonelli suggested that after plugging in those values they evaluate the projects to determine those with the highest need and propose a funding amount and that's what goes into their budget recommendation. Selectman Hoffman questioned if the highest need is judged by the score? Ms. Simonelli replied not solely by score; we will sort them by score order; there are some projects in Town that are sort of perpetual. Revaluation has to happen every 5 years, so some money goes into that every year so that by the 5th year there's enough money to do that. Vehicles are something we constantly put a little money into so we can keep a rollover and nothing falls apart. When we finally come up with the project we're recommending it's not just those that hit the highest priority; we also look at the others to see if they actually provide a benefit to the community or something the community has been asking for, or might bring in money in a way that would pay for itself. Mr. Mr. Leach cited another consideration was if a project was associated with a grant opportunity.

Ms. Simonelli also noted there are projects that go unfunded every year; they don't go away; at least the first two thirds of the list are things that are broken or are things that we're now mandated to do that we weren't before. So the projects are not really options; they just couldn't make the cut with the funding available. Ms. Simonelli felt that each year they're adding new projects, and we're pushing existing projects to some day and we're creating a backlog of real work. There are real infrastructure needs in the town that aren't being met.

First Selectman Maynard returned discussion to the weighted value of the projects. Lengthy discussion followed regarding how the CIP Committee weighs each project request, how the project value is determined, what the criteria for the ranking is, and review of various items on the 2019 – 2020 CIP Project list. Ms. Simonelli indicated there are 7 categories the Committee considers when reviewing and ranking a budget request; each of those 7 categories are then ranked 1 to 10, with the exception of category 1 – government obligation – which is reviewed under a ranking of 1 to 5. Ms. Simonelli identified the project categories, and their weighted values, as the following:

<u>Categories</u>
(1) government obligation(2) mandate, compliance, and statutory obligations

(3) public health and safety

(4) the department's personal priority

Weigthed value range

1 - 5 1 - 10

1 - 10

1 - 10

(5) extent if benefit to community	1 - 10
(6) whether it maintains or improves the standard	
of service	1 - 10
(7) whether it improves efficiency or creates a cost savings.	1 - 10

Ms. Simonelli gave the Board an example of the project consideration ranking process.

CIP ID #12 - The PD and Radio Tower Replacements. Ms. Simonelli clarified this project request is just the generators for the towers to keep commuication going; Treasurer O'Toole concurred, noting it has nothing to do with the towers or the communicaton requests brought to the Board previously. Ms. Simonelli suggested the Committee said, is that a government obligation? And it is, we rated it a 5 as a government obligation, because the PD can't communicate without that and that we thought was pretty important. And then we said is it a mandate, a compliance, or a statutory obligation, and we rated it an 8. Not a mandate per se but our PD has to be able to talk. They can't fulfill their statuory obligations if they can't talk. So we rated it pretty high. Ms. Simonelli then referenced public health and safety, in order for our police to do their job they need those radio towers; that was an 8. It was their (department) first priority on their list, so it got a 10. The extent and benefit to community, again, an 8 because we need that. Does it maintain or improve the standards of service? Absolutely; that was an 8. Does it improve efficiency and cost savings? Yes; that was an 8; again, if they can't talk they're going to be rather inefficient. Ms. Simonelli indicated so all that rolled across, all the math happens, and it ended up with the 1770 overall score - which was pretty high, compared to the rest of the projects. Discussion indicated DPW had submitted this project replacement; the total project anticipated cost is \$97,000 with \$50,000 recommended as funding for this 2019 – 2020 FY. Discussion continued to identify the location of the (2) towers. The remainder of the project funding will occur in FY 2020 - 2021

Ms. Simonelli continued to review the discussion process within the CIP to determine project rankings. Discussion followed regarding the choice of the formula, and its complexity. Treasurer O'Toole noted the first 9 projects occur every year, so the ranking really starts with number 10. Ms. Simonelli concurred; the first half are the perpetual projects, they may be multi-year projects but they are single projects. Ms. Simonelli noted the exception would be the *NextGen (CIP ID #4)* will come out of that group once it's paid for. It's critical that we pay for that project; we put it up there to be sure the 3 annual payments would be made. Treasurer O'Toole cited the current transfers going to BOF are different than this CIP request for 4 installment payments of the total \$173,000 project cost. Treasurer O'Toole noted licensing for NextGen will subsequently occur annually out of the IT Operating Budget.

