### TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR BOARD OF SELECTMEN

### PUBLIC HEARING CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING OPTIONS February 16, 2023 7:00 p.m.

THIS MEETING
IS BEING HELD IN-PERSON
In the John Daly, Jr. Meeting Room
Town Hall, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT 06016

AND

REMOTELY via ZOOM Teleconference Meeting ID: 332 683 3563 Passcode: townhall

MEETING MINUTES

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

### **Board of Selectmen**

Jason E. Bowsza, First Selectman Marie DeSousa, Deputy First Selectman Alan Baker, Selectman Sarah Muska, Selectman Charles Nordell, Selectman

**ATTENDANCE:** First Selectman Bowsza hosted the in-person meeting. Deputy

First Selectman DeSousa, Selectman Baker, Selectman Muska, and

Selectman Nordell were present in person.

**ABSENT:** No one was absent; all Selectmen attended in person.

GUESTS/SPEAKERS in-person: First Selectman Bowsza hosted the in-person

meeting. Public: Paul Anderson, James Barton, Jim Barton, Mike

Ceppetelli, Randy Clifton, Bill Dunne, Tom Lansner, Tom Munzell, Joan Nordell, Lynn Stanley, Rand Stanley, Maria

Wheldon, Keith Yagaloff.

GUESTS/SPEAKERS signing in to meeting remotely: Anne; Izzy; Megan, Noreen Farmer, Jim Thurz; and Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

### 1. TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:

First Selectman Bowsza CONVENED the Congressionally Directed Spending Options Public Hearing at 7:00 p.m. in the John Daly, Jr. Meeting Room, Town Hall, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT 06016.

First Selectman Bowsza read the LEGAL NOTICE.

First Selectman Bowsza reviewed the following PowerPoint presentation, which is included as Attachment D to this document. Following is a short summary of his comments.

### 2. <u>UPDATED OPTIONS FOR CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED</u> <u>SPENDING (CDS) AWARDS – Community Center Renovation and Expansion:</u>

### 1. CDS Award:

- Funding for the Scout Hall project, which would be used as a Community Center, was included in the Federal Budget December 3, 2023
- Funding included 55% up to \$5,000,000.00 of the project cost
- The appropriation occurred via a Congressional appropriation through the United States Department of Agriculture
- The Town must secure the remaining 45% of the funding before the CDS funding will become available
- The CDS funding can NOT be reassigned to another local project.
- Options include cancelling the Federal funding, or seek approval of the project by the voters under the changed circumstances

First Selectman Bowsza noted a petition containing over 250 signatures has been submitted by a resident. The petition has not been submitted due to a requirement for the submission of a bond.

### 2. Project Costs, Details, and Other Factors:

• Updated project cost - \$4,720.000.00 as estimated by a professional estimator. Project cost includes the engineering/professional services already spent

Meeting ID: 332 683 3563 Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

- 55% of the total project cost under the revised estimate is \$2,596,000.00
- The Town has encumbered \$1,200.000.00 transferred from the CNR Fund by the Board of Finance for the project, pending voter approval
- Current project cost \$924,000.00

### 3. Options to Fund Project Cost Balance:

- Returning Federal funding
- Utilization of unused ARPA funding
- Utilization of \$1,500,000.00 "impact funding" provided to the Town related to the Gravel Pit Solar project
- Utilization of Community Investment Grant funding
- Utilization of the General Fund balance

### 4. American Rescue Plan Act (Option 1):

- Approximately \$2,000,000.00 funds remain available
- Funds can be used for any municipal project, with minor restrictions
- Balance in ARPA funding available after allocation of \$924,000.00 for the Scout Hall project would leave a \$1,200,000.00 ARPA balance for other projects

### 5. American Rescue Plan Act (Option 2):

- Current ARPA funding remaining is \$2,000,000.00
- Federal appropriation is \$2,596,000.00
- Remaining project cost needed is \$80,000.00

### 6. Gravel Pit Solar:

- Gravel Pit Solar has agreed to provide \$1,500,000.00 to the Town in addition to an annual payment in lieu of taxes
- Funding is to be used specifically for infrastructure
- The first of the \$1,500,000.00 annual payments has been received

### 7. Community Investment Fund Grant:

- East Windsor is one of 54 towns eligible for Community Investment Grant Funding
- Second round of funding is scheduled to occur on March 6, 2023
- Award of a grant would completely fund the remainder of the project

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

### 8. General Fund Appropriation or Bonding:

- Town policy requires that 10% to 20% of the Fund Balance to be retained
- Should the Town consider funding this project through the Fund Balance the remaining available funding for other projects would by 16.76%
- The Town could consider bonding

### 9. Notes to Consider:

- Federal funding is specific to the Scout Hall project
- Community discussion has promoted use of the Kogut property, which lacks utilities, sewer, or water. The Connecticut Water Company has recently estimated the cost of running public water to Park Hill and the school at \$3.7 million, which would not include extension to the Kogut property
- Kogut property currently encumbered by a long-term agricultural lease

### 3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

First Selectman Bowsza noted this is a Public Hearing. He opened discussion to members of the in-person audience.

Keith Yagaloff, 125 Depot Street: Mr. Yagaloff indicated he's in general agreement that the Town shouldn't return the \$2,750,000.00 provided through the Congressionally Directed Spending Grant. Mr. Yagaloff felt, however, that the approved grant wasn't in line with the project as posted on the Town website. The grant specifies it's to be used to streamline Town services for Seniors and low-income residents. Mr. Yagaloff explained the intent of the Department of Agricultural Grants, noting they require a lower funding match for lower socially economic communities. Mr. Yagaloff felt the project is an expansion of Town offices. Currently Scout Hall has a large area for public usage, this project tears off interior walls and adds offices around the external walls of the building. Mr. Yagaloff noted the project lists offices for Parks and Recreation and Social and Senior Services, yet there's nothing in the grant that mentions Parks and Recreation as part of Scout Hall; he suggested it's not within the scope of the Federal grant.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

