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

SPECIAL MEETING

7:30-10:00 P.M.

AGENDA August 15, 2018

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
- **B. SUPERINTENDENT REPORT**
 - B.1 Pupil Services Supervisor
 - B.2 Education Reserve Fund
 - B.3 Marijuana Dispensary Proposal in Tolland
- C. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION
- D. ACTION
- E. POINTS OF INFORMATION

Town Council Meeting – July 24, 2018

F. ADJOURNMENT

Agenda Item #B1

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM:	Pupil Services Supervisor
ITEM SUBMITTED BY:	Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent
For BOE meeting:	August 15, 2018

ITEM SUMMARY:

The Curriculum Supervisor for Pupil Services position search and selection process included initial review, interviews, performance task, and a final interview. This candidate became the choice of administrators and curriculum personnel. In accordance with Policy 4010 this candidate is recommended to the Board of Education for hire.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

Salary \$111,572 with a TSA of \$4,847

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW: N/A

BOE ACTION DESIRED:

- 1) Meet with the candidate.
- 2) Motion to move B1 to item D1 for action.
- **3)** Proposed Motion: Approve the candidate presented by the Superintendent of Schools for hire as the Supervisor for Pupil Services for the Tolland Public Schools.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

1) Supervisor for Pupil Services document

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM:	Education Reserve Fund – Letter from the BOE to the TC
ITEM SUBMITTED BY:	Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent
For BOE meeting:	August 15, 2018
ITEM SUMMARY:	
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

The following is a communication from the BOE to the TC with regard to the Educational Reserve Fund:

Educational Reserve Fund Considerations

In August of 2013 something unprecedented happened in Tolland, made possible by leaders at the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities and the State Legislation in the form of Sec. 10-248a. *Unexpected education funds account*: the Town Council and Town Manager relinquished some control over end of year funds. The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities had recommended such a solution to the perennial "use it or lose it" scenarios Boards of Education across the State were backed into in fulfilling their duties and obligations under 10-222 to expend allocated funds on education.

The Educational Reserve Fund provided Boards of Education the option to put up to 1% of the Board of Education budget in a fund for the proverbial rainy day. This allowed for and encouraged a less protective method of budgeting and planning for margin of error. For instance, if it looked like a certain Special Education expense or expenses *could* be \$80,000, would *probably* be \$50,000 and had a small chance of being \$30,000 – the smaller figures could be chosen if a reserve fund existed. Missing the mark in such a scenario does not mean risking coming in over budget when there is a reserve. The current culture - media and otherwise - are unforgiving of both individuals and elected bodies that are perceived to have not budgeted properly; thus, without a reserve, it is not hard to understand why more conservative methods are used.

These ERFs (Educational Reserve Funds), when built with certain language, provide the necessary operational functionality to foster conservative and sound fiscal planning. For instance, funds for a special education allocation that *shall* be available to a BOE are something a Superintendent can count on, even before the audit. The *shall* terminology allows for funds to be not only expended in the spirit of 10-222 for education as they were intended, but also can *be relied upon* as available so that a sound operational decision can be made. If instead, *may* is used, it opens up ambiguity and uncertainty – something that *may* happen in December is not something a prudent manager can count on for operational decisions in the previous June. In this way, not having an ERF with sufficiently functional language for a Board of Education is to have it in words alone, not in a functional reality.

ERFs also help avoid a "mad rush" mentality to get everything expended before the end of the fiscal year; the ERF allows for a more prudent approach. If funds *shall* be there, there is no need to rush important decisions. If something comes in under budget one year, it is a good idea to save those funds for the year when things are not as favorable. This is no different from the philosophy of the Town's unassigned fund balance with a 10% floor on the fund. The establishment of the ERF was a significant departure from policy that inadvertently endorsed a poor spending model with no margin for error toward one that allowed for rainy day savings and conservative budgeting – making lower budgets possible and emergency situations less likely.

The action on the part of the Town Council in 2013 and the use of the fund by the BOE in subsequent years not only fostered useful operational practice, but also demonstrated a unity of Board and Council, a message of trust and good practice. The State budget situation that evolved over FY17 and FY18 threw both the Town

Council and the Board of Education into disarray. Both elected bodies struggled with how to handle the situation, and chose various strategies to do so such as delayed referendums, reduced expenditures, and transferred funds. In the end, all of these efforts from both the Town and the Board helped weather the State budget storm and fund the Town and School needs as best as could be done. When asked to revoke a 1% request, the Board did so; when the time came to support the school budget, the Council did so.

While the FY17 and FY18 State budget strained relations of all political bodies across the State, a choice remains before Tolland. The negative impact of those years can be contained, or it can proliferate. The political pressures and dynamics of social media can either be transcended, or succumbed to swallowing goodwill like quicksand. The Educational Reserve Fund in Tolland is not simply fiscal structure; it is a symbol of cooperation, innovation, and trust.

In short, the Board of Education feels that keeping the *shalls* in the document is imperative and that requested funds, up to 1%, should be put into a fund that is committed to Education. The Town staff should be provided the opportunity to invest the funds, and the funds in the Educational Reserve Fund should not be utilized for personnel.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY:

See information available in:

10-248a

10-222

Ordinance 86 Town of Tolland 8-1 through 8-6

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW:

Attorney reviewed and provided feedback

BOE ACTION DESIRED:

TC review of document

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

None.

Agenda Item #B3

SUPERINTENDENT'S AGENDA ITEM BACKGROUND

ITEM:	Marijuana Dispensary Proposal
ITEM SUBMITTED BY:	Walter Willett, Ph.D., Superintendent
For BOE meeting:	August 15, 2018
ITEM SUMMARY:	

In consideration of the Board of Education's goal regarding the Strategic Prevention Framework the following thoughts and concerns were shared by administration and the Board of Education of the Tolland Public Schools specifically for the purpose of being communicated to the Planning and Zoning Committee and the Director of Planning and Development for Tolland:

- Time and resources have been dedicated to addressing the drug problems Tolland is facing through the Eastern Highland Health District, the local Prevention Council, and State's Attorney Matthew Gedansky (with respect to crime and drug use). Have these resources been directly accessed or consulted?
- The ERASE Surveys (East of the River Action for Substance Abuse Elimination) done in the Tolland Public Schools (2010 and then 2014*) reported:
 - o 22% of High School students reported using Marijuana*
 - o 65% felt it was relatively easy to acquire*
 - Marijuana had the *lowest* perceived risk of use (when compared to Cigarettes, Alcohol, and Rx Drugs)*
 - o 40% reported they felt Marijuana use would be disapproved by friends*
 - o 81% reported they felt Marijuana use would be disapproved by parents*
 - o 31% have used tobacco by Grade 12*

Given this information, what message will the presence of a legal dispensary in the Town convey to adolescents? Will it further impact these students' beliefs and behaviors? If the State does legalize Marijuana what will prevent the dispensary from becoming a store-front for the broader sale of Marijuana?

- The legal age of use might be as low as 18, like it is for smoking. This will impact Secondary School populations even more profoundly if the State legalizes recreational use?
- Marijuana sales are a business endeavor, and businesses are using some of the marketing tactics that Tobacco companies use. Like other companies (Alcohol and Tobacco) businesses tend to market to youth for long term profitability. Does Tolland want to associate itself with this market?

RELEVANT RESEARCH

(from the American Psychological Association: the Monitor, and Other Sources):

- Marijuana can be addictive for youth and has rising potency (<u>https://www.drugabuse.gov/publications/research-reports/marijuana/marijuana-addictive</u>) and research has indicated that Marijuana use has significantly negative impacts on the brain development of children and adolescents.
- Until the early or mid-20s, "the brain is still under construction," says Staci Gruber, PhD, a
 neuroscientist and director of the Cognitive and Clinical Neuroimaging Core and the Marijuana
 Investigations for Neuroscientific Discovery (MIND) Program at McLean Hospital/Harvard
 Medical School. During this period of neurodevelopment, the brain is thought to be
 particularly sensitive to damage from drug exposure. And the frontal cortex the region
 critical to planning, judgment, decision-making and personality is one of the last areas to
 fully develop, Gruber says.
- Duke University psychologist Terrie Moffitt, PhD, and colleagues collected data from the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study, longitudinal research that has followed 1,000 New Zealanders born in 1972. Participants answered questions about marijuana use at 18, 21, 26, 32 and 38. They also underwent neuropsychological testing at ages 13 and 38. The team found that persistent marijuana use was linked to a decline in IQ, even after the researchers controlled for educational differences. The most persistent users those who reported using the drug in three or more waves of the study — experienced a drop in neuropsychological functioning equivalent to about six IQ points (*PNAS*, 2012). "That's in the same realm as what you'd see with lead exposure," says Weiss. "It's not a trifle."
- Also immature in teens is the endocannabinoid system. As its name implies, this system comprises the physiological mechanisms that respond to THC. That system is important for cognition, neurodevelopment, stress response and emotional control, and it helps to modulate other major neurotransmitter systems, says Krista Lisdahl, PhD, director of the Brain Imaging and Neuropsychology Laboratory at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Repeated exposure to marijuana can dial down cellular activity in the endocannabinoid system. Such interference might be a bigger problem for immature brains, says Lisdahl. "That sets the stage for why adolescents may be more sensitive to the effects of repeated marijuana exposure, from a neuroscience perspective."
- A number of studies have found evidence of brain changes in teens and young adults who smoke marijuana. In 2013, Rocío Martín-Santos, MD, PhD, at the University of Barcelona, and colleagues reviewed 43 studies of chronic cannabis use and the brain. They found consistent evidence of both structural brain abnormalities and altered neural activity in marijuana users. Only eight of those focused on adolescents, but the findings from those studies suggested that both structural and functional brain changes emerge soon after adolescents start using the drug. Those changes may still be evident after a month of abstaining from the drug, the researchers reported (*PLOS ONE*, 2013). Some of those brain abnormalities have been linked to cognitive differences. Gruber found that regular, heavy marijuana users those who reported smoking five of the last seven days, and more than 2,500 times in their lives had damage to their brains' white matter, which helps enable communication among neurons. Those white matter changes were correlated with higher impulsivity, she found, particularly in people who began smoking before age 16 (*Psychopharmacology*, 2013).

 Gruber's work compares heavy, regular marijuana users who began before and after age 16. Her results suggest there's greater risk in starting young. Compared with users who began after 16, early-onset smokers made twice as many mistakes on tests of executive function, which included planning, flexibility, abstract thinking and inhibition of inappropriate responses. As adults, those who started using before 16 reported smoking nearly 25 times per week, while those who started later smoked half as often, about 12 times per week. The early-onset smokers also reported smoking an average of nearly 15 grams each week, versus about 6 grams for their late-onset counterparts (*Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 2012).

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Seek out the input of the Eastern Highland Health District.
- Seek out the input of John Daviau of the Smart Approaches to Marijuana.
- Consult with the Superintendent of School directly and specifically on this issue.
- Review as an elected body research and videos that explore the potential issues. While surveying is useful, the elected body is empowered and obligated to inform themselves beyond what the average individual might have opportunity to know.

Examples:

- 1. Smart Approaches to Marijuana link: <u>http://www.cappct.org/ct-sam</u>
- 2. SAM Talking Points: <u>https://learnaboutsam.org/sam-resources/one-pagers-fact-sheets-and-talking-points/</u>
- 3. Tedx Talk on Legalization by Kevin Sabet: https://youtu.be/klafHRlhNg4 -
- 4. Surprising Truths about Medical Marijuana by Ben Cort: <u>https://youtu.be/SmqtPaMMVuY</u>
- 5. Medical Marijuana Sales banned in New Canaan: <u>https://ncadvertiser.com/121643/medical-</u> marijuana-sales-banned-from-town/
- 6. Five Problems with Medical Marijuana: <u>https://theoakstreatment.com/marijuana-addiction-abuse/5-problems/</u>
- 7. Advertising and popular media starting to market to kids, JUUL scholarships: <u>https://www.nbcnews.com/health/kids-health/vaping-essays-e-cigarette-sellers-offering-scholarships-n881361</u>

FINANCIAL SUMMARY: N/A

BOARD ATTORNEY REVIEW: N/A

BOE ACTION DESIRED:

Discussion and request of the Planning and Zoning Committee and the Director of Planning and Development for Tolland to review this information.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS ATTACHED:

- 8. CAPP MARIJUANA POWERPOINT May2018
- 9. ERASE 2014 Survey

~



Connecticut Association of Prevention Professionals, Inc.

Learn | Network | Advocate

MARIJUANA: MYTHS, MEASURES AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS

CREATED BY:

THE CONNECTICUT ASSOCIATION OF PREVENTION PROFESSIONALS, THE CONNECTICUT CHAPTER OF SMART APPROACHES TO MARIJUANA (SAM)WITH SUPPORT AND RESOURCES FROM SAM.

STATUS OF MARIJUANA LAWS IN CT

- 2011 Penalties for possession of small amounts of marijuana was reduced to an infraction (decriminalized)
- 2012 Medical Marijuana passed
- 2015-2018 Bills to legalize retail sales of marijuana proposed in the legislature each year
- 2018 3 marijuana retail sales bills failed in the Judiciary, General Law and Finance, Revenue and Bonding Committees
- 2018 The powerful Appropriations Committee narrowly passed a legalization bill and went to the House calendar, but never getting to the floor for a vote.
- 2019 Since many legislators didn't want legalization to become a campaign issue, there will be a strong push in 2019. It will be the toughest battle yet.

Overview of Connecticut's Medical Marijuana Program

Public Act 12-55: An Act Concerning The Palliative Use Of Marijuana & 2016 Amendments



Learn | Network | Advocate

To be approved for Medical Marijuana:

- Must be a CT resident
- Must be 18 years or older or have parent/guardian permission
- A CT licensed physician must certify the patient has an approved debilitating condition to DCP
- Patients receive a one-year certification
- Can not be a prison inmate or in a DOC facility
- Patients can not grow their own marijuana.



Learn | Network | Advocate

- Medical marijuana users must use in private
- Public use is not permitted
- May not use in the presence of minors
- No one previously convicted of a drug law can act as a caregiver



Learn | Network | Advocate

Certifying Physicians:

- Must be licensed in CT and registered with the CPMRS
- Have a bona fide physician-patient relationship
- Examine patient's medical & prescription history and perform an examination
- Have tried or be reasonably sure other therapies are ineffective
- Explain the potential risks and benefits
- Can not have a financial stake in a dispensary or producer



Loam | Network | Advocate

- To certify a patient for medical marijuana, a CT licensed physician with a "bona fide" doctor/patient relationship must start the on-line registration process
- Patients then complete their sections of the on-line registration
- Patients may elect to have a caregiver who must also register with DCP



Learn | Network | Advocate

- A patient, caregiver or physician acting within the boundaries of state law cannot be prosecuted.
- All medical marijuana in CT must be produced in state and may not be transported out of state.
- The DCP establishes a Board of Physicians to review petitions to add medical conditions to the approved list and to determine the appropriate amounts that patients will need for an uninterrupted one-month supply.
- Health insurers do not have to pay for medical marijuana.



Learn | Network | Advocate

- Employers and landlords cannot discriminate based on use of medical marijuana. Schools cannot refuse to enroll certified students.
- The law does not restrict an employer's ability to prohibit the use of intoxicating substances during work hours or discipline an employee for being under the influence of intoxicating substances during work hours.



Learn | Network | Advocate

Amended Public Act 12-55 for minors

- Patients under the age of 18 can not use smoked, inhaled or vaporized forms of marijuana
- Certifying physicians must take into account adverse effects of brain development before certifying minor patients
- Process for adding new medical conditions for minors must be separated from process for adult patients
- At least one pediatrician sits on the Physicians Advisory Board



Learn | Network | Advocate

Additional 2016 Expansions:

- Expands medical conditions for adults
- Allows hospices and other inpatient facilities to receive and dispense medical marijuana
- Allows for research programs to be created and supplied with marijuana. Research subjects must be registered with the DCP
- Allows for removal of medical conditions from the approved list

Leam | Network | Advocate

Sec. 21a-408-55. Manufacturing of marijuana products

(A) a producer shall only manufacture or sell marijuana products in the following forms:

- (1) raw material;
- (2) cigarettes;
- (3) extracts, sprays, tinctures or oils;
- (4) topical applications, oils or lotions;
- (5) transdermal patches;
- (6) baked goods; and
- (7) capsules or pills.



Learn | Network | Advocate

Sec. 21a-408-55. Manufacturing of marijuana products

No marijuana product shall:

(1) include alcoholic liquor, dietary supplements or any drug, except for pharmaceutical grade marijuana.

(2) be manufactured or sold as a beverage or confectionary;

(3) be manufactured or sold in a form or with a design that:

(A) is obscene or indecent;

(B) may encourage the use of marijuana for recreational purposes;

(C) may encourage the use of marijuana for a condition other than a debilitating medical condition; or

(D) is customarily associated with persons under the age of eighteen;

(4) have had pesticide chemicals or organic solvents used during the production or manufacturing process



Learn | Network | Advocate

Sec. 21a-408-56. Packaging and labeling by producer

(A) A producer shall individually package, label and seal marijuana products in unit sizes such that no single unit contains more than a one-month supply of marijuana.

(B) a producer shall place any product containing marijuana in a child-resistant and light-resistant package. A package shall be deemed child-resistant if it satisfies the standard for "special packaging" as set forth in the poison prevention packaging act of 1970 regulations, 16 CFR 1700.1(b)(4).

Learn | Network | Advocate

Program Fees

Annual patient registration	\$	100
Initial Dispensary licensing	\$	6,000
Dispensary renewal (every two years)	\$	5,000
Registering each Dispensary employee	\$	50
Registration for each Dispensary backer	\$	100
Initial Producer license	\$1	00,000
Producer renewal	\$	75,000
Registering each Producer employee	\$	100



Learn | Network | Advocate

Number of certified patients by County: July 23, 2017

MMP Statistics as of 05/13/18	
Number of registered patients	25,743
	<u></u>
Number of registered patients per county	
Fairfield	5,332
Hartford	6,346
Litchfield	1,569
Middlesex	1,535
New Haven	6,024
New London	2,817
Tolland	1,243
Windham	874



Learn | Network | Advocate

MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES IN CT

Arrow Alternative Care, Inc.	92 Weston Street, Unit #16, Hartford, CT 06120	
Arrow Alternative Care #2, Inc.	255 West River Street, Milford, CT 06461	
Bluepoint Wellness of Connecticut	471 East Main Street, Branford, CT 06405	
Caring Nature, LLC	237 East Aurora St, Waterbury, CT 06708	
Compassionate Care Center of Connecticut/D&B Wellness, LLC	4 Garella Road, Bethel, CT 06801	
Prime Wellness of Connecticut, LLC	75 John Fitch Boulevard, South Windsor CT, 06074	
Southern CT Wellness & Healing, LLC	318 New Haven Avenue, Milford CT, 06460	
Thames Valley Relief, LLC	887 Norwich New London Turnpike	
The Healing Corner, Inc.	159 East Main Street, Bristol, CT 06010	

£

Marijuana-based Medicines

Marijuana-based medicines are being scientifically developed.

However this process needs improvement.

Research must be done on marijuana's components, not the raw, crude plant.



Leam | Network | Advocate

Marijuana-based Medicines

- Marinol has been on the market for years
- Sativex[®] is in Stag 3 federal trials in the USA for MS patients.
 - THC:CBD = 1:1
 - It is administered via an oral mouth spray
 - Already approved in Canada and Europe
- Also Epidiolex

 a pure CBD oil (no THC), being studied for seizure disorders, including with young children is in the final stages of approval



CAPP and SAM focus on 4 main goals:

1.) To inform public policy with the science of today's marijuana.

2.) To reduce the unintended consequences of current marijuana policies, such as lifelong stigma due to arrest.

3.) To prevent the establishment of "Big Marijuana" — a 21st-Century tobacco industry that would market marijuana to children. Those are the very likely results of legalization.

4.) To promote research on marijuana in order to obtain FDAapproved, pharmacy-dispensed, cannabis-based medications.





Myths about Marijuana



The Myths of Inevitability (based on three assumptions)

MYTH #1: Marijuana is Harmless



MYTH #2: Tax Revenues from Sales Will be a Boon to the State



MYTH #3: It Will Save Money on Law Enforcement and Incarceration





- Your Father's Marijuana in 1960s-1980s: <u>1-4% THC</u>
- Today's Marijuana: <u>Up to 40% THC</u>
- Different numbers on this but regularly <u>4 40 X</u> stronger



<u>HEART</u>: Can cause an increase in risk of heart attack more than fourfold in the hour after use and can provoke chest pain in patients with heart disease*.

<u>LUNGS</u>: Marijuana smoke contains 50-70% more carcinogenic hydrocarbons than tobacco smoke, which can be irritants to the lungs and result in greater prevalence of bronchitis, cough and phlegm production.





<u>MENTAL HEALTH</u>: Marijuana use is significantly linked with mental illness, especially schizophrenia and psychosis but also depression and anxiety.

<u>PREGNANCY</u>: Marijuana smoking during pregnancy has been shown to increase problems with neurological development in newborns.