Treasurer O'Toole referenced <u>CIP ID #9 - Town Property - Vehicle Replacment Program</u>, she suggested there's really not a mandate for Town Hall to replace their vehicle, so if you look at the 633 there's really not very high numbers driving that project but if we don't put away some</u>

money every year when the grant comes through for the Senior Bus we don't have enough money put aside to match it.

First Selectman Maynard referenced <u>CIP ID #3 – Public Works – Pavement Management</u>. He noted the total project cost at \$1 million but the recommended funding is \$500,000. Treasurer O'Toole indicated Town Engineer Norton asked for \$1 million for just 1 year. Considering the whole CIP Budget last year was less than \$1 million they noted they couldn't allocate the full \$1 million but gave \$500,000; Town Engineer Norton's ask was for \$1 million. Selectman Szymanski questioned how many miles of pavement could be redone for that cost? Treasurer O'Toole suggested it would depend on the project; tearing down to the base surface and repaving would cost more than resurfacing a road. Lengthy discussion followed regarding Selectman Szymanski's questions regarding the cost of the various road improvement processes, to whom the purview fell to ascertain the selection of the road improvement projects, and funding options.

Deputy First Selectman Dearborn referenced <u>CIP ID #2 – Chip Sealing Roads</u> – noting that money is reimbursed by the State; Town Engineer Norton can then use that money in association with CIP funding. Ms. Simonelli referenced a letter sent to "you guys", the second to the last paragraph addresses road maintenance; they looked at funding a significant amount through bonding.

Treasurer O'Toole cited Town Engineer Norton noted during his budget presentation that he has roads he wants to repave but needs to do drainage for those roads first. Money for that would come from the General Fund, which would be in addition to this funding request; Town Engineer Norton also does much of the engineering work on these projects. Someone from the audience (believed to be CIP Committee Member Adam Mehan) offered information regarding road condition. Mr. Mehan suggested it breaks down by mileage, and a repair category. Reading from his report he suggested we have 31 miles with the notation "do nothing", they're in good shape; 17 miles – "need preventative maintenance" at half a million; 10 miles - "needs structural improvements" at \$3 million, and 12 miles – " need base rehabilitation" which he assumed meant the whole road at \$10.5 million. Ms. Simonelli suggested we're looking at \$14 million. Selectman Szymanski cited that was the reason for his concern; he just wanted to know for \$500,000 what can we fix? How many miles of roads, based on Town Engineer Norton's priority. Mr. Leach felt that would be a question for Town Engineer Norton.

Discussion continued regarding the process for bonding. Treasurer O'Toole noted monies received must be spent within 18 months so Town Engineer Norton has to schedule it so it comes into 2 seasons, and then you schedule the rest of it to be done in the next 18 month period. Ms. Simonelli indicated they asked Town Engineer Norton to look at it, determine how the project could be structured, as well as a rough cost to bring more of our roads out of disrepair and put us back on a normal maintenance schedule. Ms. Simonelli noted they have not met with Town Engineer Norton as a committee; she felt Town Engineer Norton was looking at that. Ms. Simonelli felt if the Board was open to that process she was sure that conversation could happen.

Ms. Simonelli felt that's not CIP's purview; it's our suggestion to you that's how that could move forward.

Treasurer O'Toole noted the CIP money doesn't go away; if this \$500,000 isn't enough for a whole project it can stay in there and get added to next year's \$500,000 to get him the \$1 million that he needs for X, Y, Z roads. Selectman Szymanski questioned if there was anything "parked" now that could be used? Ms. Simonelli suggested CNR – Roads, as of 1/31/2019 has \$959,000 in there. Selectman Szymanski questioned the current summary total; Treasurer O'Toole cited \$2.6 million right now, working through all those projects to get that money spent. That includes the \$883,000 that was sent over in July of this year.

The Board mulled reviewing the CIP ranking list project by project.

<u>*CIP ID# 1 – Police – Vehicles:*</u> Ms. Simonelli noted the cost has gone up. She referenced the past practice of funding 3 vehicles one year followed by 2 vehicles the next year and continuing with that rotation. She noted they fall behind because of the inability to fully fund the request, so they began funding 2.5 vehicles so they would know what the money was. Discussion continued regarding the increased cost of vehicles, the changing model availability, and the associated impact on other budget requests, such as equipment to outfit the vehicles.