Meeting ID: 332 683 3563

Mr. Yagaloff suggested that the Town had not approved this project, either via referendum vote or approved the expenditures as required by Charter, or by approval of the grant application. Mr. Yagaloff referenced the Charter, suggesting that any resolution approving any appropriation of \$20,000.00 not included in the annual budget requires a Town Meeting. Mr. Yagaloff suggested you can't just shift money from one pot to another. And, any resolution which requires borrowing more than \$1 million requires a referendum. An application for a Federal or State grant requires a Town Meeting to give the taxpayers an opportunity to vote. Mr. Yagaloff indicated this is the first meeting where the Board is asking the public what they think of this project; that's a good thing. And, finally, the Charter says the Town Meeting may not act on any appropriation which hasn't been referred to Town Meeting by the Board of Finance. Mr. Yagaloff contended that this project, which is to build Town offices, including Park and Recreation Offices, doesn't comply with the grant. Mr. Yagaloff suggested the Town needs a Community Center for Social Services and Senior Services for low-income residents/families - people who are struggling to pay their bills; that's what the grant should be used for. Mr. Yagaloff suggested the ARPA money was intended to combat the issues associated with COVID and the Town's ability to raise taxes and improve it's economy. Mr. Yagaloff suggested that money should be used for infrastructure - sewer, water, gas lines - to bring infrastructure into parts of town where we want to do economic development. He felt the solar farm money shouldn't be used for this project but should be included in the budget to offset the cost of the trucks coming in, the wear and tear on the roads, the impacts on the community.

Mr. Yagaloff suggested the legislative body of the town is the Town Meeting, not the Board of Selectmen. The public is going to vote on the project and how this money is going to be spent. He's concerned that you build something that doesn't comply with the grant and the Government is going to make you pay it back. This can't be an expansion of Town offices that currently exist in a new building.

Mr. Yagaloff concluded his comments.

<u>Tom Munzell, Aspen Drive:</u> Mr. Munzell thanked everyone before him and their teammates for working on behalf of the community, and, he apologized to all the people behind him for not being able to see him speak.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

Meeting ID: 332 683 3563

Mr. Munzell reported that in 2000, and in 1985, he embarked/co-chaired a commission in South Windsor that wrestled with similar issues, such as senior services and tracking commercial real estate/commercial businesses. Mr. Munzell concurred, suggesting he felt we need a South Windsor type of Senior Center where Seniors of modest or average means can go and work out/exercise to stay healthy. Mr. Munzell concurred with the gentleman who preceded him.

Mr. Munzell reported that what he and his commission did was to try to build up a commercial tax base in town so the residential taxpayers wouldn't bear the full brunt of everything. Mr. Munzell suggested if you take a look at South Windsor over the last 10 or 15 years he felt they did a great job on that. Mr. Munzell noted that East Windsor's Economic Development Commission is meeting infrequently, he suggested anything the residents can do to help that commission row their boat forward should be done, and we need to pave the way for infrastructure to impact that business.

Mr Munzell concluded his remarks.

Bill Dove: Mr. Dove reported he's a retired engineer who does things by numbers, that's how we measure things. He asked a friend to look at the cost of construction at the Scout Hall building, they provided him with a document that provides a wide range of variables — what kind of construction, what it's going to be used for — that type of thing. He then calculated the cost per square foot for the proposed addition at Scout Hall. Scout Hall itself is 7,500 square feet, the addition is another 7,500 square feet. To accomplish this we've asked for \$5 million plus or minus. The cost per square foot is \$666.00, that's what we're asking the public to pay for. Mr. Dove felt it wasn't a question of what to do, although some people will question that; it's a question of do they have their arms around the construction cost? Has it been documented and detailed, or has it been just thrown at the public.

Mr. Dove referenced a copy of an e-mail which he'd like to have incorporated into tonight's meeting minutes, the last sheet shows the range of costs he's discussing based by category. Mr. Dove noted none of the numbers start with the number "6", none start with the number "5", or the number "4", or the number "3"; every one of these starts with something like \$200.00 per square foot based on the type of construction, etc.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Dove indicated he's not a construction professional, he requested someone from the Board of Selectmen or the Building Department or the Town Building Committee – anybody – take a look at this, and take a look at \$666.00 that we want to send a bill to the taxpayer for versus the \$200.00 or \$300.00 per square foot. Tell me we have our arms around this, or show him.

Mr. Dove concluded his comments, and submitted his a copy of his e-mail to First Selectman Bowsza.

Rand Stanley, 87 Rye Street: Mr. Stanley indicated he's here tonight on behalf of another taxpayer who can't be here this evening. Mr. Stanley submitted a copy of the comments to First Selectman Bowsza, noting the gentleman has asked that his comments be made a part of the record this evening.

Mr. Stanley reported the gentleman has asked that his comments be read at the meeting. First Selectman Bowsza suggested Mr. Stanley didn't have to read the statement if it's to be included in the meeting record; Mr. Stanley indicated he would like to read the comments.

Mr. Stanley reported the document is titled "The rest of the story", the comments are being made on behalf of Jack Mannette, 15 Old Ellington Road, Broad Brook, CT.

"The Rest of the Story

East Windsor's 1st Selectman Et al, have pulled the wool over taxpayers' eyes with regard to converting our Scout Youth Hall into a "Community Center". During the 2020/2021 budget work shop, without explanation, they increased the Public Works "Professional Services" budget by \$100,000. Burying \$100,000 in an account that averaged \$15,000 a year without any public discussion, is a serious lack of transparency. Nowhere, in any public meeting minutes can you find an explanation as to why \$100,000 was added to the Public Works annual budget request AFTER, the Finance Board initially approved a lower budget! (See BOF Budget Workshop Minutes of April 7, 2021) Adding \$100,000 deserved public input! The first public indication of how these funds were spent, was during a June 2, 2022, presentation of Architectural and Building Plans by our 1st Selectman to convert our leased Scout Hall into a "Community Center"

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

Meeting ID: 332 683 3563

with Town Offices. After the November ballot rejection, an FOI request was made requesting all relevant information, communications and costs associated with this proposal. To date, no response has come forth! Maybe, it's because, the 1st Selectman, Et al pursued this project on their own?

The time is right to support creating a "Community Multigenerational Center". A center that can be used for Board and Town Meetings, Community & Town Gatherings including Senior Services. NOT TOWN OFFICES! In this past weekend's Journal Inquirer, our PZC announced its intention to install sidewalks along a 2.5-mile safe pedestrian access loop on Reservoir Ave, Rye Street, Windsorville Road and Old Ellington Road. This effort supports development of Town owned Kogut acreage on the corner of Windsorville Rd. and Reservoir Ave. Seniors could walk to a new "Community Center" from Park Hill. Maybe this would help increase the 20 or so Seniors that currently utilize our current Senior Center.

