

TOLLAND BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hicks Municipal Center
Council Chambers
Tolland, CT 06084

REGULAR MEETING

7:30 – 10:00 P.M.

AGENDA
September 27, 2017

VISION STATEMENT

To represent education at its best, preparing each student for an ever-changing society, and becoming a full community of learning where excellence is achieved through each individual's success.

A. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting – September 13, 2017

C. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (2-minute limit)

The members of the Tolland Board of Education welcome members of the public to share their thoughts and ideas at this time. When appropriate to do so, members of the Board and the administration may respond to comments during "Points of Information". However, in consideration of those in attendance and in an effort to proceed in a timely manner, follow-up discussion may need to take place outside of the meeting setting.

D. POINTS OF INFORMATION

E. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES' REPORT - Alexandra Simon and Mallory Goldsmith.

F. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

- F.1 Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot
- F.2 New Paraprofessional Positions
- F.3 Policy 4144 – Criminal Justice Fingerprint Retention Policy
- F.4 Policy 4041 – Social Networking
- F.5 2017 – 2018 Budget Update (No Enclosure)

G. COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

H. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

I. BOARD ACTION

J. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (2-minute limit)

Comments must be limited to items on this agenda.

K. POINTS OF INFORMATION

L. CORRESPONDENCE

Town Council Meeting- September 12, 2017

Town Council Special Meeting – September 14, 2017

M. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

N. NEW BUSINESS

O. ADJOURNMENT

TOLLAND BOARD OF EDUCATION

Hicks Memorial Center
Council Chambers
Tolland, CT 06084

REGULAR MEETING – September 13, 2017

Members Present: Mr. Sam Adlerstein, Chair; Ms. Colleen Yudichak, Vice Chair; Ms. Kathy Gorsky, Secretary; Ms. Michelle Harrold, Ms. Karen Moran, Mr. Jeff Schroeder, Ms. Susan Seaver, and Mr. Bob Pagoni.

Administrators Present: Dr. Walter Willett, Superintendent of Schools

A. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Adlerstein called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. A moment of silence was observed for those impacted by the school shooting in Spokane, WA.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- **Regular Meeting –August 23, 2017**
Ms. Gorsky motioned to approve the minutes of the August 23rd regular meeting. Ms. Yudichak seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.
- **Special Meeting - September 6, 2017**
Ms. Gorsky motioned to approve the minutes of the September 6th special meeting. Ms. Harrold seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

C. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Brenda Falusi, 4 Laurel Ridge Road, thanked the Board for continuing to examine the budget and being ready and able to respond to anything the State provides. With this ever-changing budget, she asked what the plans are to keep the sustainability in the schools and what will be done to help keep things moving forward with the plans. Further, she asked how the BOE could partner with the Town Council and the residents for support.

D. POINTS OF INFORMATION

Mr. Pagoni noted that the referendum will not be held as previously scheduled on September 19th. On September 26th, the Town Council will set the referendum for October 30, 2017. Additionally, a joint meeting of the Town Council/BOE will be held on Sept 19th at 7PM in Council Chambers.

E. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES' REPORT – Alexandra Simon and Mallory Goldsmith

- The first school dance had good attendance and support.
 - The first official Student Council meeting has not yet taken place but it appears that there will be a lot of freshmen involvement.
 - The Student Council will have a booth at Celebrate Tolland.
 - The Student Council will assist with tomorrow night's Open House event.
 - It was noted that there are a few foreign exchange students in the school system and they are a great addition.
 - A bottle drive for Project Graduation is taking place at Birch Grove this weekend
- Mr. Adlerstein reviewed the student representatives' role to the Board which includes representing the students' voice. The Board values the representatives speaking their convictions. Ms. Gorsky is the Student Representative Liaison.

F. SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT

F.1. Custodian Contract (No Enclosure)

An Executive Session was added to the agenda as item N1.

Mr. Pagoni motioned to move item F1 to the Executive Session, item N1. Mr. Schroeder seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

F.2. Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot (No Enclosure)

Dr. Willett distributed a copy of a portion of the Tolland Professional Development Evaluation Plan to the members for review. The entire document, including this amendment, has been submitted to the state. The Professional Development Committee in each school system is responsible for the creation and upkeep the respective district's plan. The Committee in Tolland is the PDEC. The Committee reviews all elements of professional development and evaluation for both the administration and the teachers and has worked for over a year on this revision. The revision is known as Category 3 (Student Outcomes and Achievement) to teachers and comprises 45% of each teacher's evaluation. This section has been rewritten so there is both a traditional SOA and also a pilot SOA. The traditional SOA has teachers setting data-driven goals. One of the limitations of this methodology is that if a teacher chooses a rigorous goal with risk, if he/she does not hit that goal by even a small number, he/she would be deemed a "developing educator". In turn, some teachers were wary of selecting goals that may be difficult to achieve. The amendment is designed to emphasize progress monitoring. In turn, if a teacher sets rigorous goals and does everything professionally in their power and within the available resources to achieve the goal and still falls short and if the progress monitoring behaviors were all "effective" or "exemplary" then the teacher will receive the "effective" or "exemplary" rating. The State has reviewed and approved the document in full. The full plan is posted on the Dashboard. Dr. Willett requested that the Board motion to accept this August 18th version of the Teacher Evaluation Plan and the amendments to the Plan.

A discussion took place. Mr. Pagoni expressed concern that this is the first time the Board is seeing this document and the members need time to review and evaluate it. It is not something that can just be "rubber stamped". Mr. Adlerstein inquired what would happen if the Plan is not approved this evening. Dr. Willett explained that the Teacher Evaluation Plan cannot officially go forward, even with the State's approval (occurred in late August), until the Plan has Board approval. It was noted that this document is in regard to procedure and not spending. Some members of the Board commented that they would like the opportunity to ask questions after reading and studying the document and a discussion on whether to hold the vote until the next meeting took place. Dr. Willett encouraged the Board to do what it believes would be right. Mr. Adlerstein requested that as a point of process that such information be brought to the Board sooner via a posting on the Dashboard when possible. Mr. Adlerstein recommended voting on the Plan this evening and adding it to the next meeting's agenda for discussion to address any questions.

Ms. Harrold motioned to move item F2 to item I1 for action. Mr. Pagoni seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

F.3. 2017-2018 Budget Update (No Enclosure)

Mr. Adlerstein explained that there is a lot of speculation regarding revenues and how the State's budget may change. Historically, Tolland received \$10.8M in ECS revenue but now there is uncertainty and they are unsure as to when they will have the information. Rather than speculate on the revenues, the Board has asked Dr. Willett to discuss the expenditures and their impact on operating the district on the current budget level and what is necessary for the district to be sustainable if it is not so now.

Dr. Willett explained that the district is at a place with the plan where it can sustain the Lighthouse Model and keep the school system healthy and strong for the Town. The current \$38,340,608 plan for the budget is strong and made significant concessions. The adopted budget of \$40,175,960 (2.14%) was \$1.8M more. The current budget allows the district to keep the Lighthouse concept in place, keeps the school system competitive with magnets and charters, and allows the district to provide every child with a positive and strong education.

In regard to where to go from the \$38,340,608 planned budget, Dr. Willett explained that there has been a loss of SRBI and RTI resources and this is a significant challenge. He would like to try to build these programs in order to assist students in the general population. When asked if he would still want the adopted 2.14% budget if the State provided the money, he explained that he would so he could build these programs in K-5 with reading and math interventionists (4 staff positions at a cost of approximately \$200K).

Dr. Willett noted that the district has great SAT scores and is well above state averages in regard to assessments but the effect of the loss of the SRBI and RTI programs is showing and will continue to be reflected in the assessments in a couple of areas when looking at the aggregate data.

It was noted that Dr. Willett fears that there may be more reductions. The first referendum vote will likely be October 30th and the next, if necessary, may be on November 13th. If he had to make significant reductions at that time it would be chaotic. Mr. Adlerstein added that due to staff reductions, a lot of work has fallen on administrators' shoulders and there is a risk of burning people out.

Ms. Harrold inquired as to where the district is exactly in regard to the budget.

Dr. Willett distributed the "Budget Adjustment Information" document which presents information in a chronological format. Dr. Willett noted that the information contained is purely speculative since there is no budget. The last column reflects his best guess given the discussions of the September 12th Town Council meeting where a BOE budget of \$37,904,703 was a possibility. Mr. Adlerstein noted that this number is based on more speculation and will not be discussed this evening. Dr. Willett commented that this may be brought up at the joint TC/BOE meeting on Tuesday. Town Council Liaison Paul Krasusky noted that this discussion was deferred to the joint meeting and he does not support this. Dr. Willett explained the \$435K difference which drives the last column is in regard to the discussion of teacher pensions.

Dr. Willett explained that he is presenting the information to the Board as was requested. Mr. Adlerstein requested that the document be posted on the website without the last column.

Mr. Adlerstein explained that at the joint meeting they will discuss the impact of the \$1M reduction under which the district is operating and what it would look like if there were slightly more/less revenue available.

G. COMMITTEE AND LIAISON REPORTS

Negotiations – The custodians' contract will be discussed at this evening's Executive Session and the Committee will open the paraprofessionals' contract back up in a couple of weeks.