Deputy First Selectman Dearborn referenced <u>CIP ID #13 - To Replace Vehicle Computers at a</u> <u>cost of \$23,070.</u> Ms. Simonelli cited this increases the officer's efficiency as they're not taking notes and retyping notes into the reports; the current computers are 10 years old. Discussion followed; the tablets estimated cost is \$3295 plus \$550 for the keyboard; the \$23,070 will fund approximately 6 computers.

Deputy First Selectman Dearborn referenced <u>CIP ID #21 – South Road Sewers – Repair South</u> <u>Road Sewer to allow transfer to WPCA</u> – Deputy First Selectman Dearborn thought the WPCA was in charge of all the sewers. Ms. Simonelli and Treasurer O'Toole suggested the WPCA has said if we fix it then they will take it over. Treasurer O'Toole cited it was a private sewer which was built by the Federal Government; the Town inherited the private sewer through the tax sale for all those properties on South Road. Selectman Hoffman cited the repair has gone up \$14,000 since last year when the estimated cost to repair was \$80,000. Ms. Simonelli suggested the cost to replace the whole thing is \$270,000; total cost to repair is now \$94,000 and it could be passed off to the WPCA.

<u>CIP ID #17 – Dog Pound Repairs - \$61,920 split over three years</u>. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn questioned that this cost is to replace the inside and outside kennels? Ms. Simonelli indicted the issue with the dog pound is that the inspector is really unhappy with our progress, so they thought if they could begin funding the repair it would show intent. Selectman Szymanski noted he has mentioned at another meeting about acquiring informaton about East Windsor going in with the regional facility in South Windsor. Discussion followed regarding past

attempts for shared facilities. Selectman Szymanski indicted he'll research the South Windsor facility and bring the information to a future meeting.

Ms. Simonelli suggested she should have mentioned in the beginning this list is developed from what they know in the Fall; a lot can change by the time of the Budget presentations in the Spring. She noted <u>the Scout Hall HVAC Replacement (CIP ID #25)</u> has been completed; it's no longer a CIP project. The Town split the cost of the project with the Scout Hall Building Committee.

Ms. Simonelli noted that the CIP didn't get their full \$1.1 million budget request last year. They received \$883,000 which they are allocating to the various projects until the money runs out. The BOE received a grant from the State for being an Alliance District for their CIP requested projects so the BOE projects were removed from the CIP list; no money changed hands. Lengthy discussion followed regarding the BOE project requests, the removal of those projects from the CIP Project list due to funding via the State Alliance Grant, and the process for handling those projects.

Discussion turned to responsibility for project selection. First Selectman Maynard and Selectman Szymanski felt the CIP is an advisory committee to the BOS; it should be the BOS who have the responsibility to decide what projects will be funded. Ms. Simonelli indicated that wasn't how it's happened in the past. Treasurer O'Toole felt the BOS allocate the dollar amount and the CIP Committee decides the projects. First Selectman Maynard suggested the Charter identifies the CIP as being advisory to the BOS; Ms. Simonelli agreed they were advisory in that they ask for an amount of money. Ms. Simonelli didn't feel the Charter spells out who should do it, she felt it's always come back to the CIP Committee because they're the most familiar with the projects. Selectman Szymanski felt it's the BOS that has the responsibility to decide what projects are funded. The CIP advises the BOS based upon all your interviews and what you have; this is what you're recommending but it's up to us to make those decisions. Treasurer O'Toole noted right now the CIP Committee is asking for \$1.5 million, which is double the \$883,000 they got last year. If you only give them \$883,000 then \$700,000 of projects have to come off this list.

Selectman Szymanski referenced <u>CIP ID #10 – Board of Education – Kitchen Steam Boiler</u> – he suggested he had in his notes that that project was in the CIP list last year. Ms. Simonelli replied no, not the kitchen steam boiler; she noted they did some kitchen work last year through the Alliance Grant but it was not this repair. Treasurer O'Toole suggested this problem just happened this year. Ms. Simonelli continued explaining background information she offered to share; Selectman Szymanski was fine with her explanation.