East Windsor can utilize the \$2.7 million-dollar Federal Grant Community Center funds with the \$1.2 million of taxpayer monies put in reserve from last year. Utilizing these funds, plus ARPA money, earmarked to rebuild the Reservoir Park Pavilion and other Recreation projects would be better directed to building a dedicated "Community Center" in Broad Brook.

Jack Mannette, 15 Old Ellington Road, Broad Brook"

Mr. Stanley reiterated the comments read were Mr. Mannette's words, not his. Mr. Stanley indicated he does support a multi-generational Community Center for the community but he doesn't support the expansion of Town offices taking place based on the course of what's taken place over the last 3 years. Mr. Stanley urged the Board to take a hard look at this and keep in mind that we aren't a Town Manager/Town Council form of government. Mr. Stanley suggested when people say they're not necessarily against this project this is the only bridge he has, don't skip over the process. Mr. Stanley suggested we are this community. (Audio for end of comments was garbled).

Lynn Stanley, 87 Rye Street: Mrs. Stanley advised the Board that on November 14, 2021 under the Freedom of Information Act she sent an e-mail to the First Selectmen's Office requesting the amount of money spent before the Town had a chance to vote on November 8<sup>th</sup>. Mrs. Stanley indicated that to this date she has not received any kind of response in regards to her request. This information

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

should be readily available and should not be difficult to provide. The spending ocurred within the last 10 months.

On another note, Mrs. Stanley indicated she does support a Community Center which would be available for everyone, however, Town Offices should not be relocated to the Community Center. It appears the expansion is all about Town Offices, and not the Seniors, Youth, or community. The proposed multigenerational expansion would then eliminate certain budget line items, such as Senior Services. Monies will be consolidated and distributed by the Director without taxpayer input. The trickle-down effect of moving Town Offices will increase taxes, growing governmental programs and services without economic development available to the taxpayers. No one has proven what the building's footprint of the current Scout Hall is adequate for Seniors, Youth Services, and community events and Town meetings without spending \$5 million. Yes, remodeling and updates would be needed but those costs are substantially less than what's being proposed. Mrs. Stanley suggested she'd like to know how many Seniors actually use the Senior Center, and how many kids use the afterschool activities. The plan to expand the current building to build around the perimeter makes no sense. Ask any builder if they can confirm by expanding out from the back of the building and adding 3 walls would be more cost-effective. Mrs. Stanley noted the current building has 4 good sized conference rooms and a state-of-the-art huge kitchen and a huge community room, the current building may need some updates but not \$5 million worth. The building today is adequate to accommodate the Seniors, community meetings, youth, public hearings and other events. If the Scout Hall Committee wants to relinquish the lease and sell the property, and take the money to be used at the Kogut property, or start letting the Seniors and youth start using the facility. In light of the Planning and Zoning Meeting regarding their plan to install sidewalks to connect Main Street, Depot, Perri, Reservoir, Windsorville Road, Old Ellington, and Rye it would make sense to build on the Kogut property that we already own, and we'd have a complete walking route with sidewalks surrounding the Kogut property and the Town Reservoir Park. Mrs. Stanley suggested it would make sense to have a Community Center there. Additionally, the residents at Park Hill and surrounding neighborhoods could walk to the Community Center. Possibly we could even bring in the trolley train through the town to a central location where events can take place.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

The February 2nd, 2023 Board of Selectman Meeting mentioned potentional obstacles to using the Kogut land due to the Reichle farm lease, which was renewed in 2018. Mrs. Stanley noted it's been 5 years; when does it expire? Additionally Reichle states in the YouTube video of that meeting that he would welcome the use of the land for municipal use and he would be open to discussion.

Lastly, Mrs. Stanley suggested we need to promote economic development and bring new businesses into our community. By building economic development we can grow our Grand List and reduce our taxes. Mrs. Stanley proposed that the grants should be invested in our infrastructure to improve our roads and drainage, sewer lines, water. We need to expand the businesses who want to invest in our community. Additionally, many homeowners want to connect to these services. Remember when half of the voters said no to spending \$5 million to renovating Scout Hall.

Mrs. Stanley concluded her comments.

<u>Joan Nordell, Borrup Road:</u> Mrs. Nordell suggested she's hearing everyone talking about building out here in Broad Brook, but she guessed they've forgotten East Windsor is Warehouse Point as well.

Randy Clifton, 7 Hickory Trail, East Windsor: Mr. Clifton noted he was one of the guys who went around with the petition to try to get a second look at this opportunity. What they found as they traveled through the community was that there was a lot of misinformation presented to people about what was going to happen with Scout Hall. One of the things they said was they thought the kids would be kicked out of Scout Hall; that's not the intention of this. This is a multi-generational hall that everybody can use. You're talking about Town Offices, but the Town Offices he's hearing about are getting a bad rap. We're promoting a multi-generational building, it would make sense to have Parks and Rec there, there's a huge area that you can make football fields and more soccer fields.

Mr. Clifton indicated it didn't make sense to him to take a property that's going to cost \$3.75 million to provide water to, and you don't have electricity, or gas. Mr. Clifton suggested it would cost \$12 to \$15 million to build on Kogut. Mr. Clifton

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

suggested we already have the Scout Hall building, and we've paid for it in our Federal taxes; this is a chance to get some of that money back for our community. Mr. Clifton reiterated the amount of misinformation about this project, which was defeated by approximately 23 votes.

Paul Anderson, 89 Main Street, Broad Brook: Mr. Anderson suggested the misinformation continues. The Kogut property isn't logical, it's difficult to get to for many people. Scout Hall was built 23 years ago by a group who then gave it to the Town. The Town owns the land and the building; they've been supporting youth groups there ever since. The water company has a policy if you want water then you pay for it and they'll collect the fees. It will cost over \$3 million just to get water in. The electricity available is incredibly inadequate; who pays for it, Mr. Anderson suggested he doesn't know the answer. Having sidewalks out there doesn't make that property more viable for the purpose of what this is. You have a lot of trees, you're going to have to clear a lot of land, all of that adds to the cost. And then you have engineering costs to determine what you need for a base to build a building, and on and on. There's also no gas line, which is another expense to be borne by someone. There's no sewer, which would have to go under the railroad tracks, which isn't all that convenient. That has to be paid for by someone – us. Mr. Anderson suggested he could see a \$10 million plus cost just to get utilities to the property, let alone do anything with it. You're already beyond the cost where we are, and the youth won't be pushed away, they get to use the facility as a high priority - first in line.