*Source: *Substance Abuse Journal, Mar. 2015:* Bagot, Milin, & Kaminer, *Neurotoxicol Teratol.* 1987;Fried, Makin

PREGNANCY:

- · THC crosses the placenta
- THC exposure in utero compromises brain function and IQ in young children (as in adolescents who use to adulthood)
- The pattern is for pro-marijuana advocates to quote old (1970's -1990's) studies and not recent ones. Recent ones describe adverse consequences of marijuana in the pre-natal exposed fetus.

*Source: Madras, B. Harvard Medical School, 2016

PREGNANCY:

Human fetal findings suggest that in utero cannabis exposure may impair distinct mesocorticolimbic neural systems that play important roles in reward, motivation, learning, memory, and movement.

Source: Biological Psychiatry, volume 56, issue12, 15 December 2004, Wang, Edwards, Anderson, Minkjoff, Hurd

PREGNANCY:

Early maternal marijuana intake provides data suggestive of detrimental effects on the mid-gestation fetus. Main developmental outcome variables were fetal weight, foot length, body length, and head circumference

*Source: Neurotoxicology and Teratology Volume 27, Issue 2, March–April 2005, Y.L.Hurd^a. X.Wang^a..Anderson^b. O.Beck^c.Minkoff^d..Dow-Edwards^f



PREGNANCY:

- Pre-natal exposure to marijuana affects
 - In the short-term: neurobehavior
 - In the long-term:
 - inattention and impulsivity
 - deficits in problem-solving, sustained attention, visual memory and analysis,
 - academic underachievement especially reading and spelling
 - increased risk for cigarette and marijuana use

Source: Goldschmidt et al, 2000, 2004, 2008, Fried, 2002; Fried et al, 1998, 2001, 2003; Day et al, 1994, 2006, 2011; Richardson et al, 2007; Wilford et al, 2012; Porath et al, 2005; Morris et al, 2011
Myth #1: It's Harmless

PREGNANCY:

- Consuming cannabis during pregnancy clearly results in defective development of nerve cells of the cerebral cortex, the part of the brain that orchestrates higher cognitive functions and drives memory formation.
- These developmental deficits may evoke life-long modifications to the brain function of those affected. Even though not all children who have been exposed to Cannabis will suffer immediate and obvious deficits, relatively subtle damage can significantly increase the risk of delayed neuropsychiatric diseases.
- "This concerns also the medical use of Cannabis, which should be avoided during pregnancy."

Source: Fetal brain development jeopardized by cannabis use during pregnancy, Medical News Today, Wednesday 29 January 2014 (From a study published *EMBO Journal*, of how THC affects brain development of the unborn fetus)



True: It's Addictive!

- 1 in 6 teens who try marijuana become addicted.
- 1 in 10 adults who try marijuana will become addicted to it.
- Children and teens are six times likelier to be in treatment for marijuana addiction than for all other illegal drugs combined.

Using US census data and CT YRBS data on high school marijuana use rates, CAPP estimates about 10,000 high school students in CT are addicted to marijuana right now.

Source: Anthony, J.C., Warner, L.A., & Kessler, R.C. (1994); Giedd. J.N., 2004 ; CAPP 2016

True: It's Addictive!

- Adult marijuana use:
 - is associated with greater likelihood of developing alcohol and drug use problems, including nicotine dependence
 - But not associated with greater risk of developing a mood or anxiety disorder.

Source: M. Olfson, Columbia University Medical Center, U.S. National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions.

÷

True: Poor Academic Achievement

Individuals who are daily users of cannabis before age 17 are over <u>60% less likely</u> to complete high school or obtain a degree compared to those who have never used the drug.



Source: The Lancet Psychiatry, Silins & Mattick Sept. 2014 The study was funded by the Australian Government National Health and Medical Research Council.

True: Poor Academic Achievement + Other Outcomes

From the journal Addiction:

- A longitudinal study of 6509 middle school students were surveyed from age 11.5 to 17 years old (high school).
- Greater alcohol use predicted greater academic unpreparedness and delinquency.
- Greater marijuana use predicted greater academic unpreparedness and delinquency, as well as poorer academic performance and mental health conditions.

Source: Addiction. 2016 Oct;111(10):1825-35

Learn | Network | Advocete

True: It Causes Brain Damage in Adolescents

- The hippocampus, which is directly associated with regulating memory and emotions, was found to be 12% smaller in marijuana users as compared to non users.
- A 2012 Duke University study demonstrated an average 6-8 point <u>permanent</u> drop in IQ among teens who use marijuana 3-5 times per week.



Source: http://www.drugabuse.gov

Source: Meier, M.H., et al., 2012; MacLeod, J., et al., 2004.

Crashes and Crash Fatalities

The Colorado Department of Transportation found that after passing the "Medical Marijuana" legislation in the state, drivers who tested positive for marijuana in <u>fatal</u> car crashes <u>DOUBLED</u> between 2006 and 2010.



A medical marijuana card isn't a license to drive under the influence.

URUNGED BRIVING IS IMPAIRED DRIVING. www.HeatlsOnColorado.com



Source: National Highway Traffic Safety Administrations

earn ; Network | Advocat

Youth Marijuana Use:

- Youth past month marijuana use increased 20 percent in the two year average (2013/2014) since Colorado legalized recreational marijuana compared to the two-year average prior to legalization (2011/2012).
 - Nationally youth past month marijuana use declined 4 percent during the same time.
- The latest NSDUH 2013/2014 results show Colorado youth ranked #1 in the nation for past month marijuana use, up from #14 in 2006.
- Colorado youth past month marijuana use for 2013/2014 was 74 percent higher than the national average compared to 39 percent higher in 2011/2012, just prior to commercial sales.
- In school year 2015/2016, 62 percent of all drug expulsions and suspensions were for marijuana violations.

(CAPP)

Source: Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report September 2016

Driving under the Influence

- Marijuana-related traffic deaths increased 48 percent in the threeyear average (2013-2015) since Colorado legalized recreational marijuana compared to the three-year average (2010-2012) prior to legalization. o During the same time, all traffic deaths increased 11 percent.
- In 2009, Colorado marijuana-related traffic deaths involving operators testing positive for marijuana represented 10 percent of all traffic fatalities. By 2015, that number doubled to 21 percent.
- Percentage of WA traffic fatalities where driver tested positive for recent marijuana use more than doubled the year recreational marijuana sales began.

Source: Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report September 2016; AAA Foundation for Public Safety

Emergency Room Marijuana and Hospital Marijuana-Related Admissions:

- Colorado Emergency Department visits per year related to marijuana:
 - 2013 14,148
 - o 2014 18,255
- · Number of hospitalizations related to marijuana:
 - 2011 6,305
 - 2012 6,715
 - 2013 8,272
 - 2014 11,439

Source: Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report September 2016

Diversion of Colorado Marijuana:

- Highway patrol yearly interdiction seizures of Colorado marijuana increased 37 percent from 288 to 394 (2013-2015), since recreational marijuana was legalized.
- Of the 394 seizures in 2015, there were 36 different states destined to receive marijuana from Colorado. The most common destinations identified were Missouri, Illinois, Texas, Iowa, and Florida.
- Seizures of Colorado marijuana in the U.S. mail has increased 471 percent from an average of 129 pounds (2010-2012) to 736 pounds (2013-2015) in the three years that recreational marijuana has been legal.

Source: Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report September 2016

Related Data:

- Drug and Narcotics crime in Denver increased about 11 percent per year since marijuana legalization.
- Colorado annual tax revenue from the sale of recreational marijuana was about 0.5 percent of total general fund revenue (FY2016).
- 68% of local jurisdictions in Colorado have banned commercial marijuana businesses.
- National THC potency has risen from an average of 3.96 percent in 1995 to an average of 12.55 percent in 2013. The average potency in Colorado was 17.1percent.
- As of January 2016, there were 424 retail marijuana stores in the state of Colorado compared to 322 Starbucks and 202 McDonald's.

Source: Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report September 2016



earn | Network | Advocate

Black Market Activity:

- Despite claims being made by prolegalization advocates:
- In February 2015, Colorado Attorney General Cynthia Coffman told reporters: "The criminals are still selling on the black market. ... We have plenty of cartel activity in Colorado (and) plenty of illegal activity that has not decreased at all."



Source: Lessons Learned After Four Years of Marijuana Legalization, SAM, October 2016

Impact on Business:

- The CEO of large Colorado construction company GE Johnson has said that "his company has encountered so many job candidates who have failed pre-employment drug tests because of their THC use that it is actively recruiting construction workers from other states."
- The owner of Colorado Springs construction company Avalanche Roofing & Exteriors told *The New York Times* that in Colorado, "to find a roofer or a painter that can pass a drug test is unheard-of."



Source: Lessons Learned After Four Years of Marijuana Legalization, SAM, October 2016

Impact on Business:

- The percentage of employees in the combined U.S. workforce testing positive for drugs has steadily risen over the last three years to a reach 10-year high.
- Percentage of people who missed work during the past 30 days "because [they] just didn't want to be there"
 - Overall Population = 7.4%
 - Alcohol Users = 7.9%
 - Marijuana Users = 15%

Source: Quest Diagnostics, 2015; National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2015

Impact on Communities of Color

- Between 2012 and 2014, the number of Hispanic and African American youth under 18 years old arrested for marijuana-related offenses rose 29 percent and 58 percent, respectively. At the same time, the number of white kids arrested for the same crimes fell eight percent.
- A 2016 investigation by *The Denver Post* revealed that a "disproportionate share" of marijuana businesses are now located in lower-income and minority communities in Denver, communities that often suffer disparate impacts of drug use. One of Denver's lower-income neighborhoods has one marijuana business for every 47 residents.

Source: Lessons Learned After Four Years of Marijuana Legalization, SAM, October 2016

Myth #1: It's Harmless

<u>TO RECAP</u>—The science is emerging on the effects of marijuana, but we can say with certainty that marijuana use is significantly linked with:

- Addiction
- Heart and lung complications
- Mental illness
- Car crashes
- IQ loss and poor school outcomes
- Poor quality of life outcomes
- Hiring problems for business
- Increased crime and targeting of minority communities

Learn | Network | Advocate

Myth #2: The Revenue Will be a Boon to the State

It Will Bring in Revenue

Just Like:

- □ The Tobacco Tax
- □ The Gambling Money
- Alcohol Tax





Myth #2: The Revenue Will be a Boon to the State

Alcohol & Tobacco: Money Makers or Dollar Drainers?



Learn | Network | Advoce

The Dollars Don't Make Sense

Projected high estimate for revenue from marijuana legalization in Connecticut (OFA): Projected costs of marijuana legalization in Connecticut:

\$216 million

\$410.6 million

Source: The Projected Costs of Marijuana Legalization in Connecticut, 2018. SAM Report

Tax Revenues: Empty Promises

- Over half the pot money promised for drug prevention, education & treatment in Washington never materialized...
- ...Instead, much of it was diverted to the general fund

Source: Initiative 502; Washington State Economic and Revenue Forecast Council (as reported by The Seattle Times)

Learn | Network | Advocate



- But SAM agrees. There is no reason to imprison Marijuana smokers. Treatment and or fines are S.A.M.'s preferred option.
- In CT it is a fine for the past 7 years for adult possession of small amounts of marijuana.
- According to a 2015 OPM report, there 49 people jailed in CT for possession of controlled substances.

"If Only We Treated It Like Alcohol ... "



"If Only We Treated It Like Alcohol..."



The Myths of Inevitability (Based on Three Assumptions)

- 1. Marijuana is Harmless
- 2. Tax Revenues from Sales Will be a Boon to the State
- 3. It Will Save Money on Law Enforcement and Incarceration





Other Concerns

Tobacco 2.0: A Big New Marijuana Industry

- There is big money behind marijuana, among those looking to get in the business are the tobacco companies
- In early 2014 we heard 10 marijuana lobbyists had been contracted in Connecticut, in 2016 we lost count





Big Marijuana

"Kids are still more likely to smoke marijuana than adults and even twentysomething's, presenting a real marketing conundrum for marijuana retailers who seek to increase their business and expand their markets, while also claiming they are only targeting adults"



Steve Pasierb, CEO, Partnership for Drug Free Kids



Does Liberalizing Cannabis Laws Increase Use?

"the impact of decriminalization is concentrated amongst minors, who have a higher rate of uptake in the first 5 years following its introduction".

Source: J of Health Economics 36; Williams & Bretteville-Jensen



	IRUR CONFIDENTIAL
	I. THE INFORTANCE OF YOUNGER ADULTS DRAFT
	Within five years, younger adults (18-24) will drop from 18% to 15% of the total adult population (184). They will continue to decline in numbers until at least 1995, as the creat of the Baby Bubble pushes forther past age 25.
	This shift in the population will cause emokers aged 18-24 to fail from 16% to 14% of all smokars by 1988. Even 13% would not be surprising, since suching incidence has been declining more rapidly smong younger adults than any other age group in recent years (see Appendix A).
	Why, then, are younger adult suckers important to ZJR?
1. VOLUME	a the only source of verlagement sectors. Denoted
 YOLUME Younger adults are government studies Less than one-t 	e the only source of replacement smokers. Repeated (Appendix B) have shown that: third of smokers (312) start after age 18.
 <u>VOLUME</u> Younger adults are government studies Less than one-t Only 5% of smoke 	e the only source of replacement smokers. Repeated & (Appendix B) have shown that: third of smokers (31%) start after age 18. Kers start after age 24.
 <u>VOLUME</u> Younger adults are government studies Less than one-t Only 5% of smok 	e the only source of replacement smokers. Repeated (Appendix B) have shown that: third of smokers (31%) start after age 18. kers start after age 24. As a company, Philip Horris held more than 60% of these 18-year-olds in 1983 varues LIR's 15-202, yielding PH a .5 point in-going 50M odvantage due only to "new" smokers.
 <u>VOLUME</u> Younger adults are government studies Less than one-t Only 5% of smok 	e the only source of replacement smokers. Repeated (Appendix B) have shown that: third of smokers (31%) start after age 18. ters start after age 24. As a company, Philip Horris held more than 60% of these H0-year-olds in 1983 versus ER*s 15-20%, yielding PM a -5 point in-poing 50M obvantage due only to "new" smokers start after age 18. * This assumes H0-year-olds are 10% of the 18-26 group rather than a "fair share" of 14% because of population decline and the fact that some smokers start after age 18. y



Alcohol Industry "Self-Regulation"

Distilled Spirits Council of the United States(DISCUS) Code:

Beverage alcohol advertising and marketing materials should not contain any lewd or indecent images or language





Youth Exposure to Alcohol Advertising: Magazines

In 2008, kids aged 12-21 per capita saw (compared to adults 21 and over):

- 10% more beer ads
- 16% more ads for alcopops
- 73% fewer wine ads

The overwhelming majority of youth exposure (78%) came from ads placed in magazines with disproportionate youth audiences. The same examples are found in radio ads and social media.





Source: Center for Alcohol marketing and Youth, CAMY.org

US Television

- In 2009, 315,581 alcohol product commercials appear on U.S. television. Underage youth ages 12-20 were more likely than legal age adults on a per capita basis have seen 67,656 of them or about 21%.
- These ads accounted for more than 44% of youth exposure to alcohol advertising on television. From 2001 to 2009 – the number of television alcohol ads seen by the average 12 to 20 year-old increased by 69%, from 217 per year to 366 per year.
- Youth under the legal drinking age saw 2.3 billion noncompliant alcohol advertising impressions, about 1 out of every 14 alcohol advertising impressions viewed on cable TV by youth. (April 2018)

Source: Center for Alcohol marketing and Youth, CAMY.org





Powerful Pot Lobby Pushes Back Against Regulation Attempts

Colorado's pot lobby has been hard at work stacking the deck since legalization passed in 2012, including:

- Blocking legislation to deter use of illegal pesticides that promote marijuana production
- Suing over restrictions on marijuana advertising targeting children
- Proposing legislation to move regulatory authority from existing state department's to a special committee packed with industry representatives
- Making it more difficult for local initiatives restricting marijuana businesses to be represented on the ballot by raising the threshold for signature collection, from 5% to 15% of the voting electorate
- Sponsoring an initiative in Denver to allow pot smoking in restaurants and cafés

Source: Lessons Learned After 4 Years of Marijuana Legalization: SAM, October 2016

Edibles

- A variety of marijuana products and 'edibles' can be found at marijuana stores and dispensaries:
- Brownies, carrot cake, cookies, peanut butter, granola bars, ice cream, gummies and other candies. Many such as 'Ring Pots' and 'Pot Tarts' are marketed with cartoons and characters appealing to children









Learn | Network | Advocate


 \bigcirc

In Conclusion

- Marijuana is harmful (all drugs are). ۰
- Revenues will be eclipsed by new costs. The only money to be ۰ made is by marijuana entrepreneurs.
- We don't save money on legal alcohol, so why would we save ٠ money on legal marijuana? State coffers will suffer, taxes could increase.
- Corporations will act on behalf of their stock holders to maximize ٠ profits. Efforts to put controls on tobacco, alcohol, etc. have not worked.





Connecticut Association of Prevention Professionals, Inc. Learn | Network | Advocate

www.cappct.org

John Daviau, MACP, CPS Executive Director john@cappct.org 203-530-4314

Tolland

Student Substance Use and Related Behavior Survey Report, 2014

Survey Conducted By



East of the River Action for Substance Abuse Elimination

Report Prepared By

Jennifer Bisson, Ph.D. & Sarah Sanborn, M.A.

Contact Information:

70 Canterbury Street East Hartford, CT 06118 Phone: (860) 568-4442 Fax: (860) 568-4445

www.erasect.org

-Table of Contents-Tolland 2014 Alcohol and Drug Use Student Survey Report

Section Heading	Page Number
Introduction	2
Key Findings	6
Section I: Survey Sample Demographics	а а
Section II: Tobacco Use and Perceptions of Use	9
Part 1: Tobacco Use	9
Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Tobacco Use	16
Section III: Alcohol Use and Perceptions of Use	
Part 1: Alcohol Use	
Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Alcohol Use	
Section IV: Marijuana Use and Perceptions of Use	
Part 1: Marijuana Use	
Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Marijuana Use	
Section V: Prescription and Over-the-Counter Drug Abuse and Perceptions of Al	buse 38
Part 1: Prescription and Over-the-Counter Drug Abuse	
Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Prescription Drug Abuse	41
Section VI: Other Drug Use Rates	44
Section VII: Families and Substance Use	50
Section VIII: Perceptions of Alcohol Prevention Strategies	53
Section IX: Substance Use Comparisons to State and National Data	
Section X: Substance Use Comparisons to Regional Data	
Section XI: Year Trends in Core Measures Summary: Grades 9-12	
Acknowledgements	59
Appendix A: Tolland 2014 Youth Culture Student Survey Tool, Grades 6-12	60

Introduction to the 2014 Tolland Alcohol and Drug Use Student Survey Report

The following report is a summary of data that was gathered during June of 2014 at Tolland Middle School (grades 6-8) and Tolland High School (grades 9-12), all located in the town of Tolland, Connecticut. Data collected from this year's student survey will be used in the planning and development of strategies, policies, and practices in Tolland.

This survey was administered to youth in the schools in order to ensure a representative sample and reliable data. Please note that the findings presented in this report are not reflective of the school but are intended to reflect the greater community of Tolland.

The Tolland 2014 Alcohol and Drug Use Student Survey fulfills the following objectives:

- 1. Describes the nature and extent of substance abuse, school environment, and other risky behaviors among Tolland students in grades 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 in the year 2014.
- 2. Monitors trends in substance abuse and other risky behaviors over time through comparisons with the 2010 survey report.
- 3. Aids in future planning of services and activities for young people in Tolland.

Survey Tool:

The current ERASE Survey tool was adapted from the Governor's Prevention Initiative for Youth (GPIY) Student Survey, a school survey that was distributed throughout the state of Connecticut in 2000. The ERASE Survey has been used throughout the ERASE Region to monitor the rates and trends of substance abuse and other risk and protective factors for over 10 years.

Survey Consent:

The 2014 Tolland Alcohol and Drug Use Student Surveys were administered throughout the month of June 2014 to students at Tolland Middle School and Tolland High School. Students' guardians received letters notifying them of the purpose and content of the survey and were able to return a signed "passive consent" form to the school if they did not want their children to participate in the school survey.

Survey Administration:

Teachers received a set of instructions to read to the students before administering the surveys. Both verbal and written instructions informed students that participation of the survey was voluntary and anonymous. Students who chose to not participate in the survey were asked to work quietly at their desk during the class period. Students were given a full class period to complete their surveys. Students who finished early were instructed to work quietly at their desk until all surveys were collected. To ensure anonymity, names were not written anywhere on the surveys. Teachers immediately collected and enclosed surveys in a sealed envelope. ERASE staff retrieved the surveys from the school administrative offices as soon as survey administration was finished.

Data Processing:

The student survey data was entered and processed by ERASE staff, using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Data Analysis Software. A total of 34 surveys (2.3% of original sample of 1,497 surveys) were omitted from the sample pool due to observed discrepancies in the responses. The final sample size after surveys were omitted was 1,463 surveys for grades 6-12.

Sample Validity:

Response rates by grade level and school are listed below in Table 1. Response rates are calculated as a proportion of the number of surveys included in the sample to the number of total students enrolled in the 2013 - 2014 school year. Note that total sample counts only contain surveys that were used in the survey report; surveys that were omitted from the sample pool are not included in the following counts.