Town Council – Mr. Pagoni commented that during the public session, a resident spoke up and said that at one of the BOE meetings there was a discussion of \$24K or so and it was glossed over as it was not much money and

that is why it was not included. The resident did not feel that this was appropriate. Mr. Pagoni spoke to someone else in regard to the \$24K, which is a lot of money, and noted that the funds were in regard to bringing students in from other school systems and the money was not included in the budget because there was not a guarantee that it would be actualized. He asked Dr. Willett if this was the case.

Dr. Willett explained that he is guessing this discussion was in regard to the Open Choice program. There is a document on this which includes all of the data including a 5 year projection on the website and it has been discussed a number of times. When they went into the school year, they did not know until the last week or two how many Tolland students from Hartford the district would have. Dr. Willett noted that there are 3 Tolland students from Hartford and there are funds to come to Tolland associated with those students. By the end of the year the district will realize between \$22K and \$24K. The district is where it expected to be in regard to this item. Mr. Pagoni inquired if these funds have been included in the budget. Dr. Willett explained that they were not able to plan on these funds since they did not know how many students would actually attend and remain enrolled. The financial information is available in the document on the website. He is encouraged to know that people feel that the \$22K-\$24K is significant since there was a concern at the beginning of the process that Open Choice would take away from the district. He added that the district is fortunate to have these young students in the district and they are part of the Tolland School Community. He has heard nothing but great things and is proud of everyone involved.

Mr. Pagoni added that he commented at the Town Council meeting that the Board is glad that it was able to get together with those who could not make it to the meeting last week and the Board would like to continue to have a good relationship with the Town Council.

Mr. Krasusky highlighted Mr. Pagoni's comment. In regard to the gentleman in question, he severely misinterpreted the definition of what Dr. Willett was attempting to elaborate on in regard to the \$24K. Mr. Krasusky added that unfortunately there is an inordinately large contingency of people in town who want to "ah ha gotcha" and see them as greedy politicians who are hiding money. Mr. Krasusky does not understand it or know where it comes but he believes this is what Mr. Pagoni was referring to. The gentleman interpreted Dr. Willett's comment during the presentation in the auditorium regarding the \$24K and heard it as the \$24K is not part of the budget and is only \$24K and does not matter.

Mr. Pagoni added that the Town Council ran its last meeting more like the Board does and people walked away knowing they got buy-in and Mr. Pagoni was pleased to see this.

H. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT - none

I. BOARD ACTION

I.1. Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot

Ms. Harrold motioned to accept and approve the updated Tolland Public School Professional Development Plan dated August 18, 2017. Ms. Moran seconded the motion. Mr. Adlerstein, Ms. Yudichak, Ms. Gorsky, Mr. Schroeder, Ms. Harrold, and Ms. Seaver were in favor. Mr. Pagoni abstained. Motion carried.

J. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Brenda Falusi, 4 Laurel Ridge Road, thanked the Board for having the vote. She recalled when Dr. Willett discussed the issue when he was at TMS and is familiar with it and is encouraged by the overview of the changes. She noted that she attended the 8th grade curriculum night. It was apparent that the teachers are fully

invested in the students and want to challenge the kids and themselves. What the Board approved will help the teachers succeed with the kids and their own professional development.

Chris Plourd, 101 Metcalf Road, inquired about the \$38,340,608 budget and asked if it is sustainable and will be published. Further, when the \$38,340,608 budget is published, will the Open Choice number of \$24K be included? Lastly, she asked if the 4 pages of the Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot will be accessible to the public. Dr. Willett, in response to the last question, noted that he will make it, and/or the entire plan if desired, available to anyone who asks. It can be loaded to the web-site but the overall plan would be a large document to download.

Paul Krasusky, 26 Susan Drive and speaking as a resident, commented that he also attended the curriculum night at TMS and shared that listening about the consolidation of going down to one LA teacher for all the grades and hearing from his children of the large class sizes, that the tangible impacts are noticed and felt. He hopes there is not further regression and thanked the Board members for their efforts.

Deidre Goldsmith, 21 Marlboro Glade, commented in regard to SRBI and RTI. She believes that taking that away, as seen in other districts, would cause percentages and expenses to increase. Dr. Willett noted that SRBI/RTI programs were designed to *reduce* the number of students referred to Special Education. Without strong SRBI/RTI programs there may be more students referred to special education.

Dr. Willett explained that the 0% budget of \$39,333,948 (FY 16/17) is what is currently reflected in the computer system because no one has decided on the actual overall reduction. Thus, all numbers are speculation. When the budget is determined, the detail and line items for the final number will be available. He added that when the budget is available when computing reductions they will not realize the full amount of the certain positions since the salaries will have been partially paid. Mr. Adlerstein explained that one needs to start with last year's budget and add increases such as teacher raises, transportation, and other items and then what has already been reduced which will bring the number to approximately \$38.3M. Dr. Willett will continue to provide any information requested. He has produced 1-page documents in response to past requests. He recommended that they wait until the finalized budget is available before data including object codes are included. Mr. Adlerstein explained that people may be confused seeing a 2.14% budget on the website which is not the reality or what the district is operating upon. People want to see the \$38.3M quantified. Dr. Willett explained that he can post the document that was distributed this evening without the last column as requested. He went on to explain that he is currently working with the 16/17 budget but has frozen virtually everything. Thus they are working with the \$39,333,948 with enough frozen to eliminate and make it \$38,340,608 if that budget is finalized through referendum. The latter is posted on the website with impacts. Mr. Adlerstein requested that the document distributed this evening (Budget Adjustment Information) be posted on the website with general numbers. Mr. Schroeder recommended posting a summary of this information on the page with the 2.14% budget for clarity.

Mr. Pagoni noted that the Town Council asked that the letter that was agreed to at last week's special meeting be "deep sixed".

K. POINTS OF INFORMATION - none

L. CORRESPONDENCE

- Town Council Meeting – August 22, 2017
- Town Council Special Meeting – August 29, 2017

M. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot
- Budget

N. NEW BUSINESS – none

N1 EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Schroeder motioned to go into Executive Session at 8:51PM for the purpose of discussing the Custodian Contract and invited Dr. Willett to attend. Mr. Pagoni seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried. The Board exited the Executive Session at 9:15PM.

Mr. Schroeder motioned to ratify the contract between the UPSEU Local 424 – Unit 27 Tolland BOE Custodians and the Tolland Board of Education for the period from July 1, 2017 through June 20, 2019. Mr. Vachon seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

O. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Pagoni motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:15PM. Mr. Vachon seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Pascuzzi
Clerk

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM: Teacher Evaluation Plan Amendment for Pilot

ITEM SUBMITTED BY: Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent

FOR BOE MEETING: September 27, 2017

ITEM SUMMARY:

The Student Outcomes and Achievement category was updated in the Tolland Public School Professional Development Plan (Teacher Evaluation Plan). This update includes a PILOT “Category 3” section that provides for Teachers to be evaluated both on their acquisition of goals, and on their Progress Monitoring performance. Unlike the “traditional” option that relies only on acquisition of goals, where an educator who has chosen rigorous goals and performed their duties professionally to achieve them yet misses the mark, can be rated below effective – the teacher’s Progress Monitoring practices in this case can serve to override that rating when the teacher is rated as effective or exemplary.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

No financial impact.

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW:

State Approved.

BOE ACTION DESIRED:

Motion: Motion to accept and approve the updated Tolland Public School Professional Development Plan dated 8.18.2017.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

Student Outcomes and Achievement “Pilot” section.

Full TPS Professional Development Plan “Revised” is available upon request.

Student Outcomes and Achievement Category (45%)

CATEGORY 3: Student Outcomes and Achievement (45%)

Teachers are required to develop up to four Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). These are SMART goals related to student growth and development. Forty-Five percent (45%) of a teacher's evaluation will be based on achievement of the SLOs and the fulfillment of effective progress monitoring in relation to those SLOs. SLO(s) shall be aligned with standardized and/or standards based measures.

SLOs or SMART Goals need to be developed based on the past performance of students. Student progress on SLOs is used in conjunction with the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix to evaluate teachers for a rating in Category 3. Multiple and varied assessments may be used as tools to ascertain student progress toward SLOs, including but not limited to formative assessments, unit assessments, standardized assessments (e.g. NWEA), school wide rubrics, analytic rubrics, and student portfolio assignments. Teacher's support of student growth, use of assessments, use of interventions, engagement of stakeholders, and use of other resources to promote student performance are also important.