Mr. Anderson agreed that the expansion concept allows for more room, Seniors usually do things during the day although they could also use it at night but don't typically do things at night. As far as convenience goes, we have buses that can move the Seniors from their homes to the facility. It's not an issue but people can make it an issue if they want. Mr. Anderson suggested he's a little tired of political issues as opposed to practical issues.

Mr. Anderson suggested he felt this needs to move forward. Regarding which of these financial options, Mr. Anderson felt the Town should hold off until March 6<sup>th</sup> because if we can get all of the money we should take all the money. If there's any question as to what can go into the facility with the Federal funding Mr. Anderson felt that could be clarified without a lot of trouble. Mr. Anderson noted Mr. Blumenthal and Mr. Murphy toured there and they were thrilled with what

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

they saw. They thought it was great and they're the ones who got this Federal funding for us.

Mr. Anderson indicated he sees all of this negativity as a non-issue. Mr. Anderson felt we need to move forward.

Members of the in-person audience continued to request an opportunity to speak, some of those requesting to be acknowledged would be speaking for a second time. First Selectman Bowsza suggested he would like to give others who haven't yet spoke an opportunity first, first time speakers remained silent.

First Selectman Bowsza then offered the opportunity to comment to online participants.

Noreen Farmer, 247 South Water Street: Mrs. Farmer suggested there are so many ways someone could look at this. The reality of this is these conversations have been happening since the early 2000s that the Seniors shouldn't be in that building. It's a hazard for them to get into it, it's a conflict between the Seniors and the Fire Department. Mrs. Farmer suggested her recollection of the purchase of the Kogut property was to put a municipal building there was kind of a carrot, because people were complaining on spending all of this money on just farmland. So the carrot became that we'll put a municipal building there someday. Then after the Kogut property was purchased there was talk of moving Town offices to the Superfund site, which would be good, and maybe we could expand Broad Brook School to there, or the Senior Center.

Mrs. Farmer suggested we have to do something. Mrs. Farmer suggested we sit here and we do nothing, year after year after year. We continue to have delapitated things in Town for the people we try to serve. Seniors need a place to go to do what they need to do in a comfortable environment, they need to have the staff near them. That's why there's offices. You can't have the office staff who run the Senior services in another building across town. This questioned the idea that sidewalks are going to bring people in there because now they have sidewalks. Mrs. Farmer noted she lives in Warehouse Point, she's not walking on those sidewalks. We need to stop the political garbage that gets involved in everything and do something – anything. Mrs. Farmer suggested we don't have enough youth to sustain that building, there's not enough people using it. We

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

have to put a roof on it, we have to do all kinds of stuff. We have Seniors trying to climb a ramp and stairs that are dangerous, we have Staff running from an annex, which is inadequate to even house them, we have a Police Department that could use that space, and the reality of it is that it all sounds wonderful that we could take more money and build this wonderful thing — we're never going to do it because nobody's ever going to say I'm going to spend the money. When you decide to go to Kogut people are going to ask why we had to buy dirt and how much did we spend on the dirt? Mrs. Farmer suggested there has to be a point in time when we move forward. Mrs. Farmer felt this was an attempt to try to rectify something. She noted she's been here for 30 years and she's sick to death of listening to this nonsense because people can't put their political crap away and do something to move forward.

As far as this whole grand scheme of economic development, which she agreed we absolutely need, Mrs. Farmer noted the same people who say they want economic development are the same people complaining when economic development comes in. They were complaining about the Silverman property because "Oh my God, I can't see a barn." They don't want that but they want the money that comes with it. The solar panels, believe it or not it's going to bring in some tax dollars. Enough is enough. 23 people did not vote for this, the embarassment that's going to be caused by us turning this money back over 23 people is not worth it. Put it back out or do whatever you have to do. Get those Seniors out of that building and into some place that's relatively safe and accomodating, and the Staff should be there to accommodate them. Parks and Recreation, Social Services, the Senior Center – they are all one group of people. We need to stop the nonsense and do something - please. If someone wants to do something with the Kogut property please come to a Board of Education meeting and tell us you want to build a big old school complex out there because it would be perfect for that. We could move all of our schools there; it's a 12 year plan but maybe they could do that. And are you going to want to spend a \$100 million it's going to cost to do it? You're not going to want to do that, you're going to nickle and dime everything while people don't have accomodations that are safe for them.

Mrs. Farmer concluded her comments.

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

First Selectman Bowsza called for additional comments from the online participants; no one requested to be acknowledged. First Selectman Bowsza then offered the opportunity to speak to the in-person audience again.

Randy Clifton, 7 Hickory Trail, East Windsor: Mr. Clifton addressed the people in the audience and asked how many have been to the Senior Center? Several people raised their hands. Mr. Clifton asked how easy it was to get into the Senior Center? Unidentified members of the audience suggested it was horrible. Mr. Clifton noted he witnessed an older gentleman who was trying to get up the stairs and a petite woman was trying to assist him; it's dangerous for people to get into.

Maria Whelden, 32 Rolocut Road, joined the conversation, noting she's the Town's representative to the Health Department. She noted the nurses who work for the Health Department went to the Senior Center to do flu clinics and they got that response from the Seniors at the clinic. That's why the attendance for the clinics in East Windsor are way down from those in surrounding towns because the Seniors can't get to the place.

Randy Clifton, 7 Hickory Trail, East Windsor: Mr. Clifton suggested the Seniors can't get to the clinics because they can't get into the building. He continued to cite examples of dangerous conditions at the Senior Center. He suggested various activities that could occur outside the kitchen at Scout Hall, and noted the access is covered. Mr. Clifton suggested there are so many reasons why this plan makes sense.