TABLE 1:	Sample Count	Population Count	Response Rate (%)
Grade 6	253 students	240 students	100% ¹
Grade 7	212 students	219 students	96.8%
Grade 8	209 students	235 students	88.9%
Grade 9	190 students	206 students	92.2%
Grade 10	204 students	217 students	94.0%
Grade 11	187 students	206 students	90.8%
Grade 12	206 students	224 students	92.0%
Grades 6-8	674 students	694 students	97.1%
Grades 9-12	787 students	853 students	92.3%
Grades 6-12	1463 students	1547 students	94.4%

¹ The actual response rate for grade 6 is technically 105%. This is likely because a small handful of students misreported their grade level when asked in the survey.

Table 2 shows the confidence intervals calculated for grades 6-8, 9-12 and 6-12, using a 95% confidence level. A confidence interval simply means the percentage range you can expect the accurate rates to fall within. Smaller confidence intervals give you more accurate estimates of the actual use rates in the school population (and larger confidence intervals give you less accurate estimates of the actual use rates in the school population).

For example, if 25% of your sample reported using alcohol in the past month, a confidence interval of 2.0 means that if you randomly re-sampled your population 100 times, 95 of those times you would find past month alcohol use rates to fall somewhere between 23% (25-2) and 27% (25+2). In contrast, if your confidence level is 5 (and 25% of your sample reported using alcohol in the past month), you would typically find past month use rates ranging between 15% (25-5) and 30% (25+5) if you repeatedly re-sampled students in this population.

TABLE 2:	Confidence Level	Confidence Interval
Grades 6-8	95.0%	+/- 0.64
Grades 9-12	95.0%	+/- 0.97
Grades 6-12	95.0%	+/- 0.60

Statistical Analyses:

Statistical comparisons by grade levels were conducted separately for grades 6-8 and grades 9-12 using the appropriate one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Chi-Square (χ^2) technique. Generally, grade level percentage differences are only reported when overall significance is found, with the exception of some key substance use measures (core GPRA measures for alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and prescription drug use), all of which will be reported by grade level regardless of significance level.

Statistical comparisons by race were conducted for grades 6-12 using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or Chi-Square (χ^2) techniques. For additional information, refer to the "Comparisons by Race" section below.

When overall significance was found (p < 0.05), post-hoc analyses using either the Tukey/Bonferroni (equal group variances assumed) or Games-Howell (unequal variances assumed) were conducted to determine which grade levels were significantly different from each other. All three post-hoc procedures protect against Type I error, which occurs when a significant result is actually due to error rather than actual group differences. Throughout the survey report, the type of post-hoc procedure used will be specified in a superscript located in parentheses, with a "(T)" indicating that the Tukey's procedure was used, "(B)" indicating that the Bonferroni procedure was used, and a "(GH)" indicating that the Games-Howell Procedure was used.

Statistical comparisons by gender were conducted for grades 6-8 and grades 9-12 separately using an independent-samples *t*-test or Chi-Square (χ^2) test. Gender differences for grades 6-8 and 9-12 are only reported when a significance value (*p*) of less than 0.05 is found.

Comparisons by Race:

We must be careful not to unfairly identify or stereotype a handful of students as using or abusing drugs, given the small sample size within specific minority groups in these schools. Due to low sample sizes by race sub-group (87.3% White/Caucasion), race differences will not be included in this report, however we will include the breakdown by race as represented in the survey sample in the demographics section.

For information regarding race differences in substance use, refer to the national survey reports, such as the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (<u>http://oas.samhsa.gov/nsduh.htm</u>) or the Monitoring the Future Survey (<u>http://monitoringthefuture.org</u>).

Sections 2-6: Substance Use



Among students in 9-12, the highest past month use rates were for alcohol, followed by marijuana and prescription drugs. Among students in grades 6-8, past month use rates were very low across drugs, highest for alcohol, followed by prescription drugs and marijuana.



Among students in grades 9-12, past month use rates for alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana have decreased since 2009. Binge drinking, drinking under the influence of alcohol, and prescription drug use has increased.

Perc	eived Ease of Accessibility (/erv Easy or Sort of Easy)		
100.0% T	J (
80.0%				
60.0%				
40.0%				
20.0%				
0.0%	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12		
■Alcohol	34.5%	81.6%		
Tobacco Products	10.9%	59.5%		
Marijuana	5.0%	64.6%		
Rx Drugs	12.8%	35.7%		

For grades 6-8, students perceived alcohol as the easiest drug to obtain and marijuana as the most difficult drug to obtain. For grades 9-12, students perceived alcohol as the easiest drug to obtain and prescription drugs as the most difficult drug to obtain.

	Perceived Risk (Great or Mo	derate) of Core Drugs		
100.0% 80.0% 60.0% 40.0% 20.0%				
0.0%	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12		
Alcohol	83.5% 69.8%			
Cigarettes	92.3%	92.3% 90.9%		
Marijuana	86.7%	42.0%		
Rx Drugs	92.0%	89.4%		

For grades 6-8, perceived risk of use was highest for cigarettes and lowest for alcohol. For grades 9-12, perceived risk of use was highest for cigarettes and lowest for marijuana.

100.0%	Perceived Friend Disapprov	al (Greatly or Moderately Wrong)
80.0%		
60.0%		
40.0%		
20.0%		
0.0%	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Alcohol	92.5%	58.2%
■Cigarettes	93.8%	72.6%
■Marijuana	94.2%	39.5%
Rx Drugs	94.8%	74.9%

For grades 6-8, students perceived the highest levels of friend disapproval for prescription drug abuse and marijuana use and the lowest levels for alcohol use.

For grades 9-12, students perceived the highest levels of friend disapproval for prescription drug abuse and the lowest levels for marijuana use.

Pe	erceived Parent Disapproval (G	ireatly or Moderately Wrong)
100.0% 80.0% 60.0% 40.0% 20.0%		
0.0%	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Alcohol	95.8%	86.2%
Cigarettes	97.1%	91.0%
Marijuana	97.9%	81.4%
□Rx Drugs	98.8%	94.9%

For grades 6-8, students perceived the highest levels of parent disapproval for prescription drug use and the lowest levels for alcohol use. For grades 9-12, students perceived the highest levels of parent disapproval for prescription drug abuse and the lowest levels for marijuana use.

Section 7: Families and Substance Use

• 8.3% of students in grades 6-8 and 18.3% of students in grades 9-12 reported that someone in their family used alcohol so that it created problems at home, at work, or with friends.

Section 8: Perceptions of Alcohol Prevention Strategies

- Alcohol prevention strategies seen as most effective for grades 6-8 and 9-12 were for having one's driver's license suspended and for checking ID's in stores or bar.
- Alcohol prevention strategies seen as least effective for grades 6-8 were school rules and setting high prices. In grades 9-12, least effective strategies to prevent alcohol consumption were for alcohol education in school and school rules.

Section 9-11: Comparisons of Tolland 2014 data to Regional, State, National, & Past Year Data

• Refer to these sections directly in the survey report, pages 56-58

Section I: Survey Sample Demographics

The student survey sample consisted of a total of 1,463 students (707 males and 727 females). 674 students represented Tolland Middle School (332 males, 329 females) and 787 students represented Tolland High School (375 males, 397 females).

Refer to Figure 1.0 to see the	e count of students surveyed in each grade level and gender
breakdowns by grade level.	Refer to Figure 1.1 for the breakdown of the sample by race.

6 th grade	7 th grade	8 th grade	9 th grade	10 th grade	11 th grade	12 th grade
n = 253	n = 212	n = 209	n = 190	n = 204	n = 187	n = 206
males: 118	males: 111	males: 103	males: 86	males: 95	males: 93	males: 101
females: 127	females: 100	females: 102	females:102	females: 101	females: 90	females: 104
unknown: 8	unknown: 1	unknown: 4	unknown: 2	unknown: 8	unknown: 4	unknown: 1

Figure 1.0 - Student sample size and gender breakdown for each grade level

	White	Black or African American	Asian or Pacific Islander	Hispanic or Latino	Native American	Other	Bi- or Multi- racial
Grades 6-8	n = 590	n = 9	n = 15	n = 17	n = 5	n = 16	n = 13
	(88.7%)	(1.4%)	(2.3%)	(2.6%)	(0.8%)	(2.4%)	(2.0%)
Grades 9-12	n = 676	n = 25	n = 32	n = 26	n = 3	n = 16	n = 7
	(86.1%)	(3.2%)	(4.1%)	(3.3%)	(0.4%)	(2.0%)	(0.9%)
Grades 6-12	n = 1266	n = 34	n = 47	n = 44	n = 8	n = 32	n = 20
	(87.3%)	(2.3%)	(3.2%)	(3.0%)	(0.6%)	(2.2%)	(1.4%)

Figure 1.1 - Student sample breakdown by race

Section II: Tobacco Use and Perceptions of Use

Part 1: Tobacco Use

Students were asked to report how frequently in the past month they had used cigarettes. In a separate question, students were asked to report how frequently in the past month they had used "other" tobacco products (not including cigarettes), such as chewing or pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, or Snus. To facilitate comparisons to regional and national data, and to allow for comparisons to past year Tolland survey reports, we have merged students' answers to these two separate questions into a general "tobacco products use" variable, in addition to reporting student usage rates for "cigarettes" and "other tobacco products".

Tobacco Use Rates for 2014

6.6% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1424) reported using *any* type of tobacco product (cigarettes, chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus, etc.) at least once in the past month. Of all students in grades 6-12, 3.7% reported using cigarettes at least once in the past month, 4.4%

reported using other tobacco products (not including cigarettes) in the past month, and 8.2% reported using e-cigarettes in the past month.

Overall, tobacco products usage rates are generally much higher among grades 9-12 compared to grades 6-8.

Refer to Figure 2.0 for tobacco use rates (all tobacco products, cigarettes, and other tobacco products) among students in grades 6-12, grades 6-8, and grades 9-12.

Figure 2.0 - Tobacco Use Rates	Grades 6-12 (n=1424)	Grades 6-8 (n=665)	Grades 9-12 (n=757)
All Tobacco Products: Lifetime Use (used at least once before)	10.5%	1.2%	18.8%
All Tobacco Products: Past Month Use (used in past 30 days)	6.6%	0.9%	11.6%
All Tobacco Products: Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	3.2%	0.6%	5.4%
Cigarettes: Lifetime Use (used at least once before)	7.3%	1.1%	12.8%
Cigarettes: Past Month Use (used in past 30 days)	3.7%	0.6%	6.5%
Cigarettes: Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	2.1%	0.6%	3.4%
Other Tobacco Products: Lifetime Use (used at least once before)	7.4%	0.6%	13.3%
Other Tobacco Products: Past Month Use (used in past 30 days)	4.4%	0.6%	7.7%
Other Tobacco Products: Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	1.9%	0.3%	3.3%
E-Cigarettes (used at least once before)	16.5%	4.7%	17.8%
E-Cigarettes: Past Month Use (used in past 30 days)	8.2%	3.5%	8.8%
E-Cigarettes: Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	3.3%	3.5%	3.3%

Tobacco Use Trends by Year:

Since 2010 among students in grades 6-8 and students in grades 9-12 general tobacco use has decreased slightly. Refer to Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1 – Past Month General Tobacco Use: Year Trends	2010	2014	% Change Since 2010
Grades 6-8	2.2%	0.9%	- 1.3%
Grades 9-12	15.7%	11.6%	- 4.1%

2014 Tobacco Use Comparisons by Grade Level:

When comparing individuals who had used tobacco products at some point in their lifetime to individuals who had never used tobacco products, there were no significant differences in lifetime use of all tobacco products (including cigarettes and other tobacco products) based on grade level for grades 6-8, p > 0.05. However, there were significant differences for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 757) = 33.294$, p < 0.001. For students in grades 9-12, there was a higher

percentage of individuals who had used tobacco products at some point in their lifetime in 11^{th} and 12^{th} grade than there were in 9^{th} grade, ps < 0.05. There were also more individuals who used tobacco products at some time in their lifetime in grade 12 than there were in grade 10, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.2.

When comparing individuals who had used cigarettes at some point in their lifetime to individuals who had never used cigarettes, there was a significant difference in cigarette use based on grade level for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 757) = 25.332$, p < 0.001. There was a greater percentage of individuals in grade 12 than in grades 9 and 11 who had used cigarettes at some point in their life, ps > 0.05. There were no differences between individuals in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.2.

When comparing individuals who had used other tobacco products (e.g., chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus) at some point in their lifetime to individuals who had never used other tobacco products, there was a significant difference in use of other tobacco products based on grade for students in grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 754) = 24.005$, p < 0.001. There were more students who reported using other tobacco products at some point in their lifetime in grade 12 compared to grades 9 and 10, ps < 0.05. There were also more students in grade 11 who reported using other tobacco products at some point in their lifetime in grade 9, p < 0.05. There were no differences between individuals in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.2.

When comparing individuals who had used e-cigarettes (electronic cigarettes) at some point in their lifetime to individuals who had never used e-cigarettes, there was a significant difference in e-cigarette use based on grade for students in grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 752) = 8.001, p < 0.05$. However, there were no significant post hoc ^(B) differences. There were no significant differences between students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.2.



When comparing individuals who had used tobacco products at some point in the last month to individuals who had not used tobacco products in the last month, there was a significant difference in past month use of all tobacco products (including cigarettes and other tobacco products) based on grade level for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 757) = 30.008$, p < 0.001. There were more students in grades 11 and 12 who had used tobacco products in the past month than were in grades 9 or 10, ps < 0.05. There was no significant difference in past month use of tobacco products between grade levels for students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.3.

When comparing individuals who had used cigarettes at some point in the last month to individuals who had not used cigarettes in the last month, there was a significant difference in past month use of cigarettes based on grade level for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 757) = 25.691$, p < 0.001. There were more students in grade 12 who had used cigarettes in the past month than were in grades 9,10, or 11, *ps* < 0.05. There was no significant difference in past month use of cigarettes between grade levels for students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.3.

When comparing individuals who had used other tobacco products (e.g., chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus) at some point in the last month to individuals who had not used other tobacco products in the last month, there was a significant difference in past month use of other tobacco products based on grade level for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 754) = 27.125$, p < 0.001. There were more students in grades 11 and 12 who had used other tobacco products in the past month than were in grades 9 or 10, ps < 0.05. There was no significant difference in past month use of other tobacco products between grade levels for students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.3.

When comparing individuals who had used e-cigarettes (electronic cigarettes) at some point in the last month to individuals who had not used e-cigarettes in the last month, there was a significant difference in past month use of e-cigarettes based on grade level for grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 752) = 8.614$, p < 0.05. However, post hoc testing ^(B) revealed no significant pairwise differences. There was no significant difference in past moth use of e-cigarettes between grade levels for students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.3.



2014 Tobacco Use Comparisons by Gender:

<u>General Tobacco Use Rates</u>: There were no gender differences in lifetime or past month tobacco use rates among students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. There were significant gender differences in lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 742) = 17.355$, p < 0.001, and past month, $\chi^2(1, N = 742) = 19.424$, p < 0.001, tobacco use rates among students in grades 9-12. Males reported significantly more lifetime tobacco use compared to females in grades 9, 11, and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 2.4 and 2.5. Males reported significantly more past month tobacco use compared to females in grades 9, 11, and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 9, 11 and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 9, 11 and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 2.6 and 2.7.

<u>Cigarette Use Rates:</u> There were no gender differences in lifetime or past month cigarette use rates among students in grades 6-8, or 9-12, ps > 0.05. Refer to Figures 2.4 - 2.7.

<u>Other (Non-Cigarette) Tobacco Use Rates:</u> There were no gender differences in lifetime or past month (non-cigarette) tobacco product use rates among students in grades 6-8, ps > 0.05. There were gender differences in lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 739) = 42.583$, p < 0.001, and past month, $\chi^2(1, N = 739) = 34.713$, p < 0.001, other tobacco use rates among students in grades 9-12. Males reported significantly more lifetime non-cigarette tobacco use compared to females in grades 9, 11, and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 2.4 and 2.5. Males reported significantly more past month non-cigarette tobacco use compared to females in grades 10, 11, and 12, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figures 2.6 and 2.7.

	Figure 2	.4 - Male Li	ifetime Tob	acco Use b	y Grade Le	evel	
50% T				······			•••••
40% +							
30% +					101-1		
20% +				50113 2003			-
10% 🕂							
0% +	Cth	7+6	Oth	Oth	1.046	4446	
	001	701	0(1)	ອແກ	Toun	1110	12th
All Tobacco	1.7%	0.9%	1.9%	12.9%	14.6%	30.8%	40.2%
Cigarettes	1.7%	0.9%	1.0%	11.8%	7.9%	11.0%	27.2%
Other Tobacco	0.9%	0.0%	1.0%	9.4%	13.5%	29.2%	34.1%
E-Cigarettes	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	18.8%	26.1%	15.6%	31.5%

50% + 40% +							
30% +							
20% +		ញ					
10%							
0%	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
All Tobacco	0.0%	2.1%	1.0%	4.0%	17.2%	8.9%	21.9%
Cigarettes	0.0%	2.1%	1.0%	3.0%	17.2%	5.6%	18.8%
■ Other Tobacco	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	2.0%	7.0%	5.7%	7.2%
≅E-Cigarettes	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	12.1%	12.2%	10.1%	15.6%

Fi	gure 2.6 -	Male Past	Month Tob	acco Use by	y Grade Le	vel	
50% _T					-		
40% +							
30% +							
20% -						-8-8	-
10% -							
0%	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
All Tobacco	1.7%	0.9%	1.0%	8.2%	6.7%	24.2%	27.2%
Cigarettes	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	7.1%	2.2%	2.2%	16.3%
Other Tobacco	0.9%	0.0%	1.0%	5.9%	5.6%	22.5%	19.8%
E-Cigarettes	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	10.6%	6.8%	6.7%	19.6%

Fig	aure 2.7 -	Female Pas	st Month To	obacco Use	e by Grade	Level	
50% T							
40% +							
30% +							
20% +							
10%							
0% -	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
All Tobacco	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.0%	6.1%	6.7%	12.5%
Cigarettes	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.0%	6.1%	4.4%	12.5%
■Other Tobacco	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	4.5%	3.1%
■E-Cigarettes	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	7.1%	6.1%	6.7%	8.3%

Age of Onset for Tobacco Use:

Students that reported using tobacco products at least once before were asked how old they were when they tried tobacco products (like cigarettes, snuff, chewing tobacco, dip, smoking tobacco from a pipe) for the first time.

Among students in grades 6-12, the average age of onset for all tobacco use was 13.94 years of age (n=159, SD = 2.47 yrs). Refer to Figure 2.8 for the average age of onset for grades 6-8 and 9-12.

Figure 2.8 – Age of Onset of Tobacco Use					
Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12			
13.94 yrs (n=159, SD = 2,47)	10.25 yrs (n=8, <i>SD</i> = 1.83)	14.14 yrs (n=151, <i>SD</i> = 2.34)			

Since 2010, the age of onset for general tobacco product use has decreased slightly for middle and high school students. Refer to Figure 2.9 for a summary of the average age of onset for tobacco use by grade level since 2010.

Figure 2.9 – Year Trends for Age of Onset of Tobacco Use	2010	2014
Grades 6-12	14.0 yrs	13.9 yrs
Grades 6-8	11.5 yrs	10.3 yrs
Grades 9-12	14.4 yrs	14.1 yrs

Influence to Try Tobacco for the First Time:

Students who reported using tobacco at least once before in their lifetime were asked what influenced them the most to try tobacco products.

For grades 6-12, "Curiosity" was the largest influence (5.6%), followed by "Friendship/Peer Pressure" (3.0%), and "Boredom" (1.8%). Very few of the students who reported lifetime tobacco use indicated that "Ads/Media" (0.1%) or being "angry/upset with someone" (0.1%) solely influenced their decisions to try tobacco for the first time. Refer to Figure 2.10.



Accessibility of Tobacco

Of the students that have used tobacco at least once before, most of students (12.5% sometimes or often) reported getting tobacco products from friends. Other major sources of tobacco products were from parents/guardians without their permission (5.3% sometimes or often) and from a store (8.0% sometimes or often). The least likely sources of tobacco products were from machines or from a parent or guardian with their permission. Refer to Figure 2.11.



A series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare students' sources of tobacco products between middle and high school students who reported lifetime tobacco use, and one significant difference was found. There were no differences between middle and high school students on how often they obtained tobacco products from their parents/guardians with their permission, from their parents/guardians without their permission, from their siblings, from their friends, or from a machine, p > 0.05.

0.8% of students in grades 6-8 versus 5.5% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting tobacco products from a store, t(81.00) = 10.97, p < 0.05.

Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Tobacco Use

All students, including those who reported never using tobacco products before, answered the following questions regarding students' perceptions of tobacco use, particularly regarding the risks of use, and parental and friend disapproval of use.

Perceptions of Peer Tobacco Use

Students were asked: "About how many students in your grade do you think use tobacco products (e.g., cigarettes, chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus, electronic cigarettes)?". 48.8% of students in grades 6-8 believed that less than 10% of their peers used tobacco products, and 42.7% of students in grades 9-12 believed that a few students (around 25%) used tobacco products. See Figure 2.12.