First Selectman Maynard suggested focusing on discussions of specific projects. Ms. Simonelli requested to discuss the following projects:

The <u>Treasurer's Financial Software – (CIP ID #14)</u> Ms. Simonelli noted the Treasurer has requested financial software. On February 26th the school was notified that the Phoenix Software that they use will no longer be supported and maintained as of July, 2020. So when they put in the CIP request for the Town financial software with Munis we put in the full amount that would also cover the BOE switching to Munis as well so the two departments can work better together. The BOE piece was sort of optional at that time but now it's more important because we're not going to have support for the software we use at the school. They felt it was better to keep the two together so they put in the full amount. Treasurer O'Toole noted the Town's share was \$105,000 so it's very minimal to add the BOE's share to it. Ms. Simonelli indicated they all felt that was a cost effective way to gain an efficiency between the two departments. The \$124,000 is the cost of the Town and BOE share, and includes the transfer of data and training for using the software.

Deputy First Selectman Dearborn noted we have a fire truck on here for \$1 million. (CIP ID #11 - BBFD - E7-130 Fire Truck Replacement). Treasurer O'Toole suggested this is the seed money to start the purchase of a million dollar truck. Ms. Simonelli referenced the 4th paragraph of their letter, ".....the Committee feels this would be best funded either via bonding, or lease/purchase arrangement. We have allocated a preliminary \$100,000 to begin funding either a potential lease/purchase or an outright purchase should bonding not become available." Ms. Simonelli suggested the lease/purchase vs. bonding could be discussed; she felt that was out of the hands of the CIP. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn requested clarification of \$100,000 financed for 10 years? Ms. Simonelli and Treasurer O'Toole replied yes. Ms. Simonelli suggested they initially looked at \$200,000 for 5 years; Selectman Szymanski noted he received information tonight that someone has investigated \$225,000 for 5 years. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn suggested the way this is set up is in 5 years they're looking to get a new truck. He questioned Chief Arcari if they could wait for 5 years? Chief Arcari noted the way it works is you put in your order on the 5th year and get the truck on the 6th year. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn questioned how long it takes to get a fire truck? Chief Arcari suggested about a year: Treasurer O'Toole suggested 18 months. Ms. Simonelli cited they are willing to wait 18 months, not that they wanted to. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn noted the oldest truck is a 2001; that means it's 18 years old. Selectman Szymanski cited the frame is starting to separate. Chief Arcari concurred, noting the frame is starting to scale and the frame is starting to separate; it's a double frame truck. Ms. Simonelli read from her notes, "only two locations can diagnose and help them with that, this is our second truck out, it used to be our first, it's used for municipal aid, maintenance was \$20,000 to \$25,000 last year, they hope to keep it in service for 5 years while they're saving for the replacement but that carries some risk. Other purchase options are lease/purchase or bonding". Chief Arcari referenceded Ms. Simonelli's notes that only 2 places can work on it, he cited the truck has what they call a multiplexing system. There are only two places in the State of Connecticut that can work on that truck, one is Fleetmasters in Windsor Locks, and the other is down in Milford. So we're limited as to who can repair it. Tri-State dealers and Ford dealers can't touch it. Fleetmasters, who fixed it the last time, just bought the software to fix it; Chief Arcari cited recent repairs. The truck is starting to nickle and dime on repairs. Ms. Simonelli reiterated it's a 2001. Ms. Simonelli cited when reviewing the projects

they realized they probably wouldn't get the \$1.1 million they were asking for so they cut the request; the longer you wait the more expensive these things become because prices go up and because more things are wrong with them.

Selectman Szymanski referenced <u>CIP ID #18 – BOE – BB Café Tile Replacement - \$27,500</u>. Ms. Simonelli suggested it's the original tile in the building; it's 65 years old; it's the same tile all over the place. Selectman Szymanski cited he graduated from that school 30 years ago; the cafeteria was expanded and new flooring was put in at the time. Ms. Simonelli noted the tile is breaking down; this price includes asbestos removal.

The Board thanked Ms. Simonelli and Mr. Leach for their presentation.

PRESENTATIONS/A. 6:00 P.M. –Warehouse Point Library - 710300:

The total Budget request for the Warehouse Point Library for FY 2019 - 2020 was \$293,460, which results in a 9.3% increase.

Al Floyd and Cheryl Karp Ward joined the Board.