Mike Ceppetelli, 42 Skinner Road: Mr. Ceppetelli suggested there's undoubtedly, unquestionably a less expensive building program which would serve the same purposes, the same square footage and provide similar building amenities. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested it appears that the Town's Building Committee never publically reviewed and provided input on the Scout Hall expansion plan. The only Building Committee Agendas that he could find were from 2019 and didn't address this project. Mr. Ceppetelli also reported the Board of Selectmen had refused to provide the costs of the planning phases of this project to the public when requested; he questioned why that would occur? Mr. Ceppetelli suggested there was no RFQ for the architectural services for this

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

project, which he felt was a violation of Town purchasing policy which was signed at the time by Deputy First Selectman Jason Bowsza. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested this policy has regularly been ignored by Public Works and Parks and Recreation over several years. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested our current POCD (Plan of Conservation and Development) makes no mention of Scout Hall expansion to serve Seniors and new services, although it does call for such a facility on the \$2.8 million Kogut property purchased in 2004. He suggested the property was purchased for municipal and recreational expansion that still remains largely undeveloped. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested a lot of time, research, and thought went into the POCD, he questioned if the same could be said for the current project. He noted the voters also approved the POCD, just as they rejected the Scout Hall expansion. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested those 2 reasons alone should make us take a serious look at developing the Kogut property for its intended purposes.

Mr. Ceppetelli suggested he wasn't opposed to a suitable Senior Center at a suitable location but he questioned the true need for expansion of Town offices, and also questioned the return on investments for Town residents for building a multi-generatonal facility without more indepth demographic detail on the current needs of our youth services and the 18 to 64 year olds who make up 60% of the Town's population. He's against using any additional tax revenue or ARPA funds for the project proposed. Mr. Ceppetelli suggested there are much greater needs for those funds. Mr. Ceppetelli emplores the Board of Selectmen to answer the many questions the residents have raised about this project so everyone can make the best informed decisions moving forward.

Jim Barton, 158 South Water Street: Mr. Barton indicated he's in favor of this project moving forward for many of the reasons mentioned tonight vs. doing something over here on this property and the expense. Mr. Barton noted he's in favor of votes, but something that hasn't been mentioned is he truly believes the vote on this issue was corrupted by a distraction with the Historical Society issue, and all the signs around town. Mr. Barton felt that was why the vote failed.

Keith Yagaloff, 125 Depot Street: Mr. Yagaloff didn't feel anyone was opposed to Senior offices being at the Senior Center, or the Social Services offices being at the Senior Center. Mr. Yagaloff suggested Parks and Recreation takes care of park activities across all of the town – the ballfields, Reservoir Park – it's a big program all by itself that has to do with those programs that benefit the Town and the children. It's not the same as the other 2 departments. Mr. Yagaloff indicated

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

he wasn't against it but the entire addition is office space, primarily for Parks and Recreation. Mr. Yagaloff wanted to correct the gentleman who collected the petition – yes, the Seniors need to be in the Senior Center. Let's use some common sense, you don't take a major department like Parks and Recreation and put it into a relatively small building and expect that you're going to have a state-of-the-art Senior Center, state-of-the-art Social Services at a Community Center because it's not going to happen. It will be a Parks and Recreation building with some room for Senior Services and Social Services. Mr. Yagaloff suggested the Board should go back and redesign the building, with public input, and use the grant money, but let's move forward. The first idea doesn't have to be the best idea, and in this case it's not. Let's come up with the right idea and get the thing done.

<u>Paul Anderson, 89 Main Street, Broad Brook</u>: Mr. Anderson felt people were missing the concept of multi-generational. He noted Parks and Rec does a lot with youths and other people, and it's multi-generational. It makes sense to have these 3 concepts in one place, because they all work with all the people all the time. This is not a Senior/Social Services mindset, this is multi-generational. Mr. Anderson suggested to him that was the key item.

Rand Stanley, 87 Rye Street: Mr. Stanley indicated he would like to see some numbers, he didn't feel that was an unreasonable request. Mr. Stanley would like to see what's been spent, what's proposed to be spent, the costs that have occurred thus far, proposed costs, and what the increase in the mill rate will be with increased Staff, and the operational costs of that building. Mr. Stanley didn't feel that was a tough request.

<u>James Barton</u>, 108 South Water Street: Mr. Barton suggested the Social Services Director and the Parks and Rec Director was the same person. What will we do, cut her in half?

Tom Lansner, 27 Laurel Circle: Mr. Lansner recalled that some people heard the Deputy Police Chief make a very compelling discussion of the Youth Services Bureau and how valuable this Community Center would be to serve the youth of the community that don't necessarily have that kind of place to go now. Mr. Lansner suggested he was impressed with his honesty and passion for having this center to be built to serve that portion of our residents. Mr. Lansner suggested the

Passcode: townhall MEETING MINUTES

discussion may be available under a meeting recording, and noted it's worth hearing, as it adds another dimension of service that facility will provide.

First Selectman Bowsza offered both the in-person audience and the remote participants an opportunity to comment; no one requested to be acknowledged.

### 4. ADJOURNMENT:

First Selectman Bowsza called for a motion to close the Public Hearing.

MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Muska moved/Nordell seconded/DISCUSSION: None

VOTE:

In Favor: DeSousa/Baker/Muska/Nordell

(No one opposed/No abstentions)

First Selectman Bowsza acknowledge the Public Hearing adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,	
Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Board of Selectmen	

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. First Selectman's POWERPOINT
- B. Resident requested attachment Tracyzk.
- C. Resident requested attachment DeLisa
- D. Resident requested attachment Dove
- E. Resident requested attachment Lynn Stanley
- F. Resident requested attachment Jack Mannette

# Updated options for Congressionally Directed Funding(CDS) Award

Community Center Renovation and Expansion Updated February 16, 2023

### Project Details, Costs, and Other Factors

- Updated Project Cost: \$4,720,000
- Estimate provided by independent third-party professional estimator
- Project cost includes architecture/engineering costs already spent, reimbursable by federal grant
- 55% of project costs covered by federal grant
- \$2,596,000
- \$1.2 Million local match <u>already encumbered</u>
- Project Balance: \$924,000

### American Rescue Plan Act (Option 1)

- Municipal Balance on Hand: Approximately \$2 million
- Balance is unrestricted it can be used for any purpose traditionally provided by a government\*
- Utilization of funds should follow the normal appropriations process
- Use of ARPA would leave approximately \$1.2 million available for other municipal purposes

\*The American Rescue Plan Act precludes funds to be used for tax relief, to pay down pension obligations, to pay down debt, or to replenish fund balances

# Gravel Pit Solar

- In addition to an annual payment in lieu of taxes, Gravel Pit Solar is required to pay an additional \$1.5 million to the
- Additional payment is specifically for infrastructure improvements
- Commitment of funds should follow the normal appropriations process