In this 2017-2018 pilot program, each teacher will be evaluated in Category 3 through two methods. First, each teacher through mutual agreement with their supervising administrator will develop SLOs with specific indicators of academic growth, identified in this plan as Indicators of Success (IOS) based on a student's progress. Successfully achieving the Indicators of Success, and thereby achieving success in the Student Learning Outcome, will provide for a teacher's successful completion of Category 3. To encourage teachers to choose rigorous SLOs, and IOSs, teachers will also be rated on their execution of progress monitoring of student growth in the areas of support, assessment, intervention, stakeholder engagement, and resource utilization. If a teacher does not successfully achieve their IOSs and SLOs at a level that provides an Effective or Exemplary, but receives ratings of 3 or higher from their evaluator on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix on supporting student growth, assessment, intervention, stakeholder engagement, and resource utilization that teacher will receive a Category 3 rating commensurate with the mode (or greatest number) of ratings on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix. For example, if a teacher receives more 3's than 4's on the attributes in the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix, that teacher will receive an "Effective" rating. In this way, if a teacher chooses ambitious student growth goals, works hard to progress monitor and achieve those goals, but does not quite achieve them – and has been observed to do great diligence in supporting student growth, using assessments, using interventions, engaging stakeholders, and using other resources, they will still be identified as Effective or Exemplary based on those efforts in Category 3.

The teacher will, for the student group selected as a focus for their SLOs and IOSs, submit artifacts for the administrator to review both in the Mid-year and End of Year (or semester) conference(s). These artifacts, as well as Reviews of Practice or observations from Category I, will provide the supervisor evidence upon which to establish ratings on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix. The TPS PMM Artifact Form is available in the appendix.

Goal Setting

Each teacher's students, individually and as a group, are different from other teachers' students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. As a result, for student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation purposes, a teacher's own assignment, students, and context will be taken into account.

The student outcome related indicators will be written to meet SMART goal criteria, i.e. Specific/Strategic, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-Bound. A variety of assessments can be provided to students to determine progress but one must be a standardized measure where one is available, and where the data is usable within the scope of the academic year to determine student growth.

SMART Goal(s) and Student Progress

Phase I: Learn about your students this year by examining baseline data

Phase II: Set Smart Goals (Student Learning Outcomes with Indicators of Success to be fulfilled to achieve them). These goals are for student growth and progress and should be completed in cooperation with your administrator. The TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix will be used as a tool by the administrator to ascertain the fidelity of the progress monitoring of these goals.

Phase III. Monitor and demonstrate evidence of progress, support growth, use assessments, implement interventions, engage stakeholders, access resources, and adjust to challenges in the process of helping students reach the established Student Learning Outcomes through as measured by the Indicators of Success identified. This evidence can be provided at Mid-Year, End-of-Year (or mid and end of semester) conferences, as well as collected by the evaluator through Reviews of Practice and/or other observations.

Each SMART goal will:

1. take into account the academic track record and overall needs and strengths of the students that teacher is teaching that year/semester.
2. address the most important purposes of a teacher's assignment.
3. align with school, district, and state student achievement objectives.
4. take into account students' learning needs vis-à-vis relevant baseline data.
5. consider Public School Information System (PSIS) factors.
6. be mutually agreed upon by teacher and their evaluator.
7. be fair, valid, reliable and useful to the greatest extent possible.

SMART GOAL (SLO & IOS) Development

To write meaningful and relevant SMART goals, and execute progress monitoring that aligns to teaching assignments a thorough knowledge the student population is necessary; data analysis is required. Teachers must learn as much as they can about the students they teach and be able to document baseline data that they have used to determine their instructional focus. Analysis of these initial pieces of data on incoming students for the year should be completed by **mid-September** of the academic year (**Phase I**).

Each teacher will write one or two SLO (SMART) goals that will demonstrate student growth and success. Assessment artifacts selected for review should include a variety of assessments that accurately and consistently represent student progress and growth. The SMART goal should include at least one standardized measure that can be used for an indicator of success to determine whether student growth was achieved or not when it is available for the subject area.

If two SLOs are chosen, each goal must have multiple indicators of success. One must have a standardized measure or indicator of success, where available. The SLOs should make clear (1) what evidence was or will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what assessment/indicator will be used to measure the targeted level of performance. The SMART goal(s) can also address student subgroups, such as high- or low-performing students or ELL students. It is through the examination of student performance and growth on summative and progress monitoring measures that teachers will determine the focus and the level of performance to be targeted for their students.

Teachers will submit their SLOs (SMART goals) to their evaluator for review and approval. The review and approval process for SLOs will take place during the Goal-Setting Conference on or before October 15 or November 15 (**Phase II**). A review of what artifacts can be utilized as evidence of the execution of effective and exemplary progress monitoring as evaluated through the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix and Form will be discussed at this time as well.

To ensure that goals are as fair, reliable, valid, and useful to the greatest possible extent, evaluators will review and approve the SLOs based on the following criteria.

- **Focus:** Supporting the School Improvement Plan when feasible.
- **Priority of Content:** SMART goal is deeply relevant to teacher's assignment and addresses the most important purposes of that assignment.
- **Rigor of SMART goal:** SMART goal is attainable, and establishes rigorous growth over a specified time period.
- **Analysis of Student Outcome Data:** SMART goal provides specific, measurable evidence of student learning.

Once the SMART goal(s) are approved, teachers need to monitor progress toward achieving the indicators of success and demonstrating effective and/or exemplary practices (**Phase III**) on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix as measured through an evaluation of artifacts on the TPS PMM Form (appendix).

Teachers may measure and monitor progress through:

1. Examination of student work using rubrics
2. Administering assessments and isolating appropriate indicators
3. Tracking a student's accomplishments through "quick checks", checklists, formative assessments, etc.
4. Adherence to the attributes of the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix

Teachers may choose to share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time. They may also wish to keep their evaluator apprised of progress. Artifacts related to the teacher's monitoring practices can be reviewed and discussed during the Mid-Year or Semester Conference. This review may result in revisions to instructional strategies and/or materials or in a need for professional development. Teachers and evaluators may mutually agree to adjustments to the SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). The Mid-Year Conference will take place by March 1 of the academic year, or Mid-Semester for High School Teachers teaching a semester class.

Student Outcomes and Achievement

Teacher Responsibility – The teacher needs to review all information and data collected during the year and be prepared to review this with the evaluator. The teacher review may involve being prepared to:

1. Provide **at least five students** for which progress monitoring artifacts were collected in this school year to be used in providing ratings for the teacher on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix Form.
2. Provide and discuss **at least five assessment artifacts per student** representing student growth and achievement through the practice of progress monitoring.
3. Describe what was done to support student growth in the progress monitoring process.
4. Describe the personal learning that took place and how it will be used in the future.

End of Year Conference –The teacher and evaluator will discuss the extent to which the learning goals/objectives were met. They will analyze the data and artifacts and review all other pertinent goal information. The teacher's adherence to the attributes of the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix will also be used to rate the demonstration of attributes that facilitated successful student performance and progress toward student learning goals/objectives.

Evaluators will review the teacher's self-reflection and the result(s) of the SLO (SMART) goal(s), review the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix, and assign one of four ratings to the SLO or SMART goal(s): Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point). These ratings are defined as follows:

Exceeded (4)	Exceeded SMART goal(s)
Met (3)	Met the SMART goal(s).
Partially Met (2)	Partially met the goal(s).
Did Not Meet (1)	Did not meet the SMART goals.

The evaluator will then review with the teacher the ratings s/he has derived from the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix and form(s) for which artifacts were provided and evaluated during the year and at the mid-year/semester and end-of-year/semester conference. A rating of Below Standard (1), Developing (2), Effective (3), or Exemplary (4) will be provided to the teacher depending on the mode, or greatest frequency, of ratings in each attribute area, and then the mode of those ratings to provide the final rating. If a teacher has received a Partially Met or Unmet on their SLOs but receives an Effective or Exemplary Rating on the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix mode(s), the teacher will receive the Category 3 rating determined from the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix and forms. If the teacher's SLOs were rated to be "Met" or "Exceeded" the TPS Progress Monitoring Matrix results are considered for the purpose of feedback, but will not negate the SLO ratings.

With regard to the SLOs, the final rating for Category 3: Student Outcomes and Achievement is the average of at least two indicators of success. For example, if one indicator of success was Partially Met, for 2 points, and the other indicator of success was Met, for 3 points, the student growth and development rating would be $[(2+3)/2]$ or 2.5.

The individual SLO (SMART) goal ratings, The TPS Progress Monitoring EOS-EOY Form (Appendix), and the final Student Outcomes and Achievement rating will be shared with teachers before the end of the school year.

Training for Teachers and Evaluators

Creating SMART goal(s) involves making sure:

- Quality measures and indicators are used to determine student growth
- SMART goals fulfill all the parameters for a SMART goal
- SMART goals are rigorous
- The goal includes written plans that articulate the strategies and **progress monitoring tools** teachers will use to achieve their SMART goal(s)

All teachers and evaluators will receive resources to facilitate a knowledgeable approach to the creation and use of SMART goals and analysis and use of data. Should additional training be needed, it will be decided on a case-by-case basis at the school or individual level.