Figure 2.12	"Hardly Any Students (less than 10%)"	"A Few Students (around 25%)"	"Half of Students (around 50%)"	"Most Students (around 75%)"	"Almost All Students (more than 90%)"
Grades 6-12	48.8%	27.5%	15.0%	6.5%	2.1%
Grades 6-8	88.2%	10.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%
Grades 9-12	14.2%	42.7%	28.0%	11.8%	3.3%

There were significant differences between grades 6-8, F(2, 657) = 5.78, p < 0.01, and between grades 9-12, F(3, 750) = 3.23, p < 0.05, in perception of peer tobacco use. Post hoc tests ^(GH) revealed that students in 6th grade reported less peer tobacco use than did students in the 7th or 8th grade, p < 0.05. Post hoc testing ^(T) also revealed that there were significant differences in peer perception of tobacco use between grades 9 and 12, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.13.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of peer tobacco use in grades 6-8 or grades 9-12, p > 0.05.

Risks of Smoking Cigarettes:

75.4% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1387) perceived regular smoking (defined as smoking one or more pack of cigarettes per day) as a "great risk" and 16.1% perceived regular smoking as a "moderate risk". In other words, 91.6% of all students felt that regular cigarette smoking carries a "moderate" to "great risk" to a person, physically or in other ways. Refer to Figure 2.14 for perceived risk by grades 6-8 (n=639) and grades 9-12 (n=748).

Figure 2.14	"Moderate Risk"	"Great Risk"	"Moderate Risk" or "Great Risk"
Grades 6-12	16.1%	75.4%	91.6%
Grades 6-8	16.4%	75.9%	92.3%
Grades 9-12	15.9%	75.0%	90.9%

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or grades 9-12 in the perception of regular smoking being risky to one's health, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.15 to view the differences in perception of risk by grade.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of risks associated with regular smoking among students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. However, compared to males, females perceived greater risk harming themselves physically or in other ways when smoking 1+ packs of cigarettes per day in grades 9-12, t(687.75) = 2.30, p < 0.05.

Parent/Guardian Disapproval of Smoking Cigarettes:

93.9% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1426) thought their parents/guardians felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they smoked cigarettes. 82.7% of students in grades 6-12 thought their parents felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they smoked cigarettes. Refer to Figure 2.16 for perceived parent disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=665) and grades 9-12 (n=759).

Figure 2.16	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	11.2%	82.7%	93.9%
Grades 6-8	7.5%	89.6%	97.1%
Grades 9-12	14.5%	76.5%	91.0%

There were no significant differences in perceived parent disapproval of smoking between grades 6-8, p > 0.05. There were significant differences in perceived parent disapproval of smoking between grades 9-12, F(3, 755) = 10.38, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 9, 10, 11 and grade 12, p < 0.01. Refer to Figure 2.17.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes among students in grades 6-8 or grades 9-12, p > 0.05.

Friend Disapproval of Smoking Cigarettes:

82.6% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1394) thought that their friends felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they smoked cigarettes. 62.6% of students thought that their friends felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they smoked cigarettes. Refer to Figure 2.18 for perceived friend disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=657) and 9-12 (n=736).

Figure 2.18	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	19.9%	62.6%	82.6%
Grades 6-8	13.1%	80.7%	93.8%
Grades 9-12	26.1%	46.5%	72.6%

There were significant differences for students' perceived friend disapproval of smoking cigarettes between grades 6-8, F(2, 654) = 7.04, p < 0.01, and between grades 9-12, F(3, 732) = 4.09, p < 0.01. Post hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7 and between grades 6 and 8, p < 0.05. There were also significant post hoc ^(GH) differences between grades 9 and 12, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 2.19.



Among students in grades 6-8, females showed higher rates of friend disapproval of smoking than males, t(585.48) = 3.25, p < 0.01. 85.0% of females versus 76.5% of males thought their friends felt it would be "greatly wrong" for them to smoke cigarettes. Among students in grades 9-12, females showed higher rates of friend disapproval of smoking than males, t(695.32) = 3.52, p < 0.001. 51.9% of females versus 40.8% of males thought their friends felt it would be "greatly wrong" for them to smoke cigarettes.

Section III: Alcohol Use and Perceptions of Use

Part 1: Alcohol Use

Alcohol Use Rates for 2014

15.8% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1401) reported drinking alcoholic beverages (more than a sip and <u>not</u> including religious activities) in the past month. 28.8% of all students in grades 6-12 reported drinking alcoholic beverages *at least once before* in their lifetime. 1.1% of students in grades 6-8 (n=651) and 28.6% (n=748) of students in grades 9-12 reported drinking alcoholic beverages in the past month. Refer to Figure 3.0 for specific percentage rates.

Figure 3.0 - Alcohol Use Rates	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Lifetime Use (used at least once before)	28.8%	4.5%	50.0%
Past Month Use (used in the past 30 days)	15.8%	1.1%	28.6%
Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	4.1%	0.8%	7.0%

Alcohol Use Trends by Year:

Long-term trends indicate a decline in past month alcohol use since 2010 among students in grades 6-8 and students in grades 9-12. Since 2010, past month alcohol use rates have decreased by 3.9 % for grades 6-8, and by 11.2% for grades 9-12. Refer to Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 – Past Month Alcohol Use Year Trends	2010	2014	% Change Since 2010
Grades 6-8	5.0%	1.1%	- 3.9%
Grades 9-12	39.8%	28.6%	- 11.2%

2014 Alcohol Use Comparisons by Grade Level:

There was a significant difference between grades 6-8 for lifetime use of alcohol (i.e., drinking more than a sip of alcoholic beverages), $\chi^2(2, N = 651) = 7.296$, p < 0.05. Post hoc testing ^(B) revealed more frequent lifetime use of alcohol in grades 7 and 8 compared to grade 6, p < 0.05. There were no differences between grades 6-8 for past month or frequent alcohol use, p > 0.05.

There were also significant differences between grades 9-12 for lifetime alcohol use, $\chi^2(3, N = 748) = 61.828$, p < 0.001, past month alcohol use, $\chi^2(3, N = 748) = 82.169$, p < 0.001, and frequent alcohol use, $\chi^2(3, N = 748) = 22.529$, p < 0.001. For lifetime alcohol use, post-hoc analyses ^(B) show significant differences between grades 9 and 11-12 and between grades 10 and

12, p < 0.05. For past month alcohol use, post-hoc analyses ^(B) show significant increases between grades 9-10 and 11-12 and between grades 11 and 12, p < 0.05. For frequent alcohol use, post hoc analyses ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-11 and 12.



Refer to Figure 3.2 for lifetime, past month, and frequent/daily alcohol use by grade.

2014 Alcohol Use Comparisons by Gender:

There were no gender differences in lifetime, past month, or frequent alcohol use among students in grades 6-8 or grades 9-12, p > 0.05.

Age of Onset for Alcohol Use:

Students that reported drinking alcohol at least once before (more than just a few sips and not including religious activities) were asked how old they were when they had an alcoholic beverage for the first time.

Among students in grades 6-12, the average age of onset for alcohol use was 13.9 years of age (n=403, SD=2.1 yrs). The average age of onset for alcohol use among students in grades 6-8 was 11.3 years of age (n=32, SD=2.0 yrs). The average age of onset for alcohol use among students in grades 9-12 was 14.2 years of age (n=371, SD=2.0 yrs).

Since 2010, the age of onset for alcohol use has increased slightly for high school students and middle school students. Refer to Figure 3.3 for current and past year ages of onset for alcohol use.

Figure 3.3 – Year Trends for Age of Onset of Alcohol Use	2010	2014
Grades 6-12	13.5 yrs	13.9 yrs
Grades 6-8	11.0 yrs	11.3 yrs
Grades 9-12	14.1 yrs	14.2 yrs

Influence to Try Alcohol for the First Time:

Students who reported drinking alcohol at least once before in their lifetime were asked what influenced them the most to try alcoholic drinks.

"Curiosity" was the largest influence (41.8%), followed by "Friendship/Peer Pressure" (16.4%), and "Boredom" (15.7%). Very few of the students who reported lifetime alcohol use indicated that "Ads/Media" (0.8%) or being "angry/upset with someone" (1.6%) solely influenced their decisions to try alcohol for the first time. Refer to Figure 3.4.



Accessibility of Alcohol

Of the students that have drank alcohol at least once before, most of students (66.5% sometimes or often) reported getting alcohol from friends. Other major sources of alcohol were from parents/guardians without their permission (36.9% sometimes or often) and from other people who buy it for them (44.2% sometimes or often). The least likely sources of alcohol were from a restaurant (where students would buy it themselves). Refer to Figure 3.5.



A series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare students' sources of alcohol between middle and high school students who reported lifetime alcohol use and several differences were found. There were no differences between middle and high school students on how often they received alcohol from their parents/guardians with their permission, from their

parents/guardians without their permission, from siblings, from a party with an adult's (21 or older) permission, at a restaurant or from a store or bar, p > 0.05.

- 20.0% of students in grades 6-8 versus 69.6% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting alcohol from their friends, t(395) = -4.29, p < 0.001.
- 16.0% of students in grades 6-8 versus 46.1% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting alcohol from other people who buy it for them (not including family), t(27.91) = -2.35, p < 0.05.

Places/Events Where Students Drank Alcohol in the Past Month

Students who reported drinking alcoholic beverages at least once before in their lifetime were asked to specify the frequency in which they drank alcohol in certain locations in the past 30 days.

Of the students in grades 6-8 who reported drinking at least once before, 34.6% have sometimes or often drank alcohol at home in the past month and 26.1% have sometimes or often drank alcohol at the home of other people. Refer to Figure 3.6 for specific percentages. There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 for frequency of drinking in any of the locations, p > 0.05.

For students in grades 6-8, when compared to males (0.0%), more females (55.6%) often or sometimes drink at school activities like dances or sporting events, t(8.00) = 2.87, p < 0.05, and more females (44.4%) than males (0.0%) often or sometimes drink at a party without an adult (30 or older) present, t(8.00) = 2.53, p < 0.05. There were no other significant gender differences for places where students drank alcohol in the past month, p > 0.05



Of the students in grades 9-12 who reported drinking at least once before, 59.5% have sometimes or often drank alcohol at the home of another individual at least once in the past month and 49.9% have sometimes or often drank alcohol at a party without an adult at least once in the past month. Refer to Figure 3.7 for specific percentages.

There was a significant differences between grades 9-12 for frequency of drinking at the homes of other people, F(3, 369) = 5.35, p < 0.01, frequency of drinking at parties with an adult (30 or older) present, F(3, 367) = 3.02, p < 0.05, and frequency of drinking at parties without an adult (30 or older) present, F(3, 365) = 7.35, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed fewer 9th graders (42.6%) and 10th graders (50.5%) sometimes or often drink at the homes of other people

compared to 12th graders (73.6%), p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed fewer 10th graders (23.3%) sometimes or often drink at parties with an adult present compared to 12th graders (35.2%), p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(T) showed fewer 9th graders (28.3%), 10th graders (44.9%), and 11th graders (47.6%) sometimes or often drink at parties without an adult present compared to 12th graders (64.5%), p < 0.05. There were no other significant differences.

For students in grades 9-12, when compared to females (5.8%), more males (17.1%) often or sometimes drink at school activities like dances or sporting events, t(297.82) = -2.81, p < 0.01. There were no other significant gender differences for places where students drank alcohol in the past month, p > 0.05.



Students Driving While Under the Influence of Alcohol:

Since the legal driving age in the state of Connecticut is a minimum of 16 years of age, results for driving under the influence of alcohol mainly pertains to students surveyed in grades 11-12.

Since 2010, past month alcohol-related DUI rates have decreased from 6.6% to 4.6% for students in grades 11-12. Refer to Figure 3.8.

4.6% of all students in grades 11 and 12 (n=227) reported driving a car, truck, ATV, or motorcycle under the influence of alcohol within the past 30 days. Breaking this down by grade level, 3.7% of students in grade 11 (n=102) and 5.3% of all students in grade 12 (n=125) reported drinking while driving at least once in the past 30 days. There were no significant differences in DUI rates between grades 11 and 12, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.8.



There were significant gender differences in past month DUI rates for students in grades 11-12, $\chi^2(2, N=225) = 9.691$, p < 0.01. More males (10.6%) than females (5.4%) reported driving under the influence of alcohol in the past month.

Since 2010, lifetime alcohol-related DUI rates have decreased from 19.9% to 11.7% for students in grades 11-12. Refer to Figure 3.9.

11.7% of all students in grades 11 and 12 (n=223) reported driving a car, truck, ATV, or motorcycle under the influence of alcohol in their lifetime. Breaking this down by grade level, 8.6% of students in grade 11 (n=100) and 14.6% of all students in grade 12 (n=123) reported drinking while driving at least once in their lifetime. There were no significant differences in DUI rates between grades 11 and 12, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.9.



There were significant gender differences in lifetime DUI rates for students in grades 11-12, $\chi^2(2, N = 221) = 9.228$, p < 0.05. More males (26.8%) than females (14.7%) reported driving under the influence of alcohol in the past month.

Riding in Vehicle When Driver is Under the Influence of Alcohol:

6.4% of students in grades 6-12 (n=739), 0.3% of students in grades 6-8 (n=8), and 11.7% of students in grades 9-12 (n=731) reported riding in a car in the past month when the driver was under the influence of alcohol. 19.3% of students in grades 6-12 (n=743), 0.6% of students in grades 6-8 (n=9), and 35.3% of students in grades 9-12 (n=734) reported riding in a car at some point in their lifetime when the driver was under the influence of alcohol.

There were no differences between grades 6-8 for rates of riding in a vehicle when the driver was under the influence of alcohol in the past month, p > 0.05. However, compared to 7th graders, students in 6th grade reported less frequently riding with a driver under the influence at some point in their lifetime, $\chi^2(2, N = 9) = 6.300$, p < 0.05. There were no differences between grades 9-12 for rates of riding in a vehicle when the driver was under the influence of alcohol in the past month or at some point in their lifetime, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.10.



For grades 6-8, there was no significant difference between males and females in riding in a vehicle (both in the past month and in their lifetime) when a driver was under the influence of alcohol, p > 0.05. Similarly, for grades 9-12, there was no significant difference between males and females for riding in a vehicle in the past month when the driver was under the influence of alcohol, p > 0.05. However, in grades 9-12, more females (41.6%) than males (33.8%) had ridden in their lifetime with a driver under the influence of alcohol, $\chi^2(1, N = 720) = 4.672$, p < 0.05.

Since 2010, the percentage of students who have ridden in a vehicle with a driver under the influence of alcohol in the past month has decreased for grades 6-12, 6-8, and 9-12. Refer to Figure 3.11.



Binge Drinking Rates

Students were asked if they have had 4 or more drinks during a single occasion. In this survey report, having 4 or more drinks during a single occasion will be referred to as "binge drinking".

18.4% of students in grades 6-12 (n=399) engaged in binge drinking at least once before in their lifetime and 9.6% at least once in the past month. 0.9% of students in grades 6-8 (n=29) and

17.2% of students in grades 9-12 (n=370) binge drank at least once in the past month. Refer to Figure 3.12.

Figure 3.12 - Binge Drinking Rates	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Lifetime Rate (at least once before)	18.4%	1.6%	32.8%
Past Month Rate (in the past 30 days)	9.6%	0.9%	17.2%
Frequent/Daily Rate (6+ days in past month)	2.2%	0.6%	3.6%

There were no significant differences found between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime binge drinking rates, p < 0.05. Significant differences were found between grades 9-12 for past month binge drinking rates, $\chi^2(3, N = 370) = 32.750$, p < 0.001, and lifetime binge drinking rates, $\chi^2(3, N = 370) = 17.121$, p < 0.01. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) showed significantly less binge drinking in the past month for 9th and 10th graders compared to 11th and 12th graders, p < 0.05. Students in grade 12 also reported significantly more lifetime binge drinking compared to students in grades 9 and 10, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.13.



Past month and lifetime binge drinking rates were not significantly different between males and females among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12, p > 0.05.

There were no significant race differences among students in grades 6-12 for lifetime binge drinking or for past month binge drinking, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.14.

Figure 3.14	White or Caucasian	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Bi- or Multi-racial	Other
Past Month Use	34.8%	50.0%	30.8%	33.3%	14.3%
Lifetime Use	67.0%	72.2%	61.5%	50.0%	71.4%

Binge Drinking Year Trends

Since 2010, past month binge drinking rates among students in grades 6-12 have decreased from 16.6% to 9.6%. Since 2010, lifetime binge drinking rates among students in grades 6-13 have

decreased 7.7%. Refer to Figure 3.15 for year trends in past month binge drinking rates and Figure 3.16 for year trends in lifetime binge drinking rates.





Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Alcohol Use

All students, including those who reported never drinking alcohol before, answered the following questions regarding students' perceptions of alcohol use, particularly regarding the risks of use, parental and friend disapproval, and popularity of alcohol use among peers.

Perceptions of Peer Alcohol Use

Students were asked: "About how many students in your grade do you think drink alcoholic beverages (more than just a sip and NOT including religious activities) at least once every month?". 80.8% of students in grades 6-8 believed that less than 10% of their peers drank alcohol at least once every month, and 35.9% of students in grades 9-12 believed that most students (around 75%) drank alcoholic beverages at least once every month. See Figure 3.17.

Figure 3.17	"Hardly Any Students (less than 10%)"	"A Few Students (around 25%)"	"Half of Students (around 50%)"	"Most Students (around 75%)"	"Almost All Students (more than 90%)"
Grades 6-12	39.3%	14.9%	17.7%	19.5%	8.7%
Grades 6-8	80.8%	15.8%	2.3%	0%	1.1%
Grades 9-12	4.3%	14.1%	30.7%	35.9%	15.0%

There were significant differences between grades 6-8 in perception of peer alcohol use, F(2,616) = 6.09, p < 0.01. Post hoc analyses ^(GH) revealed significant differences between grades 6 and 7 for this question, p < 0.05. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12 in perception of peer alcohol use, F(3,735) = 30.19, p < 0.001. Post hoc analyses ^(T) revealed significant differences between grades 9 and 10-12 and between grades 10 and 11-12 for this question, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.18.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of peer alcohol use in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. There were significant gender differences in perception of peer alcohol use in grades 9-12, t(722) = 3.83, p < 0.001. Females were reported more peer alcohol use than did males in grades 9-12.

Risks of Drinking Alcohol (5 or More Drinks, Once or Twice a Week)

There are two similar questions regarding students' perceived risk associated with alcohol use. The following question, "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) when they drink 5 or more alcoholic beverages once or twice a week" should be used when comparing to national and state level data, as it meets current federal grant guidelines.

39.9% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1378) perceived that drinking 5 or more alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) once or twice a week to be a "great risk" and 36.2% perceived such drinking to be a "moderate risk". Refer to Figure 3.19 for perceived risk by grades 6-8 (n=632) and grades 9-12 (n=746).

Figure 3.19	"Moderate Risk"	"Great Risk"	"Moderate Risk" or "Great Risk"
Grades 6-12	36.2	39.9	76.1
Grades 6-8	38.8	44.8	83.5
Grades 9-12	34.0	35.8	69.8

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or 9-12 in the perception risks associated with having 5 or more alcoholic drinks once or twice a week, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.20 to view the differences in perception of risk by grade.



There were no significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 in the perception of risks associated with drinking 5 or more drinks once or twice a week, p > 0.05. There were significant gender differences among students in grades 9-12 in the perception or risks associated with drinking 5 or more drinks once or twice a week, t(701.17) = 3.02, p < 0.01. Compared to males, females are more likely to view drinking 5 or more drinks once or twice a week as a greater risk.

Risks of Drinking Alcohol (1 or 2 Drinks Nearly Every Day)

In addition to the question above, which assessed perception of risk associated with drinking 5 or more alcoholic beverages 1-2 times a week, students were also asked to rate how much risk they perceived as associated with drinking 1-2 alcoholic beverages nearly every day to ease comparison of perception of risk of alcohol as asked in prior survey years for Tolland (e.g., 2010).

31.3% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1388) perceived that drinking 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) nearly every day to be a "great risk" and 37.0% perceived such drinking to be a "moderate risk". Refer to Figure 3.21 for perceived risk by grades 6-8 (n=639) and grades 9-12 (n=749).

Figure 3.21	"Moderate Risk"	"Great Risk"	"Moderate Risk" or "Great Risk"
Grades 6-12	37.0%	31.3%	68.3%
Grades 6-8	36.8%	37.6%	74.3%
Grades 9-12	37.2%	25.9%	63.2%

There were no significant differences in risk assessment between grades 6-8 or 9-12 in the perception of having 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages nearly every day, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 3.22 to view the differences in perception of risk by grade.



There were no significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 in the perception of risks associated with drinking 1-2 drinks nearly every day, p > 0.05. There was a significant gender difference among students in grades 9-12 in the perception of the risks associated with drinking 1-2 drinks nearly every day, t(718.27) = 2.94, p < 0.01. Females rated drinking 1-2 drinks nearly every day as more risky than did males.

Parent/Guardian Disapproval of Drinking Alcohol:

90.7% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1423) thought their parents/guardians felt it would be "greatly wrong" or "moderately wrong" if they drank 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) nearly every day. 76.0% of students in grades 6-12 thought their parents felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they drank alcohol regularly. Refer to Figure 3.23 for perceived parent disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=662) and grades 9-12 (n=759).