## General Fund Appropriation or Bonding

- The Town could appropriate the balance needed out of the **Fund Balance**
- If the Town appropriated the balance, there would still be 16.76% in the Fund Balance
- Established Town policy requires the Fund Balance to be at 10% - 20%
- The Town could bond the balance needed.
- The borrowing costs would be a significant percentage of the amount borrowed due to the small amount of funding necessary

### BOARD OF SELECTMEN - 2/16/2023

### CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING OPTIONS PUBLIC HEARING

### RESIDENT REQUESTED ATTACHMENT

From: Contact form at East Windsor CT < cmsmailer@civicplus.com>

Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2023 2:56 PM To: Jason Bowsza < ibowsza@eastwindsorct.com >

Subject: [East Windsor CT] Scout Hall Community Center Project (Sent by Julie

Traczyk, jatraczyk@yahoo.com)

**MEETING MINUTES** 

Hello jbowsza,

Julie Traczyk (jatraczyk@yahoo.com) has sent you a message via your contact form (https://www.eastwindsor-ct.gov/user/50/contact) at East Windsor CT.

If you don't want to receive such e-mails, you can change your settings at https://www.eastwindsor-ct.gov/user/50/edit.

### Message:

Jason -- I am unable to attend the Public Hearing tomorrow night regarding the Scout Hall Community Center Project. I would like you to know that I am 100% behind this project. It is something this town definitely needs. I've been to the senior center and it is certainly not an ideal place to congregate. I think the center will provide much for the town as in more community events, space for more adult activities and classes etc. It is a worthwhile project.

You have my total support and vote in the next round.

Sincerely, Julie Traczyk

20 Wapping Road, East Windsor, CT.

TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
PUBLIC HEARING
CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING OPTIONS
February 16, 2023
In-Person AND
ZOOM Teleconference
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563
Passcode: townhall
MEETING MINUTES

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN - 2/16/2023** 

CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING OPTIONS PUBLIC HEARING RESIDENT REQUESTED ATTACHMENT  ${\cal C}$ 

From: Jason Bowsza < jason.bowsza@gmail.com > Date: February 15, 2023 at 11:30:58 AM EST
To: Jason Bowsza < jbowsza@eastwindsorct.com > Subject: John DeLisa comments re: Scout Hall

Hello members of the BOS, I am sending you my thoughts and concerns here about the proposed scout hall community center that you are fully invested in with your dedication to bringing the best that can be afforded to the town in providing better services to the community. I believe that the seniors in our town, those of whom I am becoming one of, need a more accessible and equipped facility in which to visit and enjoy with our older peers. The broad brook fire department also needs the full use of the building that is currently being shared by the firefighters and the senior citizens who have been going there for the past years in the space above the fire department. Both of these issues need a solution that can work not only for them but for the town itself. My concern about the proposed costs for achieving the success in both is this. In being told, it will only cost the amount of money that has been said it would to accomplish all the building improvements to the scout hall facility, then that is what I will expect. If there is a possibility as in many building projects, it could go over budget. I can accept that as well but only if I can be told where the additional funding will be coming from before the ceremonial shovel hits the dirt. I will not accept anything less than what I have been told and / or promised by the BOS in this proposed project. I have never had an issue paying the property taxes for my home and vehicle's living here in East windsor since 2008. It's a beautiful place to live, and I gladly support the town in all its efforts in keeping this wonderful area to enjoy. What I can not support is being told / promised one thing and getting something completely different. Be careful in trying to keep moving forward with this project. Do not mislead the people of the town with financial figures that you can not control when it comes to the unknown. If you can't guarantee an amount that you promise, then at least explain the possibility of additional funding and where

TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
BOARD OF SELECTMEN
PUBLIC HEARING
CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING OPTIONS
February 16, 2023
In-Person AND
ZOOM Teleconference
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563
Passcode: townhall
MEETING MINUTES

exactly that will be coming from. If you can't deliver either then I suggest you don't do it all. I will repeat my original statement, I only expect what I have been told/ promised and nothing more or nothing less.. Thank you, john delisa 53 scantic Road. Sent from my iPhone

From: William Dove william.dove@hey.com Subject: Fwd: Average construction costs Date: February 16, 2023 at 3:36 PM To: Florence Dove mdove9@cox.net



Mick

a handful of copies, please

Attachment D

Bill

----- Forwarded message ------

From: Rand & Lynn Stanley <lynnstanley33@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Feb 16, 2023 at 12:06 PM Subject: Fwd: Average construction costs To: William Dove <william.dove@hey.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Stanley, Rand < RStanley@townofcantonct.org >

Date: Thu, Feb 16, 2023 at 11:41 AM Subject: Average construction costs

To: Willian.dove@hey.com < Willian.dove@hey.com >

Cc: Lynnstanley33@gmail.com < Lynnstanley33@gmail.com >

Mr. Dove,

The answer to your question regarding regional "averaged" construction costs are derived from the International Code Councils Building Valuation Data February 2021. This information is updated by this recognized body and developed for the various regions across the country. I have attached some light reading for your perusal.

Canton

I have established a cost per square foot the construction type and use or occupancy based on the limited knowledge of the proposed project. See below.

Following the chart provided by the ICC we establish a construction cost that varies due to construction type (materials) as between \$204.02 (high) per square foot and \$140.89 (low) per square foot. Average cost \$172.46 (midrange) per square foot

This is using the A-3 designation of use and occupancy (Assembly, general, community halls).

Using the B designation of use and occupancy (Business, Offices) provides for a cost per square foot as between \$212.46 (high) per square foot and \$144.35 (low) per square foot. Average cost \$178.46 (midrange) per square foot.

Note: The first paragraph on the second page of the attachment clearly establishes the cost calculation is not intended to apply to alterations or repairs. However, your description of the proposed project with the estimated projected, estimated costs far exceed any reasonable expense for a project of this scope. I trust this information is sufficient for your purposes. Be safe.

Rand D. Stanley

Building Official

Town of Canton

5 M. LION # = #666 / pt



BVD-BSJ-FEB21.pdf



### **Building Valuation Data – FEBRUARY 2021**

The International Code Council is pleased to provide the following Building Valuation Data (BVD) for its members. The BVD will be updated at six-month intervals, with the next update in August 2021. ICC strongly recommends that all jurisdictions and other interested parties actively evaluate and assess the impact of this BVD table before utilizing it in their current code enforcement related activities.