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM: 2.0fte Additional Paraprofessionals

ITEM SUBMITTED BY: Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent

For BOE meeting: September 27, 2017

ITEM SUMMARY:

Two new high needs students moved into district requiring paraprofessional support at TIS.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

Para 1 salary is for the full year at \$12,876.96

Para 1 benefits are \$12,783.52 Insurance is prorated October - June

Para 2 salary is \$12,276.48. Started 9/11/2017

Para 2 benefits are \$10,884.45 Insurance is prorated November - June

Total salary and benefit costs for 2017/2018 are \$48,821.41

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW: [N/A or put in a summary]

BOE ACTION DESIRED: Review for Information

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED: None

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM: New Mandated Policy-Criminal Justice

ITEM SUBMITTED BY: Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent

For BOE meeting: September 27, 2017

ITEM SUMMARY:

The State Department of Criminal Justice is being audited by the Federal Government regarding fingerprinting. As a result, the State has come out with new processes for municipal entities, called "non-criminal background checks." As part of this, policies must be created to accommodate. This policy is being created in response to this situation. Random audits will occur, and being in compliance is necessary.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

District personnel time, locks for cabinets for compliance.

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW:

The policy has been reviewed by Shipman and Goodwin.

BOE ACTION DESIRED: Readings and move to action.

Recommended BOE motion: *Motion to approve policy 4144 Criminal Justice Fingerprint Retention.*

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

Pending Policy 4144

**TOLLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TOLLAND, CONNECTICUT**

BOARD POLICY REGARDING: 4144 CRIMINAL JUSTICE FINGERPRINT RETENTION

NUMBER: 4144

PROPOSED POLICY SECTION TITLE: PERSONNEL

APPROVED [PENDING]

**ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS FOR THE
USE AND DISCLOSURE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION**

Each applicant for a position with the District shall be required to submit to state and national criminal record checks in accordance with the District's Employment Checks Policy and applicable law. In addition, certain volunteers may also be required to submit to state and national criminal record checks in accordance with the District's Volunteers Policy. All results and accompanying information shall be considered "Criminal Justice Information" or "CJI" (each as more fully defined herein) and shall be maintained, used and disclosed in accordance with these regulations.

A. Definition and Scope

For purposes of these regulations:

"*Criminal Justice Information*" or "CJI" means the results of any state or federal criminal records check of an employee, contractor or volunteer, any applicant or prospective employee, contractor or volunteer, and all copies thereof.

"*Criminal Justice Information Officer* or "*CJI Officer*" means the individual appointed by the Superintendent to be responsible for the use, disclosure and safeguarding of CJI in the District, and to serve as the District's primary point of contact for matters relating to CJI and these regulations. The Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection specifies that a Local Agency Security Officer "LASO" and a Terminal Agency Coordinator "TAC" be appointed. The Superintendent has appointed the following personnel:

LASO Officer is the Director of Informational Technology

TAC Officer is the Human Resource Generalist

"*Permitted Individual*" means an individual designated by the Superintendent, or his or her designee, who may access CJI. Permitted Individuals may include, but shall not be limited to, District human resources personnel, certain administrators and certain administrative staff.

These regulations apply to all CJI in the possession or control of the District, in any form or format, including but not limited to CJI incorporated or contained in correspondence, documentation or reports of the District.

B. Responsibility

The Superintendent shall appoint the District CJI Officers as specified by the Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection as "LASO" and "TAC" officers.

C. Requesting Criminal Justice Information

The District shall request CJI from an employee, contractor, applicant or volunteer or potential employee, contractor or volunteer only as permitted or required by law or District policy.

D. Use of Criminal Justice Information

1) The Superintendent, or his/her designee, shall designate those individuals who shall be considered Permitted Individuals for purposes of these regulations. No other District employee or staff person may access or use CJI for any reason without obtaining prior written approval from a CJI Officer or his/her designee. A Permitted Individual shall use CJI only as permitted or required by District policy or law.

2) The District shall ensure that each Permitted Individual satisfies the applicable legal screening requirements prior to granting the Permitted Individual access to CJI, including:

- If the Permitted Individual is a resident of Connecticut, the District shall screen the Permitted Individual through a Connecticut and national fingerprint-based record check within 30 days of designation as a Permitted Individual; or
- If the Permitted Individual is not a resident of Connecticut, the District shall conduct state and national fingerprint-based record checks and follow FBI guidance regarding additional screening requirements.

The CJI Officer may consult with the Connecticut Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection on execution of the screening requirements.

3) The District may immediately terminate a Permitted Individual's access to CJI, with or without cause at the discretion of the Superintendent, CJI Officer, or their designees, and the District shall immediately terminate a Permitted Individual's access to CJI upon termination of the Permitted Individual's employment or contract with the District. The District shall reconsider a Permitted Individual's continued access to CJI upon any reassignment or modification to professional responsibilities.

E. Maintenance and Safeguarding

1) CJI shall be maintained in only the locations, files and information systems designated by the District (the "Controlled Areas"). The Controlled Areas shall be limited to only Permitted Individuals or other authorized personnel and locked when unattended.

2) The District shall restrict access to CJI to only Permitted Individuals. In the event the District determines that it is unable to reasonably restrict access in accordance with this Section, all CJI shall be maintained in encrypted format, in a manner consistent with then-current legal requirements and industry standards.

3) No District employee may remove CJI from a Controlled Area without prior written approval of the CJI Officer. In the event the transport of CJI out of a Controlled Area is necessary for a legitimate function or activity, the CJI Officer shall develop a protocol to ensure the protection the CJI while in transport and while outside of the Controlled Area.

4) The District shall implement the following safeguards for CJI maintained in paper format: (i) maintain paper records in a physically secure location; (ii) post notice of restricted access to paper records; and (iii) utilize an access log or sign-in sheet to record access to paper records.

5) The District shall implement safeguards required by the Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy for CJI maintained in electronic format, including, but not limited to, the following procedures: (i) maintain CJI on secure electronic systems and media; (ii) position information systems in such a way as to prevent unauthorized individuals from accessing and viewing CJI; (iii) store electronic media containing CJI in a secure location; (iv) instituting access controls to limit access to Permitted Individual; (v) validate and authenticate information system users accessing CJI; (vi) develop protocols for configuration management and providing necessary access for system modifications and maintenance; (vii) provide the capability to detect and protect against threats to the integrity of CJI; (viii) develop parameters (including time stamps) for auditing electronic systems containing CJI; and (ix) institute media protection policies and procedures.

F. Disclosure of Criminal Justice Information

1) Permitted Individuals may disclose CJI as follows:

(i) to District employees or staff upon prior written approval of the Superintendent, CJI Officer or their designees when, in their reasonable discretion, such disclosure is reasonably necessary for the performance of District function or policy and is consistent with applicable law;

(ii) to third-party individuals or entities, including but not limited to advisors, attorneys and electronic and hard copy record and storage companies (each a "Recipient") when such disclosure has been approved by the Superintendent, CJI Officer or their designees, and is consistent with applicable law; and

(iii) as required or otherwise permitted by law.

2) The District shall log each instance in which CJI is disclosed pursuant to these regulations.

G. Security Incident Response.

1) For purposes of these regulations, "Security Incident" means the actual or suspected acquisition, access, use, or disclosure of CJI in a manner not permitted by these regulations or applicable law.

2) District employees and staff must immediately report a Security Incident to the CJI "LASO" Officer.

3) The CJI Officer shall investigate, collect relevant evidence and respond to all Security Incidents.

4) The CJI Officer will document each Security Incident, including, but not limited to, the details of the Security Incident, the District's response, the outcome, steps taken to mitigate harm to affected individuals, and any changes to District policies or security procedures to avoid reoccurrence of the Security Incident.

5) The District shall require in writing any Recipients to report to the District any Security Incidents without unreasonable delay after discovery of a Security Incident. The Recipient's notice to the District shall include: (a) the identification of each individual whose CJI has been, or is reasonably believed by the Recipient to have been, accessed, acquired, or disclosed during the Security Incident; and (b) other available information that the District reasonably requests with respect to its investigation or that the

District is required to include in notifications to affected individuals or governmental agencies. The Recipient shall promptly update its original notice to the District as additional information becomes available.

6) The District shall notify affected individuals and/or appropriate government agencies to the extent required by law or as otherwise determined appropriate by the District in its reasonable discretion.

H. Auditing

1) The District shall implement audit and accountability controls to increase the probability of Permitted Individuals conforming to the requirements of these regulations and applicable law. At a minimum, the auditing and accountability controls shall generate sufficient information to establish, with respect to the access, use or dissemination of CJI, what events occurred, the sources of the events and the outcome of the events.

2) The CJI Officer shall review audit reports at least weekly. Audit reports that indicate potential inappropriate activity shall be investigated as a Security Incident in accordance with these regulations.

I. Record Retention

1) The District shall maintain CJI consistent with current record retention laws. Records containing CJI shall be stored for extended periods only when they are key elements for the integrity and/or utility of case files and/or criminal record files.

2) The District shall maintain audit records and any transaction logs for at least one year.

3) The District shall destroy all records containing CJI when the District is no longer required to keep CJI on file.

I. Disposal and Destruction of CJI

1) For paper records containing CJI, destroyed means the records shall be disposed of in a manner that makes the CJI unreadable, indecipherable, and otherwise unable to be reconstructed, including but not limited to shredding or incinerating the records.

2) For electronic media containing CJI, destroyed means the records shall be disposed of or wiped of CJI using one of the following methods: (a) sanitize (electronically overwrite the media with non-sensitive data at least three times), (b) purging (degaussing or exposing the media to a strong magnetic field in order to disrupt the recorded magnetic domains), or (c) for inoperable media, destroying the media (disintegration, pulverization, melting, incinerating, or shredding). In each instance, the method used shall render the CJI unreadable, indecipherable, and otherwise unable to be reconstructed.