Figure 3.23	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong " or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	14.7%	76.0%	90.7%
Grades 6-8	10.3%	85.5%	95.8%
Grades 9-12	18.4%	67.7%	86.2%

There were significant differences in perceived parent disapproval of drinking between grades 6-8, F(2,659) = 6.27, p < 0.01. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed differences between grades 6 and 7-8, p < 0.05. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12, F(3,755) = 10.93, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed differences between grades 12 and 9-11, p < 0.05. For specific grade trends, refer to Figure 3.24.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of parental disapproval of drinking among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12, p > 0.05.

Friend Disapproval of Drinking Alcohol:

74.4% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1393) thought that their friends felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they drank 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) nearly every day. 52.3% of students thought that their friends felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they drank alcohol. Refer to Figure 3.25 for perceived friend disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=656) and 9-12 (n=736).

Figure 3.25	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	52.3%	22.1%	74.4%
Grades 6-8	79.3%	13.3%	92.5%
Grades 9-12	28.1%	30.0%	58.2%

There were significant differences in perceived friend disapproval of drinking between grades 6-8, F(2,653) = 9.09, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences between students in grades 6 and 7-8. There were also significant differences in perceived friend disapproval of drinking between grades 9-12, F(3,732) = 8.13, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences between students in grades 12 and 9-10. Refer to Figure 3.26 for percentages by grade.



There were significant gender differences in perception of friend disapproval of drinking among students in grades 6-8, t(607.60) = 2.68, p < 0.01; females reported friends would report drinking 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages nearly every day to be more wrong than did males. There were significant gender differences in perception of friend disapproval of drinking among students in grades 9-12, t(720) = 3.53, p < 0.001; females reported friends would report drinking 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages nearly every day to be more wrong than did males.

Disapproval of Peer Alcohol Use

Students were asked how they felt about someone their age having 1 or 2 drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor) nearly every day. 80.6% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1417) "somewhat" or "strongly" disapproved of someone their age having 1 or 2 drinks of alcohol regularly. Refer to Figure 3.27 for perceived accessibility of alcohol by grades 6-8 (n=658) and 9-12 (n=757).

Figure 3.27	"Somewhat Disapprove"	"Strongly Disapprove"	"Somewhat" or "Strongly" Disapprove	"Neither Approve or Disapprove"
Grades 6-12	16.0%	64.6%	80.6%	14.0%
Grades 6-8	6.7%	85.4%	92.1%	5.9%
Grades 9-12	24.2%	46.4%	70.5%	21.1%

There were significant differences between grades 6-8 for students' disapproval of peer alcohol use, F(2,655) = 10.60, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12, F(3,753) = 3.39, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(T) show significant differences between grades 10 and 12. Refer to Figure 3.28.



There were no gender differences in students' disapproval of peer alcohol use among students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05, however there were significant differences among students in grades 9-12, t(705.34) = 4.94, p < 0.001. For students in grades 9-12, females reported higher levels of disapproval of someone their age having 1 or 2 drinks of an alcoholic beverage nearly every day compared to males.

Section IV: Marijuana Use and Perceptions of Use

Part 1: Marijuana Use

Marijuana Use Rates for 2014

12.0% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1425) reported using marijuana or hashish in the past month. 17.5% of all students in grades 6-12 reported using marijuana or hashish *at least once before* in their lifetime. 0.6% of students in grades 6-8 (n=665) and 22.0% (n=758) of students in grades 9-12 reported using marijuana or hashish in the past month. Refer to Figure 4.0.

Figure 4.0 - Marijuana Use Rates	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Lifetime Use (used at least once before)	17.5%	0.8%	32.2%
Past Month Use (used in the past 30 days)	12.0%	0.6%	22.0%
Frequent/Daily Use (6+ days in past month)	6.8%	0.3%	12.5%

Marijuana Use Trends by Year:

Long-term trends indicate a decrease (2.7%) in past month marijuana use since 2010 among students in grades 6-8 and an increase (1.0%) for students in grades 9-12. Refer to Figure 4.1.

Figure 4.1 – Past Month Marijuana Use Year Trends	2010	2014	% Change Since 2010
Grades 6-8	3.3%	0.6%	- 2.7%
Grades 9-12	21.0%	22.0%	+ 1.0%

2014 Marijuana Use Comparisons by Grade Level:

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 for lifetime or past month marijuana use, p > 0.05. Refer to figure 4.2 for percentages by grade level.

There were significant differences between grades 9-12 for lifetime marijuana use, $\chi^2(3, N = 758) = 45.366$, p < 0.001, and for past month marijuana use, $\chi^2(3, N = 758) = 36.924$, p < 0.001. For lifetime marijuana use, post-hoc analyses ^(B) showed that more 12th graders (51.1%) compared to 9th graders (20.3%), 10th graders (27.9%), and 11th graders (29.3%) reported using marijuana, p < 0.05. For past month marijuana use, post hoc analyses ^(B) showed more 12th graders (37.4%) compared to 9th graders (13.4%), 10th graders (17.8%), and 11th graders (19.6%) reported using marijuana, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 4.2 for percentages by grade level.



2014 Marijuana Use Comparisons by Gender:

There were no gender differences in lifetime or past month marijuana use rates among students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. However, in grades 9-12, there were gender differences in lifetime marijuana use, $\chi^2(1, N = 744) = 9.215$, p < 0.01, and past month marijuana use, $\chi^2(1, N = 744) =$ 5.965, p < 0.05. For grades 9-12, a higher frequency of males (37.8%) reported using marijuana in their lifetime when compared to females (27.4%). There were gender differences in past month marijuana use rates among students grades 9-12, $\chi^2(1, N = 698) = 10.758$, p < 0.01, but not for grades 6-8, p > 0.05. For grades 9-12, more males (26.1%) reported using marijuana in the past month compared to females (18.6%).
Age of Onset for Marijuana Use:

Students that reported using marijuana or hashish at least once before were asked how old they were when they had marijuana or hashish for the first time.

Among students in grades 6-12, the average age of onset for marijuana use was 14.3 years of age (n=286, SD=2.00 yrs). The average age of onset for marijuana use among students in grades 6-8 was 10.0 years of age (n=5, SD=2.2 yrs). The average age of onset for marijuana use among students in grades 9-12 was 14.4 years of age (n=281, SD=1.9 yrs).

Since 2010, the age of onset for marijuana use has decreased by almost two years for grades 6-8 but has remained roughly the same for grades 9-12. Refer to Figure 4.3 for a summary of the average age of onset for marijuana use by grades 6-12, 6-8, and 9-12 since 2010.

Figure 4.3 – Year Trends for Age of Onset of Marijuana Use	2010	2014
Grades 6-12	14.4 yrs	14.3 yrs
Grades 6-8	12.1 yrs	10.0 yrs
Grades 9-12	14.7 yrs	14.4 yrs

Influence to Try Marijuana for the First Time:

Students who reported using marijuana at least once before in their lifetime were asked what influenced them the most to try marijuana or hashish.

For grades 6-12, "Curiosity" was the largest influence (12.3%), followed by "Friendship/Peer Pressure" (3.0%), and "Stress/To Feel Better" (2.9%). Very few of the students who reported lifetime marijuana use indicated that "Ads/Media" (0.1%), "family" (0.4%), or being "angry/upset with someone" (0.4%) solely influenced their decisions to try marijuana for the first time. Refer to Figure 4.4.



Accessibility of Marijuana

Of the students that have used marijuana at least once before, most of students (21.9% sometimes or often) reported getting marijuana from friends. The least likely source of marijuana was from a parent or guardian with their permission. Refer to Figure 4.5.



A series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare students' sources of marijuana between middle and high school students who reported lifetime marijuana use, and several differences were found.

- 1.1% of students in grades 6-8 versus 3.7% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting marijuana from their parents/guardians with their permission, t(1005.07) = -2.75, p < 0.01.
- 1.3% of students in grades 6-8 versus 11.2% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting marijuana from their parents without their permission, t(790.82) = -6.98, p < 0.001.
- 1.1% of students in grades 6-8 versus 11.7% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting marijuana from their siblings, t(800.72) = -7.06, p < 0.001.
- 1.5% of students in grades 6-8 versus 37.1% of students in grades 9-12 reported sometimes or often getting marijuana from their friends, t(727.70) = -16.23, p < 0.001.

Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Marijuana Use

All students, including those who reported never using marijuana before, answered the following questions regarding students' perceptions of marijuana use, particularly regarding the risks of use, and parental and friend disapproval of use.

Perceptions of Peer Marijuana Use

Students were asked: "About how many students in your grade do you think use marijuana or hashish?". 93.0% of students in grades 6-8 believed that less than 10% of their peers used marijuana, and 32.9% of students in grades 9-12 believed that most students (around 75%) used marijuana. See Figure 4.6.

Figure 4.6	"Hardly Any Students (less than 10%)"	"A Few Students (around 25%)"	"Half of Students (around 50%)"	"Most Students (around 75%)"	"Almost All Students (more than 90%)"
Grades 6-12	47.1	12.6	16.0	17.6	6.7
Grades 6-8	93.0	5.6	0.5	0.2	0.8
Grades 9-12	6.8	18.8	29.6	32.9	12.0

There were significant differences between grades 6-8 in perception of peer marijuana use, F(2,654) = 4.70, p < 0.01. Post hoc analyses ^(GH) revealed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for this question. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12 in perception of peer marijuana use, F(3,747) = 19.60, p > 0.001. Post hoc analyses ^(GH) revealed

	Figure	Figure 4.7 - "About how many students in your grade do you think use marijuana or hashish?"						
12th Grade		I			-			
11th Grade					n an		and the second second second second	
10th Grade								
9th Grade								
8th Grade								
7th Grade								
6th Grade				2				
	0% 10%	20% :	30% 40%	50%	60% 70%	80% 9	0% 100%	
	6th Grade	7th Grade	8th Grade	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	
■Less than 10%	96.7%	92.2%	89.4%	14.1%	4.6%	4.9%	3.8%	
■Around 25%	3.3%	4.9%	9.2% .	30.8%	20.9%	14.7%	8.6%	
□Around 50%	0.0%	0.5%	1.0%	24.3%	32.7%	34.2%	26.9%	
Around 75%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	22.7%	31.6%	35.3%	41.9%	
More than 90%	0.0%	2.0%	0.5%	8.1%	10.2%	10.9%	18.8%	

significant differences between grades 9 and 10-12, between grades 10 and 12, and between grades 11 and 12 for this question. Refer to Figure 4.7.

There were significant gender differences in perception of peer marijuana use in grades 6-8, t(574.51) = 2.14, p < 0.05. Females reported higher perceptions of peer marijuana use in grades 6-8 compared to males. There were no significant gender differences in perception of peer marijuana use in grades 9-12, p > 0.05.

Risks of Using Marijuana or Hashish 1-2 Times a Week

38.8% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1324) perceived that using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week to be a "great risk" and 23.3% perceived using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week to be a "moderate risk". In other words, 62.2% of all students felt that using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week carries a "moderate" to "great risk" to a person, physically or in other ways. Refer to Figure 4.8 for perceived risk by grades 6-8 (n=569) and grades 9-12 (n=728).

Figure 4.8	"Moderate Risk"	"Great Risk"	"Moderate Risk" or "Great Risk"
Grades 6-12	23.3%	38.8%	62.2%
Grades 6-8	23.7%	63.1%	86.7%
Grades 9-12	23.1%	19.0%	42.0%

There were significant differences between grades 6-8 for perception of risk associated with having marijuana 1 or 2 times a week, F(2,593) = 7.48, p < 0.01. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences (p < 0.05) between grades 6 and 8. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12 for perception of risk associated with having marijuana 1 or 2 times a week, F(3,724) = 15.78, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed differences (p < 0.05) between grades 9 and 11-12 and 10 and 12. Refer to Figure 4.9.

Figu physic	ure 4.9 - "H ally or in c	low much other ways	do you thir when they	ik people r use mariji	isk harmin Jana 1 or 2	g themselv times a we	ves eek?"
	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
□% Moderate Risk	21.4%	23.4%	26.5%	25.7%	22.2%	29.5%	15.7%
■% Great Risk	69.8%	64.6%	54.0%	32.0%	21.2%	11.0%	12.0%

There were no significant gender differences in perception of risks associated with using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week among students in grades 6-8, p > 0.05. There were significant gender differences in perception of risks associated with using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week among students 9-12, t(711) = 4.82, p < 0.001. Females were more likely to perceive higher risk associated using marijuana 1 or 2 times a week when compared to males.

Parent/Guardian Disapproval of Using Marijuana:

89.1% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1423) thought their parents/guardians felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they used marijuana. 80.1% of students in grades 6-12 thought their parents felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they used marijuana. Refer to Figure 4.10 for perceived parent disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=662) and grades 9-12 (n=759).

Figure 4.10	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	9.0%	80.1%	89.1%
Grades 6-8	2.9%	95.0%	97.9%
Grades 9-12	14.4%	67.1%	81.4%

There were significant differences in perceived parent disapproval of smoking marijuana between grades 6-8, F(2,659) = 4.84, p < 0.01 and between grades 9-12, F(3,755) = 14.76, p < 0.001. For grades 6-8, post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed differences between grades 6 and 7-8, p < 0.05. For grades 9-12, post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed differences between grades 12 and 9-11, p < 0.05. See Figure 4.11.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of parental disapproval of using marijuana among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12, p > 0.05.

Friend Disapproval of Using Marijuana

65.4% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1392) thought that their friends felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they used marijuana. 52.5% of students thought that their friends felt it would be "greatly wrong" if they used marijuana. Refer to Figure 4.12 for perceived friend disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=657) and 9-12 (n=734).

Figure 4.12	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	12.9%	52.5%	65.4%
Grades 6-8	7.0%	87.2%	94.2%
Grades 9-12	18.0%	21.5%	39.5%

There were significant differences in perceived friend disapproval of marijuana use between grades 6-8, F(2,654) = 5.23, p < 0.001, and between grades 9-12, F(3,730) = 11.36, p < 0.001. For grades 6-8, post-hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8, p < 0.05. For grades 9-12, post-hoc analyses ^(T) show significant differences between grades 9 and 10, 9 and 12, and between grades 11 and 12, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 4.13.



There were significant gender differences in perception of friend disapproval of using marijuana among students in grades 6-8, t(551.92) = 3.57, p < 0.001, and grades 9-12, t(717.80) = 4.76, p < 0.001. Females reported higher friend disapproval of using marijuana than did males for grades 6-8 and for grades 9-12.

Section V: Prescription & Over-the-Counter Drug Abuse & Students' Perceptions of Abuse

Students were asked if they had ever used the following drug(s) on their own, without their own prescription or a doctor or dentist telling them to: pain medication (e.g., OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Dilaudid), downers (e.g., barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes), uppers (e.g., Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed), Steroids (juice, roids), or over-the-counter medications to get "high" (e.g., cough medicine, mouthwash).

To ease comparison to past survey reports for Tolland and the ERASE Region, for which students were asked to generally specify if they used prescription drugs without a prescription from their doctor, we have merged pain medication, uppers, downers, and tranquilizers into one general "prescription drug" abuse rate. Over-the-counter medications and steroids have not been included in this general category because they were separately assessed in past survey reports.

Part 1: Prescription and Over-the-Counter (OTC) Drug Abuse

Prescription and Over-the-Counter Drug Abuse Rates for 2014

8.9% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1386) reported abusing prescription drugs at least once before in their lifetime and 4.1% of students in grades 6-12 (n=1380) reported abusing over-the-counter (OTC) drugs at least once before in their lifetime. Refer to Figures 5.0 and 5.1.

Figure 5.0 – Lifetime Use: Prescription & OTC Drugs	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Pain medication (OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Dilaudid)	6.4%	2.3%	10.0%
Tranquilizers (Valium, Xanax, Librium)	2.3%	0.5%	3.9%
Uppers (Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed)	3.8%	0.5%	6.6%
Downers (barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes)	4.0%	1.6%	6.3%
General Prescription Drugs*	8.9%	3.3%	14.0%
Steroids (juice, roids)	1.4%	0.6%	2.0%
OTC Medications to get "high" (cough medicine, mouthwash)	4.1%	1.7%	6.1%

*Combines the use of tranquilizers, uppers, downers, and pain medication

Figure 5.1 – Past Month Use: Prescription & OTC Drugs	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Pain medication (OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Dilaudid)	2.6%	0.9%	4.1%
Tranquilizers (Valium, Xanax, Librium)	1.1%	0.5%	1.6%
Uppers (Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed)	2.0%	0.5%	3.4%
Downers (barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes)	1.6%	0.6%	2.4%
General Prescription Drugs*	3.9%	1.1%	6.4%
Steroids (juice, roids)	0.8%	0.5%	1.1%
OTC Medications to get "high" (cough medicine, mouthwash)	1.4%	0.8%	1.9%

*Combines the use of tranquilizers, uppers, downers, and pain medication

Prescription and Over-the-Counter Drug Abuse Trends by Year:

Since 2010, past month general prescription drug abuse (combining tranquilizers, uppers, downers, and pain medication) has decreased by 0.5% for students in grades 6-8, and has increased by 0.2% for students in grades 9-12. Past month steroid use rates have also slightly decreased or stayed the same for students in grades 6-8 and grades 9-12. Refer to Figure 5.2.

Figure 5.2 –Past Month Prescription & OTC Drug Abuse Year Trends	2010	2014	% Change Since 2010
General Prescription Drugs***		, <u> </u>	
Grades 6-8	1.6%	1.1%	- 0.5%
Grades 9-12	6.2%	6.4%	+ 0.2%
Steroids (juice, roids)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Grades 6-8	0.6%	0.5%	- 0.1%
Grades 9-12	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%
Over-the-counter Medications to get "high" (c	ough medicine, mo	uthwash)	
Grades 6-8	1.5%	0.8%	- 0.7%
Grades 9-12	2.7%	1.9%	- 0.8%

*** Prescription Drug use in 2010 was characterized as oxycontin, valium, and Adderall, but a larger definition was adopted in 2014.

2014 Prescription and OTC Drug Abuse, Comparisons by Grade Level:

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or grades 9-12 in past month use of pain medication (OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Dilaudid), tranquilizers (Valium, Xanax, Librium), uppers (Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed), downers (barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes), general prescription drugs, steroids (juice, roids), or OTC medications, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 5.3 for past month prescription drug use by grade level.



There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 in lifetime use of pain medication (OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Dilaudid), tranquilizers (Valium, Xanax, Librium), uppers (Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed), downers (barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes), general prescription drugs, steroids (juice, roids), or OTC medications, p > 0.05. For grades 9-12, there were no significant differences in lifetime use of steroids or downers, p > 0.05.

There were significant differences between grades 9-12 in lifetime use of pain medication, $\chi^2(3, N = 738) = 12.321$, p < 0.01, tranquilizers, $\chi^2(3, N = 735) = 12.886$, p < 0.01, uppers, $\chi^2(3, N = 737) = 19.424$, p < 0.001, general prescription drugs, $\chi^2(3, N = 738) = 11.600$, p < 0.01, and OTC medications, $\chi^2(3, N = 734) = 15.515$, p < 0.01. For lifetime use of pain medication, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of tranquilizers, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of general prescription drugs, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of general prescription drugs, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of general prescription drugs, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of general prescription drugs, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 9-10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of general prescription drugs, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 10 and 12, p < 0.05. For lifetime use of OTC medications, post hoc test ^(B) revealed significant differences between grades 10 and 12, p < 0.05.

Refer to Figure 5.4.



2014 Prescription or OTC Drugs, Comparisons by Gender:

Among students in grades 6-8 and 9-12, there were no gender differences in lifetime use of pain medication, tranquilizers, uppers, downers, general prescription drugs, steroids, and OTC medication, p > 0.05.

Among students in grades 6-8 and 9-12, there were no gender differences in past month use of pain medication, tranquilizers, uppers, general prescription drugs, and OTC medication, p > 0.05. While there were no gender differences in past month use of downers in grades 9-12, p > 0.05, there was a significant difference among males and females in past month use of downers in grades 6-8, $\chi^2(1, N = 636) = 4.000$, p < 0.05. Significantly more males (1.3%) than females (0.0%) reported past month use of steroids in grades 6-8, p < 0.05. While there were no gender differences in past month use of steroids in grades 6-8, $\chi^2(1, N = 723) = 5.169$, p < 0.05.

Part 2: Students' Perceptions of Prescription Drug Abuse

All students, including those who reported never abusing prescription drugs before, answered the following questions regarding students' perceptions of prescription drug abuse, particularly regarding the risks of use, and parental and friend disapproval of use.

Risks of Abusing Prescription Drugs

90.6% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1359) felt that using prescription drugs not prescribed to them carries a "moderate" to "great risk" to a person, physically or in other ways. Refer to Figure 5.5 for perceived risk by grades 6-8 (n=662) and grades 9-12 (n=737).