The BVD table provides the "average" construction costs per square foot, which can be used in determining permit fees for a jurisdiction. Permit fee schedules are addressed in Section 109.2 of the 2021 International Building Code (IBC) whereas Section 109.3 addresses building permit valuations. The permit fees can be established by using the BVD table and a Permit Fee Multiplier, which is based on the total construction value within the jurisdiction for the past year. The Square Foot Construction Cost table presents factors that reflect relative value of one construction classification/occupancy group to another so that more expensive construction is assessed greater permit fees than less expensive construction.

ICC has developed this data to aid jurisdictions in determining permit fees. It is important to note that while this BVD table does determine an estimated value of a building (i.e., Gross Area x Square Foot Construction Cost), this data is only intended to assist jurisdictions in determining their permit fees. This data table is not intended to be used as an estimating guide because the data only reflects average costs and is not representative of specific construction.

This degree of precision is sufficient for the intended purpose, which is to help establish permit fees so as to fund code compliance activities. This BVD table provides jurisdictions with a simplified way to determine the estimated value of a building that does not rely on the permit applicant to determine the cost of construction. Therefore, the bidding process for a particular job and other associated factors do not affect the value of a building for determining the permit fee. Whether a specific project is bid at a cost above or below the computed value of construction does not affect the permit fee because the cost of related code enforcement activities is not directly affected by the bid process and results.

### **Building Valuation**

The following building valuation data represents average valuations for most buildings. In conjunction with IBC Section 109.3, this data is offered as an aid for the building official to determine if the permit valuation is underestimated. Again it should be noted that, when using this data, these are "average" costs based on typical construction methods for each occupancy group and type of construction. The average costs include foundation work, structural and nonstructural building components, electrical, plumbing, mechanical and interior finish material. The data is a national average and does not take into account any regional cost differences. As such, the use of Regional Cost Modifiers is subject to the authority having jurisdiction.

### **Permit Fee Multiplier**

Determine the Permit Fee Multiplier:

- 1. Based on historical records, determine the total annual construction value which has occurred within the jurisdiction for the past year.
- 2. Determine the percentage (%) of the building department budget expected to be provided by building permit revenue.

Bldg. Dept. Budget x (%) Permit Fee Multiplier = Total Annual Construction Value

### Example

The building department operates on a \$300,000 budget, and it expects to cover 75 percent of that from building permit fees. The total annual construction value which occurred within the jurisdiction in the previous year is \$30,000,000.

#### **Permit Fee**

The permit fee is determined using the building gross area, the Square Foot Construction Cost and the Permit Fee Multiplier.

Permit Fee = Gross Area x Square Foot Construction Cost X Permit Fee Multiplier

### Example

Type of Construction: IIB 1st story = 8,000 sq. ft.2nd story = 8,000 sq. ft.Height: 2 stories Permit Fee Multiplier = 0.0075 Use Group: B

Gross area:

- Business = 2 stories x 8,000 sq. ft. = 16,000 sq. ft.
- Square Foot Construction Cost: B/IIB = \$188.18/sq. ft.
- Permit Fee: Business = 16,000 sq. ft. x \$188.18/sq. ft x 0.0075 = \$22,582

**Important Points** 

The BVD is not intended to apply to alterations or repairs to existing buildings. Because the scope of alterations or repairs to an existing building varies so greatly, the Square Foot Construction Costs table does not reflect accurate values for that purpose. However, the Square Foot Construction Costs table can be used to determine the cost of an addition that is basically a stand-alone building which happens to be attached to an existing building. In the case of such additions, the only alterations to the existing building would involve the attachment of the addition to the existing building and the openings between the addition and the existing building.

- For purposes of establishing the Permit Fee Multiplier, the estimated total annual construction value for a given time period (1 year) is the sum of each building's value (Gross Area x Square Foot Construction Cost) for that time period (e.g., 1 year).
- The Square Foot Construction Cost does not include the price of the land on which the building is built. The Square Foot Construction Cost takes into account everything from foundation work to the roof structure and coverings but does not include the price of the land. The cost of the land does not affect the cost of related code enforcement activities and is not included in the Square Foot Construction Cost.

### Square Foot Construction Costs a, b, c

Group (2018 International Building Code)	IA	IB	IIA	IIB	IIIA	IIIB	IV	VA	VB
A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	263.06	254.15	247.55	237.53	223.05	216.60	229.90	207.42	199.94
A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	241.02	232.11	225.51	215.49	201.01	194.56	207.86	185.38	177.89
A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	205.93	199.80	194.89	186.91	176.19	171.34	180.27	159.46	154.02
A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	204.93	198.80	192.89	185.91	174.19	170.34	179.27	157.46	153.02
A-3 Assembly, churches	243,83	234.92	228.32	218.30	204.21	198.79	210.67	188.58	181.10
A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	204.02	195.11	187.51	178.49	163.01	157.56	170.86	147.38	140.89
A-4 Assembly, arenas	240.02	231.11	223.51	214.49	199.01	193.56	206.86	183.38	176.89
B Business	212.46	204.72	197.90	188.18	171.81	165.32	180.77	151.15	144.35
E Educational	222.69	214.99	208.81	199.81	186.17	176.74	192.93	162.78	157.80
F-1 Factory and industrial, moderate hazard	125.58	119.68	112.86	108.68	97.37	92.83	104.02	80.23	75.34
F-2 Factory and industrial, low hazard	124.58	118.68	112.86	107.68	97.37	91.83	103.02	80.23	74.34
H-1 High Hazard, explosives	117.37	111.47	105.65	100.47	90.40	84.87	95.81	73.27	N.P.
H234 High Hazard	117.37	111.47	105.65	100.47	90.40	84.87	95.81	73.27	67.37
H-5 HPM	212.46	204.72	197.90	188.18	171.81	165.32	180.77	151.15	144.35
I-1 Institutional, supervised environment	211.58	204.34	198.27	190.28	175.02	170.20	190.53	156.95	152.25
I-2 Institutional, hospitals	355.95	348.21	341.39	331.67	314.48	N.P.	324.26	293.82	N.P.
I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	247.27	239.53	232.71	222.99	207.36	N.P.	215.58	186.70	N.P.
I-3 Institutional, restrained	241.59	233.85	227.03	217.31	202.46	194.97	209.90	181.80	173.00
I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	211.58	204.34	198.27	190.28	175.02	170.20	190.53	156.95	152.25
M Mercantile	153.55	147.41	141.50	134.53	123.48	119.63	127.88	106.75	102.31
R-1 Residential, hotels	213.59	206.35	200.28	192.29	176.78	171.95	192.54	158.70	154.00
R-2 Residential, multiple family	179.04	171.80	165.73	157.74	143.25	138.43	157.99	125.18	120.47
R-3 Residential, one- and two-family <sup>d</sup>	166.68	162.17	157.99	154.10	149.61	144.19	151.48	138.79	130.58
R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	211.58	204.34	198.27	190.28	175.02	170.20	190.53	156.95	152.25
S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	116.37	110.47	103.65	99.47	88.40	83.87	94.81	71.27	66.37
S-2 Storage, low hazard	115.37	109.47	103.65	98.47	88.40	82.87	93.81	71.27	65.37
U Utility, miscellaneous	89.90	84.75	79.27	75.71	67.97	63.50	72.24	53.83	51.28