3) The destruction of media pursuant to this Section shall be witnessed or carried out only by authorized personnel.

4.) The District shall document the destruction of media pursuant to this Section and the method by which the media was destroyed.

J. Training

1) The District shall provide awareness training and education on these regulations and the use, disclosure and safeguarding of CJI to all District employees and staff persons with access to CJI, in accordance with then-current District training and education policies and procedures, provided that such training shall be provided within six (6) months of initial engagement and no less than biennially thereafter. The District shall document the provision of all training and education provided hereunder.

2) The training shall address those topics required by then-current law or regulatory guidance.

K. Sanctions

Violations of these regulations shall be investigated by the District and may result in discipline or sanctions, up to and including termination of employment, all in accordance with then-current District policies and procedures and applicable collective bargaining rights and obligations.

Legal References:

Conn. Gen. Stat. 10-221d

Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy, Version 5.4, United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, October 6, 2015.

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM: Regulation 4041-Social Networking

ITEM SUBMITTED BY: Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent

For BOE meeting: August 24, 2017

ITEM SUMMARY:

Modifications recommended to Policy 4041 – Social Networking:

SECTION: Rules Concerning District-Sponsored Social Media Activity

1. *If an employee seeks to use social media sites as an educational tool or in relation to extracurricular activities, **sports, and/or** programs of the school district, the employee must seek and obtain the permission of ~~his/her supervisor~~ **of the Superintendent of Schools in writing** prior to setting up the site.*

This will provide better management of Social Media for the district, providing one authority/decision-making point of contact. While the objective will be to provide flexibility, these changes provide better management of the various social media assets.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

N/A

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW:

Legally, provides greater accountability and protection.

BOE ACTION DESIRED:

Complete readings, and move this to the Board as a recommended change to 4041.

Motion: Motion to approve the changes to Policy 4041 – Social Networking, as illustrated in the Superintendent's proposal.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

Policy 4041 – Social Networking

TOLLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Tolland, Connecticut

ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION

REGARDING: USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

Number: 4041
Personnel

Approved: 10/12/11
Revised: 1/25/12

The Board of Education recognizes the importance of social media for its employees, and acknowledges that its employees have the right under the first amendment, in certain circumstances, to speak out on matters of public concern. However, the board will regulate the use of social media by employees, including employees' personal use of social media, when such use:

- 1) interferes with the work of the school district;
- 2) is used to harass coworkers or other members of the school community;
- 3) creates a hostile work environment;
- 4) breaches confidentiality obligations of school district employees,
- 5) disrupts the work of the school district
- 6) harms the goodwill and reputation of the school district in the community; or
- 7) violates the law, board policies and/or other school rules and regulations.

Definitions:

Social media includes, but is not limited to, social networking sites, such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, Youtube, and MySpace.

Board of Education includes all names, logos, buildings, images and entities under the authority of the Board of Education.

Rules concerning personal social media activity

1. An employee may not mention, discuss or reference the Board of Education, the school district or its individual schools, programs or teams on personal social networking sites in a manner that could reasonably be construed as an official school district communication, unless the employee also states that the post is the personal communication of the employee of the school district and that the views posted are the employee's alone and do not represent the views of the school district or the Board of Education.
2. Employees must use caution mentioning other Board of Education employees or other members of the school community (e.g., parents or others) on personal social networking sites, without such individuals' express consent unless the employee is addressing an issue of public concern and the employee's speech falls under applicable constitutional protections pertaining to same. Such postings are outside of the employee's job responsibilities, and employees are subject to potential liability as described in paragraph 6, below.

3. Employees are required to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with students, parents, and colleagues. For example, absent an unrelated special relationship (e.g. relative or family friend), it is not appropriate for a teacher or administrator to “friend” a student or his/her parent or guardian or otherwise establish special relationships with selected students through personal social media, and it is not appropriate for an employee to give students or parents access to personal postings unrelated to school.
4. Unless given written consent, employees may not use the Board of Education’s logo or trademarks on their personal posts. Please note that this prohibition extends to the use of logos or trademarks associated with individual schools, programs or teams of the school district.
5. Employees are required to use appropriately respectful speech in their personal social media posts; and to refrain from harassing, defamatory, abusive, discriminatory, threatening or other inappropriate communications. Such posts reflect poorly on the school district’s reputation, can affect the educational process and may substantially and materially interfere with an employee’s ability to fulfill his/her professional responsibilities.
6. Employees are individually responsible for their personal posts on social media. Employees may be sued by other employees, parents or others, and any individual that views an employee’s social media posts as defamatory, pornographic, proprietary, harassing, libelous or creating a hostile work environment. As such activities are outside the scope of employment, employees may be personally liable for such claims.
7. Employees are required to comply with all Board of Education policies and procedures with respect to the use of district computer equipment, networks or electronic devices when accessing social media sites. Any access to personal social media activities while on school property or using school district equipment must comply with those policies, and may not interfere with an employee’s duties at work.
8. The Board of Education reserves the right to monitor all employee use of district computers and other district electronic devices, including employee blogging and social networking activity. An employee should have no expectation of personal privacy in any personal communication or post made through social media while using district computers, cellular telephones or other electronic data devices.
9. All posts on personal social media must comply with the Board of Education’s policies concerning confidentiality, including the confidentiality of student information. If an employee is unsure about the confidential nature of information the employee is considering posting, the employee shall consult with his/her supervisor prior to making the post.
10. An employee may not link a personal social media site or webpage to the Board of Education’s website or the websites of individual schools, programs or teams; or post Board of Education material on a social media site or webpage without written permission of his/her supervisor.

11. All Board of Education policies that regulate off-duty conduct apply to social media activity including, but not limited to, policies related to public trust, illegal harassment, code of conduct, and protecting confidential information.

Rules Concerning District-Sponsored Social Media Activity

1. If an employee seeks to use social media sites as an educational tool or in relation to extracurricular activities, sports, and/or programs of the school district, the employee must seek and obtain the permission of his/her supervisor of the Superintendent of Schools in writing prior to setting up the site.
2. If an employee wishes to use Facebook or other similar social media site to communicate meetings, activities, games, responsibilities, announcements, etc., for a school-based club or an school-based activity or an official school-based organization, or an official sports team, the employee must also comply with the following rules:
 - The employee must set up the club, etc. As a group list which will be "closed" (e.g. membership in the group is limited to students, parents and appropriate school personnel) and "moderated" (e.g. the employee had the ability to access and supervise communications on the social media site).
 - When Facebook is used as the social media site, members will not be established as "friends," but as members of the group list. When other social media sites are used, the employee will establish a similar parameter on the basis of the functionality of the social media site utilized.
 - Anyone who has access to the communications conveyed through the site may only gain access by the permission of the employee (e.g. teacher, administrator, supervisor or coach). Persons desiring to access the page may join only after the employee invites them and allows them to join.
 - Parents shall be permitted to access any site that their child has been invited to join.
 - Access to the site may only be permitted for educational purposes related to the club, activity, organization or team.
 - The employee responsible for the site will monitor it regularly.
 - The employee's supervisor shall be permitted access to any site established by the employee for a school-related purpose.
 - Employees are required to maintain appropriate professional boundaries in the establishment and maintenance of all such district-sponsored social media activity.
3. Employees are required to use appropriately respectful speech in their social media posts on district-sponsored sites; and to refrain from harassing, defamatory, abusive, discriminatory, threatening or other inappropriate communications.

4. Employees are required to comply with all Board of Education policies and procedures and all applicable laws with respect to the use of computer equipment, networks or devices when accessing district-sponsored social media sites.
5. The Board of Education reserves the right to monitor all employee use of district computers and other electronic devices, including employee blogging and social networking activity. An employee should have no expectation of personal privacy in any communication or post made through social media while using district computers, cellular telephones or other data devices.
6. All posts on district-sponsored social media must comply with the Board of Education's policies concerning confidentiality, including the confidentiality of student information. If an employee is unsure about the confidential nature of information the employee is considering posting, the employee shall consult with his/her supervisor prior to making the post.
7. An employee may not link a district-sponsored social media site or webpage to any personal social media sites or sites not sponsored by the school district.
8. An employee may not use district-sponsored social media communications for private financial gain, political, commercial, advertisement, proselytizing or solicitation purposes.
9. An employee may not use district-sponsored social media communications in a manner that misrepresents personal views as those of the Board of Education, individual school or school district, or in a manner that could be construed as such.

Disciplinary Consequences

Violation of the Board of Education's policy concerning the use of social media or these Administrative Regulations may lead to discipline up to and including the termination of employment consistent with state and federal law.