Figure 5.5	"Moderate Risk"	"Great Risk"	"Moderate Risk" or "Great Risk"
Grades 6-12	18.9%	71.7%	90.6%
Grades 6-8	14.5%	77.5%	92.0%
Grades 9-12	22.7%	66.8%	89.4%

Figure s	5.6 - "How a bother ways	much do yo when they	ou think peo use prescr	ople risk ha iption drug	rming them s not presc	nselves phy ribed to the	sically m?"
		,					
				·			
	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
□% Moderate Risk	11.0%	18.0%	15.3%	19.2%	21.2%	25.4%	24.7%
■% Great Risk	81.9%	72.5%	77.0%	70.6%	66.8%	66.1%	63.7%

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or grades 9-12 for perception of risk associated with students abusing prescription drugs, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 5.6.

There were no significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 for perception of risk associated with abusing prescription drugs, p > 0.05. However, there were gender differences for perception of risk associated with abusing prescription drugs for grades 9-12, t(2.39), p < 0.05. Females perceived more risk associated with abusing prescription drugs than did males in grades 9-12.

Parent/Guardian Disapproval of Abusing Prescription Drugs:

96.7% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1421) thought their parents/guardians felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they used prescription drugs not prescribed to them. Refer to Figure 5.7 for perceived parent disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=660) and grades 9-12 (n=759).

Figure 5.7	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	6.5%	90.1%	96.7%
Grades 6-8	3.9%	94.8%	98.8%
Grades 9-12	8.8%	86.0%	94.9%

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or grades 9-12 for perception of parent disapproval associated with abusing prescription drugs, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 5.8.



There were no significant gender differences in perception of parental disapproval of abusing prescription drugs among students in grades 6-8 or grades 9-12, p > 0.05.

Friend Disapproval of Abusing Prescription Drugs

84.2% of all students in grades 6-12 (n=1390) thought their friends felt it would be "moderately wrong" or "greatly wrong" if they used prescription drugs not prescribed to them. Refer to Figure 5.9 for perceived friend disapproval by grades 6-8 (n=655) and grades 9-12 (n=734).

Figure 5.9	"Moderately Wrong"	"Greatly Wrong"	"Moderately Wrong" or "Greatly Wrong"
Grades 6-12	17.3%	66.9%	84.2%
Grades 6-8	8.1%	86.7%	94.8%
Grades 9-12	25.6%	49.3%	74.9%

There were significant differences between grades 6-8 for perception of friend disapproval associated with abusing prescription drugs, F(2,652) = 7.631, p < 0.01. For grades 6-8, post hoc analyses ^(GH) show significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8, p < 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for perception of friend disapproval associated with abusing prescription drugs, p > 0.05. Refer to Figure 5.10.



There were gender differences in perception of friend disapproval of abusing prescription drugs among students in grades 6-8, t(600.78) = 2.44, p < 0.05, and grades 9-12, t(683.73) = 3.71, p < 0.001. For grades 6-8 and 9-12, females report higher friend disapproval of using prescription drugs not prescribed to them than do males.

Section VI: Other Drug Use Rates

Other Drug Use Rates for 2014

Refer to Figure 6.0 to read lifetime use rates for the various drugs listed in this section.

Figure 6.0 – Lifetime Use of Drugs	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Inhalants (things you sniff or inhale to get high such as glue, pain, whippets, or sprays)	4.5%	1.7%	6.9%
Cocaine	2.6%	0.5%	4.5%
Crack cocaine (rock)	1.7%	0.5%	2.8%
Ecstasy or Molly (MDMA)	4.0%	0.5%	7.2%
Hallucinogens (LSD, acid or mushrooms, PCP or Angel Dust)	4.1%	0.5%	7.3%
Heroin	1.8%	0.5%	3.0%
Salvia	2.6%	0.3%	4.6%
Ketamine (Special K)	1.6%	0.5%	2.6%
GHB	1.2%	0.5%	1.9%
Methamphetamine (Meth)	1.7%	0.3%	1.8%
Synthetic Marijuana (Spice, K2, K3)	5.3%	0.5%	9.5%
Bath Salts	2.0%	1.2%	2.6%
Energy Drink (e.g., Red Bull, Monster, Amp, or Rock Star)	40.8%	28.2%	51.9%
Energy Drink Containing Alcohol	12.2%	2.0%	21.2%

Refer to Figure 6.1 to read past month use rates for the various drugs listed in this section.

Figure 6.1 – Past Month Use of Drugs	Grades 6-12	Grades 6-8	Grades 9-12
Inhalants (things you sniff or inhale to get high such as glue, pain, whippets, or sprays)	1.2%	0.8%	1.8%
Cocaine	1.2%	0.5%	1.9%
Crack cocaine (rock)	0.9%	0.5%	1.4%
Ecstasy or Molly (MDMA)	1.3%	0.5%	2.0%
Hallucinogens (LSD, acid or mushrooms, PCP or Angel Dust)	1.8%	0.5%	3.0%
Heroin	1.2%	0.5%	1.8%
Salvia	1.1%	0.3%	1.8%
Ketamine (Special K)	0.9%	0.3%	1.4%
GHB	0.9%	0.5%	1.2%
Methamphetamine (Meth)	1.1%	0.3%	1.8%
Synthetic Marijuana (Spice, K2, K3)	2.2%	0.5%	3.8%
Bath Salts	1.0%	0.5%	1.5%
Energy Drink (e.g., Red Bull, Monster, Amp, or Rock Star)	16.4%	7.1%	24.6%
Energy Drink Containing Alcohol	6.0%	0.6%	10.7%

Other Drug Trends by Year:

Refer to Figure 6.2 for year trend tables of past month use among students in grades 6-8 and grades 9-12.

Drug use year trends are only included for drugs that were measured in previous years, specifically for inhalants, cocaine/crack, hallucinogens, and heroin.

Frequency of cocaine and crack cocaine use were combined into one category of cocaine or crack cocaine use to ease comparison to past survey years, for which use of these drugs was asked in one single question.

Drug use for inhalants, cocaine/crack, hallucinogens, and heroin has decreased or remained the same since 2010.

Figure 6.2 –Past Month Drug Use Year Trends	2010	2014	% Change Since 2010
Inhalant Abuse			
Grades 6-8	1.8%	0.8%	- 1.0%
Grades 9-12	2.0%	1.8%	- 0.2%
Cocaine or Crack Use			
Grades 6-8	0.8%	0.5%	- 0.3%
Grades 9-12	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%
Hallucinogen Use			
Grades 6-8	1.1%	0.5%	- 0.6%
Grades 9-12	5.4%	3.0%	- 2.4%
Heroin Use			
Grades 6-8	0.8%	0.5%	- 0.3%
Grades 9-12	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%

2014 Other Drug Use, Comparisons by Grade Level:

Comparisons by grade level are only included for drugs that were significantly different for lifetime or past month use rates between grades 6-8 or grades 9-12.

Cocaine

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime cocaine use, p > 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month cocaine use (p > 0.05), however there were significant differences for lifetime cocaine use in grades 9-12, $\chi^2(3, N = 738) = 16.137, p < 0.01$. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 10 and 12 for lifetime cocaine use, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.3.

	Figur	e 6.3 - Coc	aine Use R	ates by Gr	ade Level		
20.0%				-			
15.0% -			·····			<u></u>	
10.0%							
5.0% -							
0.0%							
0.076	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
■Lifetime Use	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	3.3%	1.0%	4.4%	9.4%
□Past Month Use	0.4%	1.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.5%	1.6%	2.2%

Ecstasy or Molly (MDMA)

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime ecstasy use, p > 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month ecstasy use, p > 0.05; however, there were significant differences between grades 9-12 for lifetime ecstasy use, $\chi^2(3, N = 738) = 28.120$, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 9-10 and 12 for lifetime ecstasy use, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.4.



Hallucinogens (LSD, acid or mushrooms, PCP or Angel)

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime hallucinogen use, p > 0.05. There were significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month, $\chi^2(3, N = 737) = 10.453$, p < 0.05 and lifetime hallucinogen use, $\chi^2(3, N = 737) = 27.674$, p < 0.001. Posthoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 10 and 12 for past month hallucinogen use, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 9-11 and 12 for lifetime hallucinogen use, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.5.



Salvia

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime salvia use, p > 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month salvia use, p > 0.05. There were significant differences between grades 9-12 for lifetime salvia use, $\chi^2(3, N = 739) = 21.383$, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 9-10 and 12 for lifetime salvia use, ps < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.6.



Synthetic Marijuana (Spice, K2, K3)

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime use of synthetic marijuana, p > 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month use of synthetic marijuana, p > 0.05. There were significant differences between grades 9-12 for lifetime use of synthetic marijuana, $\chi^2(3, N = 738) = 10.516$, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 11 and 12 for lifetime use of synthetic marijuana, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.6.



Energy Drink (e.g., Red Bull, Monster, Amp, or Rock Star)

There were significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month, $\chi^2(2, N = 662) = 6.551, p < 0.01$, and lifetime energy drink use, $\chi^2(2, N = 662) = 9.987, p < 0.01$. There were also significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month, $\chi^2(3, N = 756) = 13.634, p < 0.01$, and lifetime energy drink use, $\chi^2(3, N = 756) = 13.454, p < 0.001$. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant

difference between grades 6 and 8 and 9-10 and 12 for past month energy drink use, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) also revealed a significant difference between grades 6 and 8 and 9 and 12 for lifetime energy drink use, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.7.



Energy Drinks Containing Alcohol

There were no significant difference between grades 6-8 for past month or lifetime use of energy drinks containing alcohol, p > 0.05. There were significant differences between grades 9-12 for past month, $\chi^2(3, N = 755) = 15.375$, p < 0.01, and lifetime, $\chi^2(3, N = 755) = 24.428$, p < 0.001 use of energy drinks containing alcohol. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 9-10 and 12 for past month energy drinks containing alcohol use, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(B) revealed a significant difference between grades 9-11 and 12 for lifetime use of energy drinks containing alcohol, p < 0.05. Refer to Figure 6.8.



2014 Other Drug Use, Comparisons by Gender:

Among students in grades 9-12, more males (9.6%) than females (5.5%) reported using hallucinogens at least once in their lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 722) = 4.332, p < 0.05$.

Among students in grades 9-12, more males (6.7%) than females (2.9%) reported using salvia at least once in their lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 724) = 5.799$, p < 0.05.

Among students in grades 6-8, more males (10.1%) than females (4.3%) reported using energy drinks at least once in the past month, $\chi^2(1, N = 650) = 8.030$, p < 0.01. Among students in grades 6-8, more males (39.4%) than females (17.3%) reported using energy drinks at least once in their lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 650) = 39.021$, p < 0.001. Among students in grades 9-12, more males (34.6%) than females (15.8%) reported using energy drinks at least once in the past month, $\chi^2(1, N = 741) = 35.184$, p < 0.001. Among students in grades 9-12, more males (62.8%) than females (42.0%) reported using energy drinks at least once in their lifetime, $\chi^2(1, N = 741) = 32.200$, p < 0.001.

There were no significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12 for any of the other drugs listed in this section, p > 0.05.

Section VII: Families and Substance Use

Parental Rules Regarding Substance Use

Students were asked how much their family had "clear rules" discouraging them from the following: smoking cigarettes or using tobacco, drinking alcoholic beverages, using marijuana, and using a prescription drug that is not prescribed to them for the purpose of "getting high".

72.2% of students in grades 6-8 and 50.6% of students in grades 9-12 answered "definitely true" to the statement "my family has clear rules discouraging me from drinking alcoholic beverages". 80.3% of students in grades 6-8 and 64.6% of students in grades 9-12 answered "definitely true" to the statement "my family has clear rules discouraging me from smoking cigarettes or using tobacco". Refer to Figures 7.0 and 7.1 for specific percentages by substance.





There were significant differences between grades 6-8 for students' families having clear rules discouraging them from smoking cigarettes or using tobacco, F(2, 661) = 10.15, p < 0.001, drinking alcoholic beverages, F(2, 660) = 8.70, p < 0.001, using marijuana, F(2, 656) = 8.52, p < 0.001, and abusing prescription drugs, F(2, 651) = 9.50, p < 0.001. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning smoking cigarettes or using tobacco, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning drinking alcoholic beverages, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning using marijuana, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning using marijuana, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning using marijuana, p < 0.05. Post-hoc analyses ^(GH) showed significant differences between grades 6 and 7-8 for parental rules concerning using prescription drugs, p < 0.05. There were no significant differences between grades 9-12 for students' families having clear rules discouraging them from smoking cigarette or using tobacco, drinking alcoholic beverages, using marijuana, or abusing prescription drugs for "getting high", ps > 0.05. Refer to Figure 7.2.



There were no gender differences for parents having clear rules against tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, prescription drug use in grades 6-8 and 9-12, p > 0.05.

Parental Use of Tobacco Products and Alcohol

Among students in grades 6-8, 14.3% reported that their parents use tobacco products and 67.9% reported that their parents drink alcoholic beverages. Among students in grades 9-12, 18.6% reported that their parents use tobacco products and 77.2% reported that their parents drink alcoholic beverages. Refer to Figure 7.3.

80.0% -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
60.0% + 40.0% +		······································		
20.0%			·	
0.0%	Grades 6-8: Tobacco	Grades 9-12: Tobacco	Grades 6-8: Alcohol	Grades 9-12: Alcohol
□Yes	14.3%	18.6%	67.9%	77.2%
■No	81.8%	79.7%	26.2%	21.3%

There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or 9-12 for parental use of tobacco products or alcohol, p > 0.05.

For grades 6-8, there was a significant gender difference for parental use of tobacco products, $\chi^2(2, N = 645) = 7.616$, p < 0.05. More males (17.7%) than females (11.1%) in grades 6-8 reported parental use of tobacco products. There were no other significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 or grades 9-12 for these two questions, ps > 0.05.

Siblings' Use of Tobacco Products and Alcohol

Among students in grades 6-8, 4.4% reported that their siblings use tobacco products and 14.1% reported that their siblings drink alcoholic beverages. Among students in grades 9-12, 10.6% reported that their siblings use tobacco products and 38.8% reported that their siblings drink alcoholic beverages. Refer to Figure 7.4.



There were no significant differences between grades 6-8 or 9-12 for siblings' use of tobacco products, p > 0.05. There were significant differences in siblings' use of alcohol between grades 6-8, $\chi^2(6, N = 654) = 21.459$, p < 0.01. More individuals in grade 7 (11.7%) and grade 8 (17.2%) reported having siblings who used alcohol than in grade 6 (4.4%).

There were also significant differences in siblings' use of alcohol between grades and 9-12, $\chi^2(6, N = 761) = 17.686$, p < 0.05. More individuals in grade 12 (46.9%) reported having siblings who used alcohol than in grade 9 (28.7%).

There was a significant gender difference among students in grades 6-8 for sibling use of tobacco products, $\chi^2(3, N = 648) = 20.195$, p < 0.05. In grades 6-8, males (6.8%) report higher levels of sibling tobacco use compared to females (1.9%). There were no significant gender differences among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12 for these two questions, ps > 0.05.

Family Problems with Alcohol Use

8.3% of students in grades 6-8 and 18.3% of students in grades 9-12 reported that someone in their family (such as a parent/guardian, brother or sister, not including their self) used alcohol so that it created problems at home, at work, or with friends. Refer to Figure 7.5.

	Figure 7.5 - Fam	ilv Problems with Alcoho	l Use
100.0% T			
80.0%			
60.0%			
40.0%			
20.0%		······	
0.0%			
	Yes	NO	I Don't Know
■Grades 6-8	8.3%	77.9%	13.8%
□Grades 9-12	18.3%	73.4%	8.3%

There were no differences between grades 6-8 and grades 9-12 for this question, p > 0.05. There were also no gender differences among students in grades 6-8 or 9-12 for this question, p > 0.05.

Section VIII: Perceptions of Alcohol Prevention Strategies

Students were asked to rate how important they think various strategies are in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages.

Perceptions of Alcohol Prevention Among Grades 6-8

For students in grades 6-8, the prevention strategies seen as most effective in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages were for having driver's license suspended (96.9% "very or somewhat important", 3.1% "not important"), checking IDs in stores or bars (97.1% "very or somewhat important", 2.9% "not important"), and being fined about \$200 for drinking (94.9% "very or somewhat important", 5.1% "not important"). The prevention strategy seen as the least effective in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages was school rules (81.9% "very or somewhat important", 18.1% "not important"). Refer to Figure 8.0.



A series of ANOVAs revealed significant differences between grades 6-8 for the following variables relating to their perceived effectiveness for preventing underage drinking:

- Having a driver's license suspended: Students in 8th grade perceived having a driver's license suspended for drinking as more effective than students in 6th grade, F(2, 583) = 6.86, p < 0.01.
- Checking IDs in stores or bars: 8^{th} graders perceived checking IDs in stores or bars as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6^{th} graders, F(2,591) = 4.18, p < 0.05.
- Fear of addiction in preventing underage drinking: Students in 7th and 8th grades perceived fear of addiction as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 6th grade, F(2,576) = 13.89, p < 0.001.
- Friends who disapprove of drinking: 7^{th} and 8^{th} graders perceived friend disapproval as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6^{th} graders, F(2,580) = 14.84, p < 0.001.
- **High alcohol prices:** Students in 8th grade perceived high alcohol prices as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 6th grade, F(2,584) = 6.89, p < 0.01.
- School rules: 7th and 8th graders perceived school rules as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6th graders, F(2,584) = 21.30, p < 0.001.
- **Parental rules about drinking:** Students in 7th and 8th grades perceived parental rules as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 6th grade, F(2,585) = 19.79, p < 0.001.
- Alcohol education in school: 7th and 8th graderss perceived alcohol education in school as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6th graders, F(2,583) = 13.35, p < 0.001.
- Being fined about \$200: 7th and 8th graders perceived being fined about \$200 for drinking as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6th graders, F(2,581) = 6.34, p < 0.01.
- Advertisements that show the problems associated with drinking: 8th graders perceived advertisements as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6th graders, F(2,583) = 6.48, p < 0.01.
- Alcohol-free activities (like dances, concerts, or spring events): Students in 8th grade perceived alcohol-free activities (like dances, concerts, or spring events) as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 6th grade, F(2,579) = 8.35, p < 0.001.
- Friends who do not drink: 7th and 8th graders perceived friends who do not drink as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 6th graders, F(2,576) = 13.25, p < 0.001.

For grades 6-8, there were gender differences in perceived effectiveness of the following alcohol prevention strategies: high prices, t(578) = 2.03, p < 0.05, school rules, t(577.42) = 2.17, p < 0.05, and parent rules, t(574.96) = 2.25, p < 0.05. In grades 6-8, females perceived high prices, school rules, and parent rules as more effective alcohol prevention strategies than did males.

Perceptions of Alcohol Prevention Among Grades 9-12

For students in grades 9-12, the prevention strategies seen as most effective in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages were having one's license suspended for drinking (88.8% "very or somewhat important", 11.2% "not important"), checking IDs in stores or bars (85.6% "very or somewhat important", 14.4% "not important"), and being fined about \$200 for drinking (83.1% "very or somewhat important", 16.9% "not important"), The prevention strategies seen as the least effective in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages were school rules (53.2% "very or somewhat important", 46.8% "not important") and alcohol education in school (61.9% "very or somewhat important", 38.1% "not important"). Refer to Figure 8.1.



A series of ANOVAs revealed significant differences between grades 9-12 for the following variables (variables not listed did not show significant effects):

- Checking IDs in stores or bars: Students in 11th and 12th grade perceived checking IDs in stores or bars as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 9th grade, F(3,691) = 3.66, p < 0.05.
- Fear of addiction: Students in 11^{th} and 12^{th} grades perceived fear of addiction as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 9^{th} grade and students in 12^{th} grade also perceive fear of addiction as more effective in preventing underage drinking that students in 10^{th} grade, F(3,680) = 8.80, p < 0.001.
- School rules: Students in 11^{th} and 12^{th} grades perceived school rules as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 9^{th} grade, F(3,676) = 4.95, p < 0.01.
- **Parental rules about drinking:** 11th and 12th graders perceived parental rules as more effective in preventing underage drinking than 9th graders, F(3,682) = 4.17, p < 0.01.
- Alcohol education in school: Students in 11^{th} and 12^{th} grades perceived alcohol education in school as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 9^{th} grade, F(3,676) = 4.99, p < 0.01.
- Advertisements that show the problems associated with drinking: Students in 11^{th} and 12^{th} grades perceived advertisements as more effective in preventing underage drinking than students in 9^{th} grade, F(3,674) = 6.22, p < 0.001.

For grades 9-12, there were gender differences in perceived effectiveness of the following alcohol prevention strategies: having driver's license suspended for drinking, t(633.63) = -2.35, p < 0.05, being fined about \$200 for drinking, t(665) = -2.69, p < 0.01. In grades 9-12, males perceived having driver's license suspended for drinking and being fined about \$200 for drinking as more effective alcohol prevention strategies than did females.

Section IX: Substance Use Comparisons to State and National Data

It is important to understand how the alcohol and drug use rates presented in this report compare to the surveys that are conducted at the national and state level. Refer to tables below to evaluate how the results presented in this report compare to results gathered from national survey studies.

Please note that binge drinking was defined in the Tolland 2014 survey as "having 4 or more drinks during a single occasion". Binge drinking was defined in the included national surveys as "having 5 or more drinks during a single occasion". Please note that this discrepancy will inflate the binge drinking rates observed for Tolland.