Mr. Floyd advised the Board the Library Director is leaving his position next week; the Board of Directors will be beginning a search for his replacement as soon as possible. Mr. Floyd noted that in addition to replacing the Director they would like to hire a Children's Librarian and bring salary levels up for existing staff. They currently have three levels of Library Technical Assistants, each based on the expertise of the assistant and the level of work performed. They were also proposing to bring one of the part-time employees up to a full time position. Mr. Floyd reported the Library Director was the only certified librarian; they would like to hire a certified librarian for the Children's Librarian position as well. Selectman Hoffman questioned the number of employees? Mr. Floyd replied 11, including the Director.

Selectman Szymanski questioned the endowment income. Mr. Floyd indicated they use the income from a \$1.6 million endowment which encompasses three accounts. Some of the income use is restricted; some can be used to contribute to library services. Selectman Hoffman questioned that the \$76,000 is the funding available without decreasing the principal? Mr. Floyd and Ms. Ward replied affirmatively. Ms. Ward also noted they also own 99 Main Street, which provides rental income from six small agencies. Mr. Floyd suggested they're not buying as many books because the money isn't available, and not as many people are using the Warehouse Point Library because materials are available in their own libraries. Selectman Szymanski questioned if they do fund drives? Mr. Floyd suggested a flyer is going out at the end of the month; the last fund drive acquired \$13,000. Ms. Ward noted they're adding a PayPal link on their website which should help with donations.

Selectman Hoffman questioned the amount of the Director's salary? Mr. Floyd indicated \$64,000. Selectman Hoffman questioned if that was a competitive salary? Mr. Floyd indicated it was not; he noted they are advertising for the position this week. Selectman Hoffman noted the current Director has only been with the library for a year, while the previous director was with the library for some time. Mr. Floyd agreed, noting the previous director had been employed for 30 years. Mr. Floyd felt the current director's leaving was a combination of the salary and the lack of staff. Ms. Ward suggested the lack of funding for building maintenance was also a contributing factor. Selectman Hoffman questioned if there were any options to bring the recurring costs, such as building maintenance, down? Mr. Floyd cited the current contractor for the building maintenance is a multi-service individual. Selectman Szymanski questioned the \$23,000 cost for utilities. Mr. Floyd indicated that included internet, HVAC, electricity, etc. Selectman Szymanski questioned if there were any grants for solar panels? Mr. Floyd noted the building is surrounded by large pine trees.

Selectman Szymanski questioned the availability of electronic services. Mr. Floyd and Ms. Ward reviewed some of the downloadable material available.

Selectman Szymanski questioned the attendance last year compared to a few years ago. Ms. Ward suggested everything went down. Selectman Hoffman questioned if that might be because of a limited inventory. Mr. Floyd noted they used to be able to buy 3 or 4 copies of books before but now they can only buy 1. Ms. Ward suggested if multiple copies aren't available people go to other libraries. Discussion continued regarding the reduction in State support. They no longer provide the vans delivering books between libraries. Mr. Floyd noted they're still able to offer museum passes. Selectman Hoffman questioned if they have any programs to bring kids in to read and meet with other kids? Ms. Ward indicated they have a pajama night but programs require staff and money for food and materials. Deputy First Selectman Dearborn questioned how many people attend the pajama night; do they bring the kids in and hang out with them? Mr. Floyd suggested the attendance is good. Selectman Hoffman questioned what could be done to turn the participation around? Mr. Floyd suggested more staffing, as that would enable them to offer more programs. Selectman Szymanski suggested perhaps a welcome packet could be developed and left at Town Hall; new students should be given packets to encourage them to get a library card.

The Board thanked Mr. Floyd and Ms. Ward for the good work they do. Selectman Hoffman noted every time he's been at the library the staff has been courteous and helpful; he's also attended meetings in the conference room. Selectman Szymanski questioned the cost for using the meeting rooms? Mr. Floyd suggested they don't charge a room rental; most people give a donation for use. Selectman Szymanski suggested the Town should consider using the library when the Town Hall isn't available.

DISCUSSION OF ALL BUDGET REQUESTS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD:

The Board briefly discussed the status of budget requests in general. They noted subsequent Budget Workshops are scheduled for March 4, March 7th, March 11, and March 13th.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Budget Workshop at 8:46 p.m.

Maynard moved/Hoffman seconded/DISCUSSION; None. VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Board of Selectmen