Legal References:

U.S. Constitution, Amend. I
Conn. Constitution, Article I, Sections 3, 4, 14
Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-48d
Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-51q
Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 53a-182; 53a-183; 53a-250
Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2510 through 2520

Policy References:

Policy 4060, Sex Discrimination and Sexual Harassment in the Workplace
Policy 4110, Employee Use of The District's Computer System
Policy 4120, Notice Regarding Electronic Monitoring
Policy 5050, Confidentiality and Access To Student Records
Policy 5051, Student Privacy

MEETING MINUTES

TOLLAND TOWN COUNCIL HICKS MEMORIAL MUNICIPAL CENTER 6th FLOOR COUNCIL ROOM SEPTEMBER 12, 2017 – 7:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Field, Chair; William Eccles, Vice-Chair; Robert Green; Paul Krasusky; Kristen Morgan and David Skoczulek

MEMBERS ABSENT: Joseph Sce

OTHERS PRESENT: Steven Werbner, Town Manager; Lisa Hancock, Director of Finance and Records; Nancy Dunn, Assistant Director, Human Services and Youth Services Coordinator

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Rick Field called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Recited.
3. **MOMENT OF SILENCE:** Observed.
4. **PROCLAMATIONS:** None.
5. **PUBLIC PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (*on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Town Council*) (2 minute limit): None.
6. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:** None.
- 7a. **REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES RESPONSIBLE TO THE COUNCIL:** None.
- 7b. **REPORTS OF TOWN COUNCIL LIAISONS:** **Bill Eccles, EDC:** The new cross fit facility is now open. They took advantage of the sandwich board, and it resulted in some new customers for them. There is a Japanese restaurant that will be opening soon. He said that the TVA report from the study will be presented on September 14th at the Fire Training Center @ 7:00 p.m. **David Skoczulek, PZC:** The public hearing regarding 40 Industrial Park Road East was continued at the Applicant's request due to the need to address a consultant's opinion that came in late. There is a PZ application for 39 Kingsbury Avenue for a site plan revision. **Robert Pagoni, BOE:** He said the meeting they had last week was well received. The Board would like to continue to work together. He asked that the Council keep the Board and the Superintendent in the loop.

The Agenda items were discussed in the following order: 8.2, 8.3, 8.1 and 8.4.

8. NEW BUSINESS (ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS):

- 8.1 Discussion of Budget – Consideration of rescinding budget adoption action taken on August 15, 2017; consideration of postponing the budget referendum scheduled for September 19, 2017 until a tentative date of October 30, 2017). If required, the next Referendum will be November 14, 2017 (information forthcoming).

Mr. Field said this was put on the agenda tonight because of the talk at the beginning of the week sounded great. It sounded like the Governor's proposal was a lot better than what was given prior. The thought was that they would get a budget from the State on Thursday. Now, from what he hears, he thinks everything will fall through.

Mr. Werbner said the spread between what could be adopted, and what could potentially be adopted through a referendum is too great. So, he is recommending that they put this referendum off for now. The town still has a window of time to see if the Legislature will do anything. Although, the next referendum that they set will be the last chance that they will have. If they postpone and call for a referendum on October 30th, and if there still is no budget by that time, they will need to go forward with the best information that they have. The Governor had released a third budget last Friday, which contained better numbers for Tolland. He outlined what the potential impact of the Governor's budget would be. It would be at least a two year budget, but really a three year budget. He has provided the first two years, because they are phasing in the reduction in ECS, and they are phasing in the fact that municipalities will need to pick up a portion of the teacher pensions. The following was reviewed:

Analysis of Governors Revised Budget vs. Initial Budget

	Current FY 16-17 Budget	Current Revenue Governor	Current Revenue loss	Gov Original Budget FY 2018	Gov Reallocation THIRD Budget FY 2018	Change Governor's Budget	Governor's Revised vs. Town 16-17 Budget
General Fund Revenues:							
PILOT	0	0	0	34,245	0	-34,245	0
Pequot	34,843	34,843	0	35,163	0	-35,163	-34,843
Adult Education	8,572	9,117	545	8,436	8,436	0	-136
Education Cost Sharing	10,784,974	10,733,601	-51,373	5,677,712	8,810,173	3,132,461	-1,974,801
Municipal Projects	85,064	85,064	0	0	85,064	85,064	0
Municipal Revenue Sharing	303,971	303,971	0	437,559	84,704	-352,855	-219,267
Elderly Circuit Breaker	65,000	70,907	5,907				-65,000
Disability Grant	1,600	1,610	10				-1,600
Veterans Exemption Grant	7,500	8,635	1,135				-7,500
Total General Fund	11,291,524	11,247,748	-43,776	6,193,115	8,988,377	2,795,262	-2,303,147
Teacher Retirement				1,934,215	435,915	-1,498,300	435,915
							-2,739,062

	Adopted 2016-2017	Gov 3rd 2017-2018	Change	2018-2019 0%	Change	Estimated FY 18-19 1%	Change	2018-2019 2%	Change
TOWN OPERATING BUDGET	11,868,056	11,524,765	-343,291	11,524,765	0	11,640,013	115,248	11,755,261	230,496
	0	-2.89%		0.00%		1.00%		2.00%	
EDUCATION OPERATING BUDGET	39,333,948	37,904,693	-1,429,255	37,440,443	-464,250	37,819,490	-85,203	38,198,537	293,844
	0	-3.63%		-1.22%		-0.22%		2.00%	
TOTAL TOWN & BOE OPERATING BUDGETS	51,202,004	49,429,458	-1,772,546	48,965,208	-464,250	49,459,503	30,045	49,953,798	524,340
PERCENTAGE CHANGE FOR OPERATIONS ONLY	0	-3.46%		-0.94%		0.06%		2.00%	
DEBT SERVICE	4,550,000	4,550,000	0	4,550,000	0	4,550,000	0	4,550,000	0
	0	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT FUND	54,578	54,578	0	54,578	0	54,578	0	54,578	0
	0	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	
TEACHER RETIREMENT PENSION	0	435,915	435,915	900,165	464,250	900,165	464,250	900,165	464,250
	0	100.00%		106.50%		106.50%		106.50%	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	55,806,582	54,469,951	-1,336,631	54,469,951	0	54,964,246	494,295	55,458,541	988,590
TOTAL REVENUES	55,806,582	54,469,951	1,336,631	54,469,951	0	54,964,246	494,295	55,458,541	988,590
OVERALL SPENDING CHANGE			-2.40%		0.00%		0.91%		1.81%
REQUIRED MILL RATE TO BALANCE BUDGET	34.19	34.57		35.06		36.50		36.94	
PROJECTED MILLS TO BALANCE BUDGETS		0.38		1.49		1.93		2.37	
PROJECT ANNUAL TAX IMPACT (%)		1.111%		4.31%		5.58%		6.86%	

Property Tax Impact of the Various Trend Budgets for Three Average Assessments

	2014 Assessment	Market Value	Taxes at 34.19 FY 16-17	Taxes at 34.57 FY 17-18	Difference	Taxes at 38.06 FY 18-19	Difference	Taxes at 38.5 FY 18-19	Difference	Taxes at 38.94 FY 18-19	Difference
Average Household											
Low	\$117,093	\$167,276	\$4,003	\$4,048	\$44	\$4,222	\$174	\$4,274	\$226	\$4,325	\$278
Medium	\$188,285	\$268,979	\$6,437	\$6,509	\$72	\$6,790	\$281	\$6,872	\$363	\$6,955	\$446
High	\$360,369	\$514,813	\$12,321	\$12,458	\$137	\$12,995	\$537	\$13,153	\$696	\$13,312	\$854

The above spreadsheets indicate that a tax increase in the 1% range is possible, utilizing those numbers along with certain expenditure reductions and use of fund balance.

The following schedule is being recommended:

September 12, 2017 (Tonight) - Council would rescind the budget, and put a hold on the Referendum;
September 26, 2017 (Tuesday) Council Discussion – Budget Finalized – Council Chambers – **7:00 p.m.**; and
October 30, 2017 (Monday) Annual Budget Referendum

There needs to be notice of 30 days by state law after the Council acts. So, it would need to be after October 28th. The following Tuesday is October 31st, which is Halloween. So, he recommends having the referendum on Monday, October 30th (usually the referendums are on Tuesdays). If there needs to be a subsequent referendum, it would fall on Tuesday, November 14th (which would give the current Council one more chance at the budget, before a new Council is in place).

He said this is all very confusing and upsetting. It's a mess for residents who are trying to understand it and figure it out. The information is changing every hour and day by day. He is getting his information from Twitter and Facebook most of the time. He believes the Governor's third proposal is about as good as it could get. He has always used the Governor's numbers as his baseline. Again, he recommended that the Council postpone things for now.

Ms. Morgan asked if the referendum could be on the day of the municipal elections. Mr. Werbner said they did look into it, but it would not be feasible. There is a requirement that if you are going to have a question on the ballot, you need to notify the Secretary of State within a certain time period. That time has passed. Also, if they did that, they would need to have two separate votes. There would need to be the municipal votes in one area and then another room would hold the referendum.

Mr. Skoczulek reiterated that they would just be rescinding the budget, and that they are not adopting the numbers as outlined by Mr. Werbner at the meeting and above.

Mr. Eccles said they are basically back to where they were a few months ago. If the schedule works out, and gives the staff time enough to get the tax bills out, then he believes they should wait and gather as much information as possible.

All the Council members agreed to rescind the resolution.