The survey data collected for the NSDUH survey was gathered using in-person interviews with each survey respondent in the privacy of their home, and thus the drug rates may be lower than they would if conducted in the school setting. For both the YRBSS and MTF surveys, respondents in private and public schools completed paper surveys during a class period.

Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to 2013 NSDUH Survey					
30-Day Use Rates	Tolland Grades 6-12	NSDUH ¹ Ages 12-17	CT NSDUH ² Ages 12-17		
Cigarette Use	3.7%	5.6%	8.8%		
Alcohol Use	15.8%	11.6%	17.8%		
Marijuana Use	12.0%	7.1%	8.9%		
Binge Drinking	9.6%	6.2%	11.2%		
Prescription Drug Abuse	3.9%	8.8%	8.8%		

Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to 2013 YRBSS Survey						
30-Day Use Rates	Tolland Grades 9-12	YRBSS ³ , Grades 9-12	CT YRBSS ³ , Grades 9-12			
Cigarette Use	6.5%	15.7%	15.9%			
Alcohol Use	28.6%	34.9%	36.7%			
Marijuana Use	22.0%	23.4%	26.0%			
Binge Drinking	17.2%	20.8%	20.0%			
(Lifetime) Prescription Drug Abuse	14.0%	17.8%				
Driving a Vehicle While Under the Influence of Alcohol	4.6%	10.0%	9.4%			

Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to 2013 MTF Survey				
30-Day Use Rates	Tolland Grade 12	MTF ⁴ Grade 12		
Cigarette Use	14.3%	16.3%		
Alcohol Use	50.3%	39.2%		
Marijuana Use	37.4%	22.7%		
Prescription Drug Abuse	8.9%	7.0%		

¹ = National Survey on Drug Use and Health; Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)

² = National Survey on Drug Use and Health; SAMHSA; Connecticut data collected in 2009-2010

³ = Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC); Connecticut data also collected in 2013

⁴ = Monitoring the Future Survey; University of Michigan; National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA); National Institute of Health (NIH)

Section X: Substance Use Comparisons to Regional Data

It is also necessary to understand how the alcohol and drug use rates presented in this report compare to the ERASE Region. Regional rates seen in tables are weighted averages (accounting for varying sample sizes) of substance use rates taken from 8 towns in the ERASE Region between 2012-2014 for grades 9-12. Tolland 2014 rates are included in this average.

TOBACCO USE Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to ERASE Regional Averages					
Grades 9-12	Tolland 2014	ERASE Regional Average 2012-2014			
Past Month Use	11.6% Use	12.4% Use			
Perceived Risk	90.9% Risky	90.2% Risky			
Perceived Parent Disapproval	91.0% Disapproval	90.4% Disapproval			
Perceived Friend Disapproval	72.6% Disapproval	62.9% Disapproval			

ALCOHOL USE Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to ERASE Regional Averages							
Grades 9-12	Grades 9-12 Tolland 2014 ERASE Regional Average 2012-						
Past Month Use	28.6% Use	26.4% Use					
Perceived Risk	69.8% Risky	75.8% Risky					
Perceived Parent Disapproval	86.2% Disapproval	87.1% Disapproval					
Perceived Friend Disapproval	58.2% Disapproval	52.0% Disapproval					
Past Month Binge Drinking	17.2% Binge	14.8% Binge					
Lifetime Binge Drinking	32.8% Binge	30.3% Binge					
Past Month DUI (Grades 11-12)	4.6% DUI	4.2% DUI					

MARIJUANA USE Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to ERASE Regional Averages						
Grades 9-12 Tolland 2014 ERASE Regional Average 2012						
Past Month Use	22.0% Use	21.6% Use				
Perceived Risk	42.0% Risky	46.4% Risky				
Perceived Parent Disapproval	81.4% Disapproval	83.2% Disapproval				
Perceived Friend Disapproval	39.5% Disapproval	41.2% Disapproval				

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ABUSE Tolland 2014 Survey Data Comparison to ERASE Regional Averages						
Grades 9-12 Tolland 2014 ERASE Regional Average 2012-2						
Past Month Use	6.4% Use	6.4% Use				
Perceived Risk	89.4% Risky	87.3% Risky				
Perceived Parent Disapproval	94.9% Disapproval	94.3% Disapproval				
Perceived Friend Disapproval	74.9% Disapproval	74.7% Disapproval				

	2010	2014	Change Since 2010
Tobacco Use			·
Past Month Use	15.7%	11.6%	- 4.1%
Age of Onset	14.4 yrs	14.1 yrs	- 0.3 yrs
Perceived Risk	89.4%	90.9%	+ 1.5%
Perceived Parent Disapproval	93.6%	91.0%	- 2.6%
Perceived Friend Disapproval	58.4%	72.6%	+ 14.2%
Alcohol Use			
Past Month Use	39.8%	28.6%	- 11.2%
Age of Onset	14.1 yrs	14.2 yrs	+ 0.1 yrs
Perceived Risk*	64.7%	63.2%	- 1.5%
Perceived Parent Disapproval	87.1%	86.2%	- 0.9%
Perceived Friend Disapproval	36.8%	58.2%	+ 21.4%
Past Month Binge Drinking	29.8%	17.2%	- 12.6%
Marijuana Use			
Past Month Use	21.0%	22.0%	+ 1.0%
Age of Onset	14.7 yrs	14.4 yrs	- 0.3 yrs
Perceived Risk	62.3%	42.0%	- 20.3%
Perceived Parent Disapproval	90.8%	81.4%	- 9.4%
Perceived Friend Disapproval	45.2%	39.5%	- 5.7%

Section XI: Year Trends in Core Measures** Summary: Grades 9-12

*This percentage regards student ratings of risks associated with "drinking 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages nearly every day", as asked in prior survey years. Rates for perception of risks associated with "drinking 5 or more alcoholic beverages once or twice a week" were at 69.8 % for students in grades 9-12.

**Prescription Drugs are not included in this chart because perception questions associated with prescription drug use (risk, parent/friend disapproval, accessibility) were not include in past survey years, as they were for the current 2014 survey report.

Section XVI: Acknowledgements

ERASE staff would like to express their sincere appreciation for the following individuals or groups that helped the coordinate the survey administration process:

- Tolland Local Prevention Council
- Tolland Board of Education
- The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Secretaries of Tolland Middle School
- Tolland Middle School Teachers and Staff
- The Principal, Assistant Principal, and Secretaries of Tolland High School
- Tolland High School Teachers and Staff

ERASE staff would also like to thank the students of Tolland Middle School (Grades 6-8), and Tolland High School (Grades 9-12) for participating in this survey and their parents for allowing participation.

Appendix A:

Tolland 2014 Alcohol and Drug Use Student Survey, Grades 6-12

Survey Instructions

This survey is sponsored by the Tolland Local Prevention Council. The survey is open to youth in grades 6 through 12 attending school in the town of Tolland. We are conducting the survey to learn about your experiences and feelings regarding tobacco, alcohol, drugs, and various activities. This is NOT a test. There are no right or wrong answers.

We encourage you to answer truthfully. Your answers cannot be traced back to you, so you can be completely honest. This is your chance to be heard.

If you are taking this survey later in the cycle, you may have heard classmates talking about the questions or answers they gave. We are relying on your independent spirit and integrity to give answers based on your OWN opinions and experiences, regardless of what you may have heard.

Please work as quickly as you can. If you don't find an answer that fits exactly, choose the one that comes closest. You should not compare or discuss your answers with other students while you are taking the survey, but you may ask your teacher or survey administrator if you do not understand a question.

ECTIO	N 1: Questio	ons About Y	ou.			
1. What g	grade are you	ı in now?				
6	7	8	۹ 🔾	0 10	0 11	0 12
2. What i	s your sex?					
Female						
Male						
. How d	o vou describ	e vourself (M	ark all that a	(vlaa		
White or	Caucasian	,		· F · J /		
Black or	African American					
Asian or	Pacific Islander					
Native A	merican					
) Hispanic	or Latino					
Other (p	lease specify)					
ECTION	l 2: Substa	nce Ilse				
					·····	

ERASE, Inc. Student	ERASE, Inc. Student Survey								
4. Please choose how true	4. Please choose how true this statement is for you:								
My family has <u>clear rules</u> o	liscouraging m	e from the	following	g:					
	D N	efinitely OT True	Mostly NOT True	Mos Tri	itly	Definitely True			
Smoking cigarettes or using tobacco.		0	0	Ċ)	\bigcirc			
Drinking alcoholic beverages.		0	Ō	Ċ)	Õ			
Using marijuana.		0	0	C)	0			
Using a prescription drug that is not prese the purpose of "getting high".	cribed to me for	0	0	C)	0			
SECTION 2: Substance	Use (Continu	ed)							
5. Do any of your parents/	guardians:								
Line tehesee products?		No		Yes	l de	on't know			
Ose lobacco products?		\mathcal{O}		\bigcirc		\bigcirc			
Drank alcoholie bevelages?		\cup		U		0			
6. Do any of your brothers	or sisters:								
	No	Yes	I	don't know	I don't have	e any brothers or sisters			
Use tobacco products?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc		\bigcirc		0			
Drink alcoholic beverages?	\supset	\bigcirc		0		0			
7. Has anyone in your family	ily (such as a pathat it created u	arent/guar	dian, brot	ther or sist	er, not inc	cluding			
		hionicilia (at nome, e		with men	lus f			
NO	U YES				NOW				
SECTION 2: Substance	Use (Continu	ed)							
8. How much do you think	people risk har	ming ther	nselves p	hysically o	r in other	ways			
when they do the following	g:								
		No Risk	Sligh Risk	t Moderate Risk	Great Risk	I Don't Know			
Smoke cigarettes, 1 or more packs a day?		0	0	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc			
Drink 5 or more alcoholic beverages (bee a week?	r, wine or liquor), once or	r twice	0	0	0	Ó			
Drink 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wi day?	ne, or liquor) nearly ever	у О	0	0	0	0			
Use marijuana 1 or 2 times a week?		Õ	Q	Õ	Õ	Õ			
Use prescription drugs that are not prescri	bed to them?	0	0	0	0	0			
SECTION 2: Substance	Use (Continu	ed)							

9. How wrong do your parents/guardians feel it would be for you to do the following:

	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Greatly Wrong
	Wrong	Wrong	Wrong	Greatly wrong
Smoke cigarettes?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Drink 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) nearly every day?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Use marijuana?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Use prescription drugs not prescribed to you?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

10. How wrong do your *friends* feel it would be for you to do the following:

	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Greatly Wrong
	Wrong	Wrong	Wrong	Greatly wrong
Smoke Cigarettes?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Drink 1 or 2 alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, or liquor) nearly every day?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Use marijuana?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Use prescription drugs not prescribed to you?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

11. How do you feel about someone your age having 1 or 2 drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor) nearly every day?

- Strongly Approve
-) Somewhat Approve
-) Neither Approve or Disapprove
-) Somewhat Disapprove
-) Strongly Disapprove

12. Think back over the <u>past 30 days</u>. On how many days, if any, did you use any of the following?

	I have NEVER used.	Not in the past 30 days	Occasionally (1 - 5 days)	Frequently (6 - 20 days)	Almost every day (21 days or more)
Cigarettes.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Other tobacco products (e.g., chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus).	0	0	0	0	\bigcirc
E-Cigarettes (Electronic Cigarettes).	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
An energy drink (e.g., Red Bull, Monster, Amp, or Rock Star).	0	0	0	0	0
An energy drink containing alcohol.	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Marijuana or hashish.	0	0	0	0	\bigcirc

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

13. Think back over your entire <u>lifetime</u> and try to remember whether you have EVER used any of the following. If so, what was your age (in years) when you FIRST used the substance?

	l have <u>NEVER</u> used	9 or younger	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
Tobacco products (like cigarettes, snuff, chewing tobacco, dip, smoking tobacco from a pipe).	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Alcoholic beverages (more than a sip, and NOT including religious activities).	0	\bigcirc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Marijuana or hashish.	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

14. When you first used tobacco pro	ducts (e.g., cigarettes, chewing tobacco, pipe				
tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus, electro	nic cigarettes), what influenced you the MOST to use				
I have NEVER used tobacco products	Advertisements/Media				
Friends/Peer Pressure	Family				
Boredom	Angry/Upset with Someone				
	Stress/To Feel Better				
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Con	ntinued)				
15. How often do you get tobacco products (e.g., cigarettes, chewing tobacco, pipe					

tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus, electronic cigarettes) from:

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Not Applicable (N/A)
Your parents/guardians, with their permission?	0	0	0	Õ
Your parents/guardians, without their permission?	\bigcirc	Ó	Ō	Ō
Your friends?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Your brother(s) or sister(s)?	\bigcirc	Ō	Õ	Ō
Store (you buy them)?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ó	Ō
Machines (you buy them)?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ō	Ō

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

16. About how many students in your grade do you think use tobacco products (e.g., cigarettes, chewing tobacco, pipe tobacco, cigars, snuff, Snus, electronic cigarettes)?

Hardly any students (less than 10%)

A few students (around 25%)

) Half of students (around 50%)

) Most students (around 75%)

() Almost all students (more than 90%)

ERASE, Inc. Student Survey				
17. When you first used marijuana, what influ	lenced you 1	the MOST to r	use marij	uana or
hashish?	-		-	
I have NEVER used marijuana	Advertisem	ents/Media		
Friends/Peer Pressure	Family			
Boredom	Angry/Upse	at with Someone		
	Stress/To F	eel Better		
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)				
18. How often do you get marijuana or hashi	sh from:			
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Not Applicable (N/A)
Your parents/guardians, with their permission?	0	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Your parents/guardians, without their permission?	0	Ō	Õ	Õ
Your brother(s) or sister(s)?	Õ	Õ	Q	Q
Your friends?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)				
19. During the <u>past 30 days,</u> nave you been ni you were at school?	gh under the	influence of	f marijua	na while
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)				
20. About how many students in your grade (do you think	use marijua	na or has	hish?
Hardly any students (less than 10%)				
A few students (around 25%)				
Half of students (around 50%)				
Most students (around 75%)				
Almost all students (more than 90%)				
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)				

21. <u>During the past 30 days</u>, how many days (if any) did you drink (more than a sip and NOT including religious activities) alcoholic beverages (such as beer, wine, wine coolers, mixed drinks, hard liquor, etc.)?

() I have <u>NEVER</u> drunk alcohol (more than a sip) before.

) Not in the past 30 days

) Occasionally (1 - 5 days)

Frequently (6 - 20 days)

Almost every day (21 days or more)

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

22. During the past 30 days, on how many days (if any) did you drink 4 or more alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, wine coolers, mixed drinks, hard liquor, etc.) *during a single occasion*?

) I have <u>NEVER</u> had 4 or more alcoholic beverages in a single occasion.

) Not in the past 30 days

) Occasionally (1 - 5 days)

) Frequently (6 - 20 days)

) Almost every day (21 days or more)

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

23. In the past 30 days, did you drink alcoholic beverages in any of the following places:

	Ideact	Sometimes	Unten
At your home?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
On the street, in the woods, or in parks or fields?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
At the homes of other people?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
At school activities, like dances or sporting events?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
At a party with an adult (30 or older) present?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
At a party without an adult (30 or older) present?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ō

24. During the <u>past 30 days</u> have you been under the influence of alcohol while you were at school?

۱ ()	10
------	----

) YES

Mour

Somotimos

SECTION 3: Substance Use

<u>04--</u>

25. Have you ever driven a car, truck, ATV or motorcycle when under the influence of alcohol:

	Yes	No	This question does not apply
	103	NU	to me.
at least once in the last 30 days?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
at least once in your lifetime?	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

26. How often do	you get alcoholic hove	ranac from		
zo. now onten uo	you get alconolic bever	Never	Sometimes	Often
Your parents/guardians, <u>wi</u>	th their permission?	0	0	\bigcirc
Your parents/guardians, <u>wi</u>	thout their permission?	Õ	Õ	Ŏ
Your friends?		Õ	Õ	Ŏ
Your brother(s) or sister(s)?		Ō	Ŏ	Ŏ
From other people who buy	y it for you?	Õ	Ō	Ŏ
At a party with an adult's pe	ermission (21 or older)?	Õ	Ŏ	Ŏ
At a restaurant?		Õ	Ŏ	Ŏ
At a store or bar (you buy it)?	Ō	Ō	Õ
27. On how many	occasions in vour lifetii	<i>me</i> have vou been dru	ınk or verv hig	h from
drinking alcoholi	c beverages?	<u></u>	····· •· · •· y ····g	
Never	1 - 2 Occasions	3 - 9 Occasions	0 10 or M	fore Occasions
SECTION 2: Sub	stance Use (Continu	ed)		
28. When you first	t drank alcohol (more th	an a sip, and NOT inc	luding religiou	s activities),
	You the MUST to drink a			
Friends/peer pressure		Family tradition		
Boredom		Alcohol readily avai	lable	
Curiosity		Angry/upset with sor	neone	
Advertisements/Media	l de la companya de l	Stress/to feel better		
SECTION 2: Sub	stance Use (Continu	ed)		
SECTION 2: Sub	stance Use (Continu	ed)		
SECTION 2: Sub	stance Use (Continu	ed)		

ERASE, Inc. Student Survey 	r>	
29. How many students in your grade	do you think drink alcoho	lic beverages (more than
just a sip and NOT including religious	activities) at least once e	very month?
A few students (accurd 25%)		
Half of students (around 50%)		
Most students (around 75%)		
Almost all students (more than 90%)		
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Cont	inued)	
30. Have you ever ridden in a vehicle a influence of alcohol:	as a passenger when the c	driver was under the
at least once in the last month?	Yes	No
at least once in your lifetime?	Ŏ	\bigcirc
any of those instances occur when the No Yes This question does not apply to me	e driver was an adult (age	21 and over)?
SECTION 2: Substance Use (Conti	inued)	

•
32. Have you EVER used any of these drugs?

	NO, Never	YES, But <u>N0T</u> in the past 30 days	YES, In the past 30 days
Inhalants (things you sniff or inhale to get high such as glue, paint, whippets, or sprays)	0	0	0
Cocaine	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Crack cocaine (rock)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ō
Allovites (vites)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Ecstasy or Molly (MDMA)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Hallucinogens (LSD, acid or mushrooms, PCP or Angel Dust)	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Heroin	\bigcirc	0	0
Salvia	\bigcirc	0	\bigcirc
Ketamine (Special K)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
GHB	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Methamphetamine (Meth)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Synthetic marijuana (Spice, K2, K3)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Bath Salts (Ivorywave, Red Dove)	0	0	0

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

33. Have you ever used any of these drug(s) on your own, <u>*without*</u> **your own prescription** or a doctor or dentist telling you to?

	NO, Never	Yes, But <u>NOT</u> in the past 30 days	Yes, In the past 30 days	
Pain medication (OxyContin, Vicodin, Percodan, Codeine, or Diłaudid)	0	0	0	
Steroids (juice, roids)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Downers (barbiturates, sleeping pills, sedatives, Quaaludes)	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Tranquilizers (Valium, Xanax, or Librium)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Uppers (Ritalin, Adderall, Amphetamines, or Speed)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Over the counter medications to get "high" (cough medicine, mouthwash)	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

ERASE, Inc. Student Survey

34. If you use any prescription or over-the-counter drugs for the purpose of "getting high", how often do you get these drugs from: Not Applicable Never Somtimes Often (N/A) 0000 Your parents/guardians, with their permission? Ĵ You parents/guardians, without their permission?

Your brother(s) or sister(s)?

Your friends?

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

35. During the past 30 days, have you been intentionally high under the influence of prescription drugs while you were at school?

Not Applicable (I have NEVER used prescription drugs for purpose of getting high)

()	No

Yes

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

36. If you wanted to, how easy would it be for you to get:

	Very Easy	Sort Of Easy	Sort Of Hard	Very Hard	
Beer, wine, wine coolers, or hard liquor?	0	Ο	\bigcirc	Ò	
Any type of tobacco products?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ō	
Marijuana or hashish?	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Illegal drugs like cocaine, heroin, LSD, or amphetamines?	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ó	
A prescription drug without your own prescription (such as OxyContin, Vicodin, Ritalin and Adderall)?	\bigcirc	0	0	Ó	
					ſ

SECTION 2: Substance Use (Continued)

ERASE, Inc. Student Survey

37. How important do you think the following are in preventing kids from drinking alcoholic beverages?

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	l Don't Know
Having driver's license suspended for drinking	0	\bigcirc	Ö	\bigcirc
Checking ID's in stores or bars	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Õ	Õ
Fear of addiction	0	Ó	Õ	Õ
Friends who disapprove of drinking	0	0	Ō	Õ
High price	0	0	Ō	Ō
School rules	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Õ
Parental rules about drinking	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	Ŏ
Alcohol education in school	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Being fined about \$200 for drinking	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	0
Advertisement that show the problems associated with drinking	0	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Alcohol-free activities (like dances, concerts, or sporting events)	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Friends who don't drink	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

You have finished the survey.

Thank you for your participation in the ERASE, Inc. Student Survey.

If anything in this survey made you upset or brought up feelings of confusion, please talk to your school psychologist, school counselor, or teacher.

MEETING MINUTES

RECEIVED FOR RECORD TOLLAND, CT

TOLLAND TOWN COUNCIL 2018 JUL 26 AM 8: 39 HICKS MEMORIAL MUNICIPAL CENSER Deiley JULY 24, 2018 – 7:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: William Eccles, Chair; David Skoczulek, Vice-Chair; Brenda Falusi; Tammy Nuccio; John Reagan; Paul Reynolds and Christine Vincent

MEMBERS ABSENT: None.