a. Private Garages use Utility, miscellaneous

c. N.P. = not permitted

b. For shell only buildings deduct 20 percent

d. Unfinished basements (Group R-3) = \$23.20 per sq. ft.



East Windsor Hearing
Community Center Funding
Thursday, February 16, 2023 - to be added to the RECORD of meeting minutes

On November 14, 2021, under the Freedom of Information Act I sent an email to the First Selectman's office requesting estimates, invoices, bids, legal costs, requests for proposals, and all monies spent concerning the Town of East Windsor proposed Community Center referenced in the November 8, 2022, Referendum Question #2. As of today, three months later, I still have not received a response to what I consider a fairly easy question. Should there not be an accurate and detailed accounting of how our taxpayer's dollars are spent? Why isn't anyone keeping track of how our tax dollars are spent? This information should be readily available and should not be difficult to provide considering the spending occurred within the past 10 months.

On another note, I do support a "community center" which would be available for everyone. However, town offices should not be relocated to the "community center". It appears this expansion is all about town offices and not the Seniors, youth, or Community. The proposed "multigeneration expansion" would *eliminate* certain budget line items such as senior services. Monies would be consolidated and distributed by the director without taxpayer input. The "trickle-down" effect of moving town offices will increase taxes. Growing governmental programs and services without economic development and growth will burden the taxpayer.

No one has proven that the building footprint of what currently exists at Scout Hall is not adequate for the Seniors, Youth Services, community events, and town meetings without spending \$5 million dollars. Yes, remodeling and updates would be needed but those costs are substantially less than what is being proposed. How many Seniors actually use the Senior Center? How many kids use the after-school services that Park & Rec offers?

The plan to expand the current building to build around the perimeter makes no sense. Ask any builder and they can confirm by expanding out from the back of the building and adding three walls would be more cost-effective. However, the current building has four good size conference rooms, a state of art huge kitchen, and a huge community room. The current building may need some updates but not \$2.5 million worth of updates. The building today is more than adequate to accommodate the seniors, youth, community meetings, public hearings, and other events.

In light of the Planning and Zoning meeting regarding the plan to install sidewalks to connect Main Street, Depot, Perri, Reservoir, Windsorville Road, Old Ellington, and Rye Street, it would make sense to build on the Kogut property that we already own. If we have a complete walking route with sidewalks surrounding the Kogut property and the town Reservoir Park it would make sense to have a community center there! Additionally, the residents at Park Hill and surrounding neighborhoods could walk to the community center. Possibly we can even bring the trolly train through town to a central location where events can take place.

Lastly, we need to promote economic development and bring new businesses into our community. By building on economic development, we can grow our grand list and reduce taxes. ARPA funds and grants should be invested in our infrastructure to improve our roads and drainage. We need to expand sewer and water lines so businesses will want to invest in our community. Additionally, many homeowners may want to connect to these services.

Remember, on November 8<sup>th</sup> more than half of the voters said "NO" to spending \$5 million dollars to renovate scout hall.

Respectfully, Lynn Stanley 87 Rye Street Broad Brook, CT 06016

### BOARD OF SELECTMEN - 2/15/2023 -

### RESIDENT REQUESTED ATTACHMENT – JACK MANNETTE



**East Windsor Hearing Community Center Funding** Thursday, February 16, 2023

### The Rest of the Story

East Windsor's 1st Selectman Et al, have pulled the wool over taxpayers' eyes with regard to converting our Scout Youth Hall into a "Community Center". During the 2020/2021 budget work shop, without explanation, they increased the Public Works "Professional Services" budget by \$100,000. Burying \$100,000 in an account that averaged \$15,000 a year without any public discussion, is a serious lack of transparency. Nowhere, in any public meeting minutes can you find an explanation as to why \$100,000 was added to the Public Works annual budget request AFTER, the Finance Board initially approved a lower budget! (See BOF Budget Workshop Minutes of April 7, 2021) Adding \$100,000 deserved public input! The first public indication of how these funds were spent, was during a June 2, 2022, presentation of Architectural and Building Plans by our 1st Selectman. to convert our <u>leased Scout Hall into a "Community Center with Town Offices</u>. After the November ballot rejection, an FOI request was made requesting all relevant information, communications and costs associated with this proposal. To date, no response has come forth! Maybe, it's because, the 1st Selectman, Et al pursued this project on their own?

The time is right to support creating a "Community Multigenerational Center". A center that can be used for Board and Town Meetings, Community & Town Gatherings including Senior Services. NOT TOWN OFFICES! In this past weekend's Journal Inquirer, our PZC announced its intention to install sidewalks along a 2.5-mile safe pedestrian access loop on Reservoir Ave, Rye Street, Windsorville Road and Old Ellington Road. This effort supports development of Town owned Kogut acreage on the corner of Windsorville Rd. and Reservoir Ave. Seniors could walk to a new "Community Center" from Park Hill. Maybe this would help increase the 20 or so Seniors that currently utilize our current Senior Center.

East Windsor can utilize the \$2.7 million-dollar Federal Grant Community Center funds with the \$1.2 million of taxpayer monies put in reserve from last year. Utilizing these funds, plus ARPA money, earmarked to rebuild the Reservoir Park Pavilion and other Recreation projects would be better directed to building a dedicated "Community Center" in Broad Brook.

Jack Mannette 15 Old Ellington Road Broad Brook 860-916-6272