Bill Eccles motioned to accept the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Town Council on August 15, 2017 adopted Resolution 17-47 and 17-48 pertaining to the FY 2017/2018 budget; and

WHEREAS, the budget adopted as part of the above cited Resolutions relied on uncertain revenue and expenditure figures from the State of Connecticut contained within the Governor's proposed budget causing the Town to have an inflated mill rate; and

WHEREAS, the Governor on September 8th submitted a third proposed budget which lessens considerably the negative revenue impact on the Town; and

WHEREAS, the Legislature is scheduled to meet and discuss a budget on September 14th; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Tolland Town Council rescinds Resolution 17-47 and 17-48 and will consider a new budget on September 26th at 7:00 pm with a tentative date for the budget referendum being October 30th and if necessary, a second referendum on November 14th.

Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

Mr. Werbner reminded that the meeting on September 26th will be at 7:00 p.m., before the regular Council meeting in Council Chambers.

- 8.2 Consideration of a resolution to authorize the submission of an application for the 2017-2018 Local Prevention Council Grant offered by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) through East of the River Action for Substance Abuse Elimination (ERASE).

Nancy Dunn advised that they have received this grant every year. It is federal money, not state money. The amount is \$3,907.40 for Tolland. The money is used for prevention initiatives.

Bill Eccles motioned to accept the following resolution:

RESOLVED: That Steven R. Werbner, Town Manager of the Town of Tolland, and in his absence the Acting Town Manager, has been empowered to sign the 2017-2018 Local Prevention Council Grant offered by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS) through East of the River Action for Substance Abuse Elimination (ERASE), and any subsequent amendments and modifications on behalf of the Town of Tolland, between the Town of Tolland and ERASE.

Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

- 8.3 Consideration of a resolution to authorize the submission of an application for the Connecticut State Department of Education Youth Service Bureau Grant Program, July 2017 - June 2019, in the amount of \$19,400 annually.

Nancy Dunn said they received \$19,400 last year. As of now, they are still fully funded under the Governor's budget. She advised that there will be some changes on what is sent to juvenile court. There is a big push for the Juvenile Review Boards to assume more, because the courts will not be taking those cases. This is a gradual move. They are going to start with truancy, and then next August it will be Families with Service Needs. So far, \$19,400 is in there. It's been a big push with the Lobbyists and all the people that are fighting for our dollars at the State Capital.

Bill Eccles motioned to accept the following resolution:

BE IT RESOLVED that Steven R. Werbner, as Town Manager of the Town of Tolland, and in his absence the Acting Town Manager, is hereby authorized to make, execute and approve on behalf of the Town of Tolland the FY2017-2019 Youth Service Bureau Grant Program application for funding offered by the Connecticut State Department of Education, and any subsequent amendments and modifications, between the Town of Tolland and SDE.

Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

- 8.4 Appointments to vacancies on various municipal boards/commissions.

8.4.a. Re-appointments to Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA). – 2 Alternate vacancies will remain.

Mr. Skoczulek mentioned that a resignation letter has been received from Nicholas Hany from the Recreation Advisory Board.

David Skoczulek motioned to *re-appoint* **Matthew Rood**, new term 8/26/17 – 8/26/20, and **Bruce Allen**, new term 8/26/17 – 8/26/20, to the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA); Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

9. **OLD BUSINESS (ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS):** None.

10. **REPORT OF THE TOWN MANAGER (A WRITTEN REPORT SHALL BE PROVIDED THE 1ST MEETING OF THE MONTH ONLY):** Mr. Werbner advised that *Celebrate Tolland* is this Saturday. Mr. Field thanked Mr. Werbner and the town staff for all their work dealing with the budget.

11. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

11.1 August 15, 2017 Special Budget Meeting Minutes: Bill Eccles moved to adopt the minutes; Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

11.2 August 22, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes: Bill Eccles moved to adopt the minutes; Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed. Paul Krasusky and Kristen Morgan abstained.

11.3 August 29, 2017 Annual Budget Presentation Meeting Minutes: Bill Eccles moved to adopt the minutes; Seconded by Robert Green. All in favor. None opposed.

12. **CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNCIL:** Mr. Field said he has six letters from residents regarding the budget, which he was unable to print. He will bring them to the next meeting.

12.1 Letter from State of Connecticut - Connecticut Siting Council re: modifying an existing telecommunications facility.

13. **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:** Rick Field reported the following:

~ Attendance was excellent at the last Chair hour. He looks forward to next months, and hopes the next Council continues them.

~The presentation on the TVA is this Thursday at 7:00 p.m.

14. **COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS FROM COUNCILPERSONS:** None.

15. **PUBLIC LISTED PARTICIPATION** (*on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Town Council*) (*3 minute limit*)

Deb Goetz of 176 Kate Lane – She thanked everyone. She asked if the budget mailer went out.

Mr. Werbner said no, they were able to stop it in time.

She asked if the BOE/TC letter that was discussed at the last meeting got out to the Journal Inquirer.

Mr. Eccles said not that he was aware of. It was not an action of the Town Council. It was a BOE meeting. The letter seems irrelevant at the moment, so he hopes the BOE wouldn't be sending it out.

She asked if the Special Education Grant is still in the picture.

Mr. Werbner said no. They put it back into the ESC fund.

John Crickman of 31 Cook Road – He asked if the town manager's monthly report from the police breaks down the number of calls that are responded to by the Resident State Troopers and the State Police barracks.

Mr. Werbner said no, they are lumped together. That is something that the study will be looking at.

Crickman asked how the town budgets are figured, as far as the different departments are concerned, use it or lose it and fund balance.

Mr. Werbner explained the process.

He asked if the town gets any additional monies / grants that aren't included in the budget.

Mr. Werbner said the BOE has a series of grants that they receive from the State, which are off budget.

They do receive dollars that are not part of the General Fund budget. The town for the most part doesn't.

The town is not in that particular category, and they just don't provide them to municipalities. There are certain grants that the BOE gets (nutrition grants, Special Ed grants) directly from the State.

The only reason Mr. Crickmore asked is because it was brought to his attention that there was roughly \$24,000 in funding from the Open Choice Program that was not included in the BOE's budget. Supposedly, because the number was so small they didn't feel they needed to include it. He finds it odd, that they don't find it convenient to include it in the budget, while they ask the residents for money. It's discouraging.

Mr. Werbner said he doesn't believe the BOE is trying to hide money from the residents. It is the way that the State has it set up. The Open Choice Program is a grant that goes directly to the BOE to offset the costs of the students who are part of the Open Choice Program.

16. ADJOURNMENT: Bill Eccles moved to adjourn the meeting; Seconded by Robert Green at 8:17 p.m. All were in favor.

Michelle A. Finnegan
Town Council Clerk

Richard J. Field, Council Chair

**SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
TOLLAND TOWN COUNCIL
FIRE TRAINING CENTER – 191 MERROW ROAD
SEPTEMBER 14, 2017**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Rick Field, Chair; William Eccles, Vice-Chair; Robert Green; Paul Krasusky, and David Skoczulek

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kristen Morgan and Joseph Sce

OTHERS PRESENT: Steven Werbner, Town Manager; Heidi Samokar, Director of Planning & Development; Rob Hunden, President & CEO of Hunden Strategic Partners; Mike Montgomery, Project Manager; and Anjali Peterson, Senior Manager (via phone); members of the Planning & Zoning Commission, Economic Development Commission, Tolland Economic & Community Development Corp., Public

1. **Call to Order:** Rick Field, Town Council Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Fire Training Center at 191 Merrow Road.
2. **Welcome:** Mr. Field welcomed all in attendance. He led the assembly in reciting the pledge of allegiance, followed by a moment of silence, then turned the program over to Ms. Samokar.
3. **Brief Overview** – Heidi Samokar, Director of Planning & Development – Ms. Samokar asked for a show of hands of those who attended any one of the public hearings held at the high school last year regarding the previous proposal by a developer for the Tolland Village Area (TVA). Most had attended at least one. She said that for at least ten years, the town has been planning for the Tolland Village Area, and the vision was always for a mixed-use type of development. The project presented during the public hearings a year ago is no longer on the table, but from that experience, the town recognized the need to have a better understanding of the market and what type of development might be financially viable in the TVA. As a result, the town hired Hunden Strategic Partners (HSP). HSP posted a report in July and they are here this evening to review that.
4. **Presentation** – Hunden Strategic Partners – Rob Hunden, President and CEO of HSP introduced himself along with Project Manager Mike Montgomery. He noted that Senior Manager Anjali Peterson was also attending by phone.

Mr. Hunden said his firm ran different scenarios for residential, restaurant/retail, and a hotel for the TVA. He said that some restaurant and retail development or hotel and restaurant development has more viability at an interchange. He noted that if a residential project were developed, it would create a need or desire for some convenience retail. However, in the absence of any multi-family development, a restaurant/hotel development (limited service branded hotel) would be the most viable.

Mr. Hunden provided a big picture analysis for multi-family development. HSP's initial market findings showed a pent up demand for apartments. The Town's consulting engineer, BSC Group, put together cost estimates for constructing multi-family, a hotel and commercial development and

September 14, 2017 Town Council Special Meeting

they broke out the infrastructure/site preparation costs. Those costs were found to be significant, and running the numbers, a 150-unit multi-family development with 12 percent workforce housing was found not to be viable. He said they ran a 300-unit version, but this didn't really help matters as greater density requires additional stories on buildings, which generally results in higher costs, such as stick vs. steel and fire safety protection.

Mr. Hunden discussed a hotel/restaurant scenario. He said that if the town provided a prepped site with infrastructure in place this could close the gap and potentially lure a developer.

HSP provided an Economic and Demographic Analysis. From 2010 to 2015 there was some shrinkage or stagnation in the Town's population. There were some demographic changes. Regarding media income, Tolland is a fairly affluent community with reasonable commutes to both the University of Connecticut and to Hartford. He said the presence of UConn only 7.2 miles away presents opportunities for new development. There are strong traffic counts on both I-84 and Merrow Road.

Mr. Montgomery analyzed the two primary multi-family rental complexes in Tolland---Ivy Woods and Norwegian Woods. He said Ivy Woods is 100 percent occupied with a waiting list and Norwegian Woods appears to be doing well from an occupancy perspective with higher rental rates. He said there is minimal market opportunity for condominiums. The primary focus for rentals is on millennials, empty nesters, and those commuting to UConn, graduate students in particular.

Mr. Montgomery said a high quality development would attract more mature graduate students with transportation who would be looking for lower rents than what are offered at on-campus developments. He said most under graduates would seek housing closer to campus.

Mr. Hunden provided a retail/restaurant market analysis. He noted that Tolland lacks diversity in cuisine options and price. He said he feels there is some opportunity for more upscale and full service restaurants, but they need a critical mass to lure such restaurants. As for retail, he said it is difficult to support major retailers the town does not already have.

Mr. Montgomery noted that Fieldstone Commons, which opened in 2007 is doing well, but it is hard to attract a drive-through type of restaurant to that development due to the lack of sufficient population in town during the daytime. The town does have a need for a pharmacy, but beyond that there are limited retail opportunities.

Mr. Hunden said there is still a fairly strong market for hotels and he provided a look at competitive properties in the area. He said the overall trend for hotels is that if they get to 70 percent or more occupancy rates on a regular basis, you start to see interest in developing another hotel. There have been some impressive growth rates in the average daily rates recently, and there has not been a change in competitive supply for hotels in some time. With Tolland's site characteristics being close to UConn and directly off the interstate, there is opportunity to capitalize on this need. If, however, UConn opened a new hotel or decided to convert the Nathan Hale to a full hotel, this could have some negative impact on a Tolland hotel.

Mr. Montgomery provided an analysis of regional multi-family developments: Storrs Center (618 units), Grand Lofts in Vernon (350 units), Broadleaf Boulevard in Manchester (224) units, and The

Tannery (250 units) which is still under construction. He said these are all in large communities and are doing well, with projections for The Tannery to also do well. Most cater to millennials and young professionals.

He said there is a market need in Tolland for about 150 units. Additionally there is a need for about 22,000 square feet of retail, namely a 12,000 square foot convenience store, a 5,500 full-service restaurant, and perhaps a coffeehouse, as well as an approximately 108 unit hotel. He ran through financial projections and the return on equity that investors would expect.

5. **Questions and Comments – Town Council** - Mr. Field opened the meeting to questions or comments from Town Council members. Mr. Eccles said he has had some time to study the report since it came out in July. He said multi-family development does not seem to be viable because of the cost to develop the land, but he asked what is specifically hampering development of the land.

Ms. Samokar said they do feel the site preparation numbers are probably high and one of the largest costs is leveling the land. It's likely a developer could work with the land rather than regrade, thereby reducing costs. Other large costs would be the development of the road needed for the site, as well as the potential need for federal permits from the Army Corps of Engineers. A development may also require a pump station. On the other hand, the costs do not include amenities such as open space, community space, and other amenities.

Mr. Skoczulek said he also studied the report. He asked if it would really cost the town \$2 to \$3 million to make the site viable for a hotel. Mr. Hunden said he believed so, and that it would be a boost to the town to just develop a hotel and restaurant at this time. In this way the town would not need to incur all the costs of prepping the entire site. He suggested the town could work with a developer on this. Robert Green asked if the site prep costs included costs to deal with environmental issues. Ms. Samokar said it did include costs for potential mitigation.

Mr. Krasusky discussed the cost impacts of going from 150 to 300 rental units. Ms. Samokar noted that greater heights call for elevators, additional fire code requirements, and would require, in the TVA's case, additional parking under the buildings.

Mr. Krasusky also asked if HSP did any studies on the impact of multi-family on a community, such as the town tax base. He said there was some debate about the potential positive or negative impacts on the school system. Mr. Hunden said they did not, but in general multi-family developments pay more in taxes per square foot than single family development, but not as much as pure commercial development. He said there would likely be a sizeable portion of graduate students living in multi-family in this area and fewer kids than might be expected.

Mr. Werbner said it appears the only really viable development in the TVA would be a hotel/restaurant which might take up five to ten acres of land. He asked if the rest of the site is basically unmarketable at this time based on the cost of development. He said there seems to be limited opportunities without the town making a sizeable investment---a tough situation. Mr. Hunden said this appears so; however, he has seen some communities do some aggressive things to grade and prepare sites for development. He said restaurants are unique in that the greater volume of eating establishments available in one area tends to draw more people there. If you have six or seven in one area, they tend to benefit one another. People stop because they have more options.

6. **Open Discussion** – Questions, Comments, Discussion with Public:

One attendee said the original plan for the TVA was for it to be an historic introduction to the town and to the town green, and she felt they have lost sight of this original intent.

Another noted that HSP suggested multi-family development in the TVA would attract graduate students, and he asked what types of renters lived at the Storrs development. Mr. Hunden said there are a lot more undergraduates at the Storrs site. The resident also asked about restaurant viability and how many sit down restaurants Storrs had. Mr. Hunden said they have a lot of fast casual restaurants, but that their market is geared more toward the student population there.

A question was asked whether it was possible to fill wetlands in and create wetlands elsewhere. Ms. Samokar said this is true in theory, but did not see this as a possibility with the Tolland Marsh.

A question was asked about the gap costs for multi-family development in the HSP report, and why any developer would build if costs to develop were really that high. Mr. Hunden noted that their firm did not do the cost estimation but that in general if the town took care of some of the infrastructure/prep costs and as rents go up, then they could get closer to being viable. Another question was raised if any longer term return on equity studies were done. Mr. Hunden reiterated that the costs seemed higher than what it likely would be.

There was the suggestion that there does not appear to be a lot of synergy between projects, where one project would beget more interest and another project. Mr. Hunden said the real challenge is that there needs to be density to support the kinds of retail that most people want. He said an exception would be where a town could be developed as a tourist attraction of some type (i.e. Branson, MO), but he did not think this would be amenable to Tolland residents. He said 150 apartment units would not necessarily make a general retail store viable.

An attendee noted that because the town only owns a small portion of the land in the TVA, she asked if the town should be trying to purchase more of it so they could have more control. Mr. Hunden said generally that would be the case if a town wants to control its destiny.

An attendee asked what the maximum number of units the town could do before they had to start developing vertically. Ms. Samokar said the study did not investigate that question.

Another attendee asked if an economic development/cost benefit to the town analysis was done with the original project. The answer was that this was not done once the developer took his proposal off the table.

An attendee said he did not feel a developer would need to switch to steel at three stories. He also didn't think the costs per square footage to develop were accurate. He said \$525 per square foot for 300 units is quadruple what it costs to build in the area. He also said flattening the land completely would not be necessary and would be less aesthetically-pleasing.

An attendee said they will need to look at what is in it for Tolland if they offer to buy any of the privately-owned land in the TVA. They will need to have a discussion about how much they are willing to give up versus keeping the character of their town protected.

September 14, 2017 Town Council Special Meeting

There was further discussion about the pure construction costs without the preliminary site prep work, and how the town could close the viability gap. Mr. Hunden said that if they eliminated workforce housing and charged more for rent, they could start to close the gap.

An attendee asked how a plan of this type fits with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Ms. Samokar said the POCD called for mixed-use development and walkability so it is consistent. Another attendee said the town needs affordable housing, and said they should not be quick to discount this need. There was a question about whether there is other attractive financing available for developers who include workforce housing.

The conversation turned toward the need for a greater diversity of restaurants in Tolland. Mr. Hunden said he did feel that more restaurants would be a viable opportunity, particularly if they could develop a small core of restaurants that would make Tolland a destination. Mr. Werbner said for some time they tried to lure a Panera Bread into town, but they kept getting told they don't have the density to support a lunchtime business restaurant. Mr. Hunden said this is a challenge, as developers all want successful restaurants in their projects, but lenders consider restaurants very risky.

Ms. Samokar asked for any final comments from the Town Council. Mr. Eccles said this will be helpful for the upcoming Plan of Conservation and Development as it is up for re-evaluation in the next two years. He said he saw no quick fix, as the town is not currently in the position to make any big investments. He said the demand may be there for development, but noted they have not gotten much interest in the last ten years.

7. **Adjournment** – Mr. Field thanked all who attended, adjourning the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Annie Gentile
Clerk