OTHERS PRESENT: Steven Werbner, Town Manager; Lisa Hancock, Finance Director; Scott Lappen, Public Works; Heidi Samokar, Director of Planning and Development

- 1. CALL TO ORDER: William Eccles called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Recited.
- 3. MOMENT OF SILENCE: Observed.
- PROCLAMATIONS/PRESENTATIONS: None. 4.
- PUBLIC PETITIONS, COMMUNICATIONS, AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (on any subject within 5. the jurisdiction of the Town Council) (2 minute limit)

Colleen Yudichak of 12 Blueberry Hill: She advised that Karen Moran and Bob Pagoni were present with her at tonight's meeting. They hope they have the option to speak with the Council regarding item 8.3.

6. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS: None

7a. REPORTS OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES RESPONSIBLE TO THE COUNCIL:

7b. REPORTS OF TOWN COUNCIL LIAISONS: John Reagan, WPCA: The meeting was short, but it was reported that everything is going well. Tammy Nuccio, Rec Advisory Board: They walked around the fields at Cross Farms and Birch Grove looking at their condition, and the possibilities for repairs and updates. Brenda Falusi, PZC: They had a joint meeting with the consultant for the POCD and the EDC. The consultant made some recommendations on permitting. It was a good meeting with a lot of information,

8. **NEW BUSINESS (ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS):**

To view agenda item attachments, you may visit: https://www.tolland.org/town-council

8.1 Consideration of a resolution to approve proposed fee changes to Chapter A173-1 of the Code of the Town of Tolland, "Cemetery Fee Schedule and Regulations" for September 1, 2018 and the setting of a Public Hearing thereon for August 14, 2018.

Mr. Werbner read his item summary: As discussed during the FY2018-2019 budget process, they reviewed and compared Tolland's local cemetery fees against surrounding communities and recommended certain fee changes to the Cemetery plots and internments. They are bringing to the Town Council the applicable fee changes within the Code of the Town of Tolland for approval effective September 1, 2018. There are changes to sections A173-1

Cemetery Fees. It is anticipated that the attached fee changes will hopefully bring in approximately \$15,000 in additional revenue during FY2018-2019.

Mr. Lappen commented that they looked at surrounding towns and found that Tolland's fees were significantly lower. Even with the proposed fee changes, Tolland will still be lower. In speaking with some of the town staff, they couldn't remember the fees being raised in the last 18 years.

Mr. Werbner reviewed the fees being raised: gravesites, interment, footing fees for foot stones and headstone fees. The current balance of the cemetery fund is \$200,000 - \$210,000. It is a self supporting fund. The additional moneys would be used for equipment and capital purchases. Mr. Reagan asked if it would stay self sustaining without raising the fees. Mr. Werbner said it would, although if any equipment should fail, the account could easily be wiped out. Mr. Reagan said he would be in favor of keeping the fees where they are. Ms. Nuccio commented even though the rates haven't been increased in 18 years, the account still has a \$210,000 balance. The \$15,000 isn't necessarily because it is needed; it is because we are lower than other towns. Mr. Werbner said they are often asked to look at all the revenues and the averages of towns in the area. He said if everyone is comfortable being lower in this area than everyone else, and providing a benefit to the residents, that is a decision of the Council. It was just brought to them as an option. Ms. Falusi asked how the maintenance of the roads is paid for inside of the cemeteries. Mr. Lappen said it would come out of that account. Mr. Werbner said there are items that need some work, ex. headstones. He also added that the town does not back charge the public works employees' salary for when there is a funeral and they are involved. If it was truly self sufficient and that expense was carried out of this budget it wouldn't be self supporting. Mr. Reynolds asked what the estimated costs of the in-kind services of public works are worth to the town. This information wasn't available, but will be gathered and provided. Ms. Nuccio said she does not want to raise the residents fees, but would be willing to raise the non-residents' fees. Ms. Falusi agreed. Ms. Vincent asked Mr. Werbner to look at the language regarding Veteran residency and clean it up. In one place it states "resident of at least 10 years" and in another area it says "regardless of Veteran's place of residency at time of death." Mr. Werbner will look at it.

David Skoczulek motioned that the following resolution be introduced and set down for a Public Hearing on August 14, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in Tolland Town Council Chambers:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Tolland Town Council that it hereby approves effective September 1, 2018 the attached fee changes to Chapter A173-1 for Cemetery Fee Schedule and Regulations.

Seconded by Tammy Nuccio. All in favor. None opposed.

8.2 Consideration of a resolution to allocate the appropriation of \$105,000 from the General Fund - Fund Balance to the Capital Improvements Fund for the replacement of the Security systems at the Tolland Intermediate and Tolland Middle Schools for \$75,000 and \$30,000 for demolition of the Tolland Middle School Portable Classrooms and the setting of a Public Hearing thereon for August 14, 2018.

Mr. Werbner read the item summary, which was submitted to him from the Superintendent:

The Tolland Intermediate School security/burglar system panels and associated Ademco software are obsolete. This system is the oldest in the District. All alarm codes have been exhausted so employees are sharing/swapping codes as necessary. With the new exterior doors scheduled to be installed this summer with Child Guard glass, it would make sense to include the installation of a more current security/burglar system where the BOE has the capacity to conduct software updates, utilize cloud based or remote monitoring and with the new doors more functional door contacts installed. We no longer can obtain parts or software to service or repair the current system. These improvements are needed to provide the appropriate security for the building. The cost for these improvements is \$30,000.

The Tolland Middle School has the second oldest system in the District and like Tolland Intermediate School has an obsolete panel and software. The list of access codes is restricted so that future hiring, employee turnover will create further strain on code monitoring. The cost for these improvements is \$45,000.

The security risk of having equipment that we can no longer update software or get parts for will create a real problem if it fails. For instance, if the panel at TMS fails, we may have to hire staff for a "fire watch" until a new board can be installed. This could take weeks and become a very costly situation. Acquiring funding of this magnitude in an emergency situation could be very problematic and we would prefer to address the issue now before it becomes an emergency.

The Tolland Middle School portable classrooms have reached the end of their useful lives. They are no longer used for educational purposes and have been vacant for several years. A majority of their contents should be discarded or placed into other storage areas. The siding is falling apart, the roofs are leaking, the stair access is unsafe and in need of repair, the two entry doors are hard to open and they are becoming more of a liability to maintain especially because they offer no real tangible value. They need to be demolished and disposed of. The cost for this is \$30,000.

Since the \$40,000 cumulative threshold for special appropriations fixed by \$C9-14 of the Charter has been exceeded for the 2018-19 fiscal year, a public hearing is required before action can be taken on this item.

The Board of Education has advised that they will return sufficient funds from unexpended appropriations for FY 17-18 to cover this request. The funds will flow into the General Fund – Fund Balance

David Skoczulek motioned that the following resolution be introduced and set down for a public hearing to be held on August 14, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in Tolland Town Council Chambers:

BE IT RESOLVED by the Tolland Town Council that it hereby approves the appropriation of \$75,000 for improvements to the security systems at Tolland Intermediate and Tolland Middle Schools and \$30,000 for the demolition of the portable classrooms at Tolland Middle School in new accounts to be established within the Capital Improvements Fund. The General Fund will allocate \$105,000 of the General Fund – Fund Balance as the funding source.

Seconded by Brenda Falusi. All in favor. None opposed.

8.3 Discussion of the Board of Education 1% Reserve Fund.

Mr. Werbner said the current ordinance requires a review in the month of August 2018. The marked up version that was presented to the Council reflects input he received from various Council members. This draft version is distributed for discussion purposes only. The BOE has requested that a copy of this marked up version be sent to them at the same time the Council received it, and he did copy them on this distribution. While it looks like a number of edits, many are procedural to reflect actual practice, which have been reviewed with the Superintendant, and others have been made to more closely mirror the language in the CT General Statutes. The most significant change is in Section A – Contributions to the Fund – whereby the Town Council may deposit funds into the account rather than shall.

Mr. Werbner said the suggested process would be for both the Council and the BOE to review the proposed changes. The BOE could get back to the Council with any suggested changes, concerns, or comments on the Ordinance. They could then reflect on those and then schedule a public hearing. Prior to the public hearing, the BOE and Council could meet to have a separate discussion if needed.

÷

Ms. Falusi suggested the following changes:

- 1. 8A. Where it says: The Board of Education shall provide a written request to the Town Council after they have approved it at their Board meeting. She asked that the word 'it' be changed to something more descriptive. Mr. Eccles suggested 'the request'.
- 2. Once they make their request, she asked if a timeframe for action could be added.

Karen Moran invited Mr. Eccles and Mr. Skoczulek to their meeting tomorrow night so they could sit in on their discussion regarding this. Mr. Pagoni gave background on the creation of the 1% fund. He doesn't think the Council should go back to the old ways. Mr. Skoczulek and Ms. Nuccio will be at tomorrow night's meeting. Mr. Eccles is unavailable.

Mr. Reynolds said this is a good time to look at this. It is a completely different time in the State of Connecticut, and so many things are out of their control now.

Mr. Eccles reviewed the process. The BOE will review it tomorrow night, and then have a letter sent to Mr. Werbner with their comments for forwarding to the Council. The Council will have discussion with them at one of the Council meetings, and then a public hearing will be set.

8.4 Consideration and action concerning resolution to: (a) appropriate \$5,000,000 for certain road improvements; (b) authorize the Town to issue and sell its notes and bonds pursuant to the Connecticut General Statutes, or any other provision of law thereto enabling, in an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000; (c) authorize the submission of the project resolution to the voters at referendum; and (d) authorize such other actions relating to the foregoing as may be necessary or appropriate and the setting of a Public Hearing thereon for August 14, 2018.

Mr. Werbner said this was discussed during the budget process. In FY 13/14 Tolland received the first million dollars of the five million dollar bond package for road surface treatments. In his item summary, he provided a brake down. Tolland has taken a very aggressive approach since the beginning of the five million dollar bonding for roads that came into existence. Since the start of the program we have resurfaced approximately 32.55 miles of roads and we are planning to address another 34.62 miles if we are successful in securing another five million dollar bond for this purpose. Our five year draft plan is attached but as with any plan, they are subject to change due to weather impact on the surfaces or funding availability. We utilize a pavement analysis program which is managed by VHB, a local Engineering firm that specializes in pavement conditions and the appropriate resurfacing techniques used to help achieve the maximum life expectancy of these roads. Collectively, we are striving to achieve a PCI, Pavement Condition Index, of 70 or better throughout the Town of Tolland. Currently, our PCI ranges between the 50's and some roads exceed the 80 mark with an average in the high 50's to low 60's. Treatments range from Chip/Crack Sealing to full depth reclamation which differs dramatically in cost. A process such as chip seal is in the neighborhood of \$5.00 per square yard as compared to approximately \$21.00 per square yard for full depth reclamation. Road surfaces are impacted by the amount of traffic that typically travels over them on a daily basis as well as the ultraviolet rays from the sun and the chemicals used during the winter months to help keep them clear of snow and ice. Neighborhood streets can last upwards of twenty to twenty-five years whereas a main road such as Old Cathole Road that sees a lot of vehicular traffic will probably last around twelve to fifteen years before it needs to be resurfaced. If we can continue on with this type of funding, he is confident that the Town of Tolland will be able to achieve our goal of 70 plus for a Town wide PCI over the next ten to fifteen years.

Ms. Nuccio spoke about the numbers. She thinks they should try to build the million dollars into the budget, but wants to get the public's input. Mr. Werbner said he is not minimizing a million dollars, because if he added a million dollars to the budget last year, he doesn't think the Council or the public would have had the appetite to approve it. His concern would be if it could be sustainable year after year. It becomes a budgetary game. This

1

isn't something you can defer. There will be other things that are coming up in the budget that will need to be addressed. He agrees with Ms. Nuccio, but now is not the time to do it, based upon the debt that they have committed to already.

David Skoczulek motioned that the following resolution be introduced and set down for a Public Hearing on August 14, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in Tolland Town Council Chambers:

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Tolland Town Council that it hereby appropriates as follows:

Consideration and action concerning resolution to: (a) appropriate \$5,000,000 for certain road improvements; (b) authorize the Town to issue and sell its notes and bonds pursuant to the Connecticut General Statutes, or any other provision of law thereto enabling, in an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000; (c) authorize the submission of the project resolution to the voters at referendum; and (d) authorize such other actions relating to the foregoing as may be necessary or appropriate.

A copy of the full text of the resolution is recorded following these minutes.

Seconded by Tammy Nuccio. All in favor. None opposed.

8.5 Appointments to vacancies on various municipal boards/commissions.

A resignation letter was received from Scott Tardif from the Tolland Water Commission.

David Skoczulek motioned to accept the following appointments:

8.5.a. Reappointment to Agriculture Commission

Arden Tanner, Term 07/09/18 – 07/09/21

8.5.b. Appointment to Blight Review Committee

Cliff Vachon, 44 Julia Road, Term 02/27/18 - 01/01/20

Seconded by Brenda Falusi. 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 said they received an Inter-Town Cooperation Award from CRCOG for their health insurance collaborative that they have with Tolland, Coventry, Plainfield, Putnum and EastCon.

11. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

11.1 July 10, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes: David Skoczulek moved to adopt the minutes; Seconded by Brenda Falusi. All in favor. None opposed. Tammy Nuccio and Paul Reynolds abstained.

12. CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNCIL

- 12.1 Invitation to All 169 Connecticut cities and towns from the Ella Grasso 100th Birth Anniversary Committee for a State Capitol Rally commemorating form Governor Garsso on June 2, 2019 @ 2:00 p.m.
- 13. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT: No report.

14. **COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS FROM COUNCILPERSONS:** Brenda Falusi mentioned that The Tolland Youth Services Community will be presenting *Seussical* July 27 & 28, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Tolland High School Auditorium. Get your tickets, they are selling quickly.

15. **PUBLIC LISTED PARTICIPATION** (on any subject within the jurisdiction of the Town Council) (3 minute limit): None.

16. EXECUTIVE SESSION

David Skoczulek motioned to go into Executive Session at 8:02 p.m., ending the Regular Meeting of the Town Council. Invited to attend were the Planning Director, the Ag Commission and the town's attorney. Seconded by Christine Vincent. All in favor. None opposed. The Executive Session ended at 8:24 p.m.

16.1. Lease Negotiations

17. **ADJOURNMENT:** Christine Vincent moved to adjourn the meeting; Seconded by Brenda Falusi at 8:24 p.m. All were in favor.

William N. Eccles Town Council Chair

Michelle A. Finnegan Town Council Clerk

§ A173-1Cemetery fee schedule and regulations.

Cemetery fee schedule.	
(1)	
rees.	
Gravesites	Fee
Single grave purchased by/for resident	\$ 500<u>750</u>
Single grave purchased by/for nonresident	\$ 600<u>950</u>
Cremation remains grave	\$225
Infant grave	\$200
Single grave in veterans' section for burial of veteran*	\$250
Single grave in veterans' section for spouse of veteran*	\$500
*Veteran shall mean a person honorably discharged from the Armed Forces of the United States who has been/was a resident of Tolland for at least 10 years.	e
Interment	
Standard interment in a resident gravesite	\$4 50 700
Standard interment in a nonresident gravesite	\$ 550 800
Infant interment	\$225
Cremated remains	\$200
(must use waterproof container)	
Frost charge, regular interment	\$150
Frost charge, cremated remains	\$75
Memorial wall for cremated remains at Valley View Cemetery:	
Space for two urns in wall	\$800
Opening and closing of space	\$150
(2)	
Extra charges for Saturday and holiday interments.	
<u>(a)</u>	
Standard interment: \$200 on Saturday; \$250 on a Town holiday.	
(D) Infant interment: \$20 on Seturdary \$100 on a Tarry halidary	
(c)	
Cremated remains interment: \$80 on Saturday: \$100 on a Town holiday.	
(<u>d</u>)	
Disinterment: one and one-half times the applicable interment rate.	
(e)	•
Footing tees for foot stones	<u>\$100_200</u>
山 Headstone fees	\$150.250
	<u>9130 230</u>

<u>B.</u>

Regulations.

(1)

All interment fees must be paid prior to interment.

<u>(2)</u>

Monument maintenance is the responsibility of the owner.

<u>(3)</u>

Lots may not be transferred.

<u>(4)</u>

Artificial decorations are not permitted between April 15 and November 20.

<u>(5)</u>

New artificial flowers may be used when Easter occurs prior to April 15. They shall be removed within 10 days after Easter.

<u>(6)</u>

New shrubbery is not permitted. Existing shrubs will be removed by the Town at such time as they become overgrown.

(7)

Concrete products, metal urns and glass jars, votive lights and bric-a-brac of any description is forbidden.

<u>(8)</u>

Planting of annual flowers is permitted within 10 inches of the burial side of an upright monument.

<u>(9)</u>

Planting of flowers on flush marker lots is prohibited. Natural cut flowers are permitted when placed in appropriate containers.

(10)

Potted plants and flower boxes are allowed only during the ten-day periods following Easter Sunday, Mother's and Father's Day and Memorial Day.

<u>(11)</u>

Monument size in the infant section shall be no greater than $18 \times 12 \times 6$ inches.

<u>(12)</u>

There shall be no interments on Sundays, Memorial Day, Thanksgiving or Christmas. (13)

The maximum monument size and type shall be specified by the sexton of cemeteries in accordance with applicable plans for a cemetery facility or a section thereof.

<u>(14)</u>

Valley View Cemetery veterans section regulations.

<u>(a)</u>

Single grave at one-half cost is available to all honorably discharged veterans who have been/were residents of Tolland for at least 10 years regardless of veteran 's place of residency at time of death.

<u>(b)</u>

Single grave at regular cost is available to all honorably discharged veterans who have been residents of Tolland for less than 10 years.

<u>(c)</u>

Single grave next to veteran may be purchased for use by spouse at regular cost; full interment fees will be charged.

<u>(d)</u>

Monument at spouse's gravesite must be installed within six months of interment of deceased. (e)

Only upright granite military-style monuments shall be allowed, at both veteran and spouse gravesites.

<u>(f)</u>

A waiver for an extension will be granted for religious reasons and a request for said waiver should be made in writing to the Town Manager.

<u>(15)</u>

Regulations pertaining to memorial wall for cremated remains at Valley View Cemetery. (a)

1

Monument shall be slant-style monument only.

<u>(b)</u>

Slant monument size shall be two feet by 10 inches by one foot six inches only.

<u>(c)</u>

Only McKenzie-style urns are allowed.

<u>(d)</u>

No plantings allowed around wall; Town of Tolland will provide all plantings.

DRAFT FY2019-2023 Town of Tolland Pavement Plan

.

Image: State	Name 2019	Station From	ĩο	PCI	Length	Area Functional Class	Treatment	Cc	
Generalization 0 WHOOLAND'ST 82 840 2134 51233 5123 51233 <td>BRANDEN WAY</td> <td>0 CUL DE SAC (S)</td> <td>CUL DE SAC (N)</td> <td>46</td> <td>2 542</td> <td>83 446 Local- Dead End</td> <td>Overlay (Local)</td> <td>87.15</td>	BRANDEN WAY	0 CUL DE SAC (S)	CUL DE SAC (N)	46	2 542	83 446 Local- Dead End	Overlay (Local)	87.15	
GENERAL READ 88.8 W.GOLAND, ST. GAMT HILLRD 81.214 Light St.221 Logit Hill St.221 </td <td>GEHRING ROAD</td> <td>0 WEIGOLD RD</td> <td>WOODLAND ST</td> <td>82</td> <td>840</td> <td>21.835 Local-Thru Street</td> <td>Shim & Overlay</td> <td>49.25</td>	GEHRING ROAD	0 WEIGOLD RD	WOODLAND ST	82	840	21.835 Local-Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	49.25	
GERMANNE RAD 2974 GAMAT HULK RD 6007 WOR GRAAT HULK RD 79 995 993 1333 Gue Thrus Street Stime A Ordering 322 GERMANG RAD 3573 SI OW OF GRAAT HULK RD 3157 W OF GRAAT HULK RD 66 750 17315 Gaach Thrus Street Shim A Ordering 757 GERMANG RAD 4938 1287 WOR GRAAT HULK RD 3157 W OF GRAAT HULK RD 66 550 17315 Gaach Thrus Street Shim A Ordering 757 GOOSE LANK 31247 AMORSON RD 17004 HULK 66 551 3757 Mug/Andros Glactor 750 6606 HULK 86 757 555 Mac/Monto Collector 750 6607 HULK 86 757 750 HULK RD 851 757 Machine Collector 750 757 Machine Collector 750 757 Machine Collector 750 757 750 <td>GEHRING ROAD</td> <td>839.8 WOODLAND ST</td> <td>GRANT HILL RD</td> <td>83</td> <td>2.134</td> <td>51.221 Local- Thru Street</td> <td>Shim & Overlay</td> <td>115,53</td>	GEHRING ROAD	839.8 WOODLAND ST	GRANT HILL RD	83	2.134	51.221 Local- Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	115,53	
GERMING ROAD 3373.3 GOV MO C RANT HULR D 327 W OF GRANT HULR D 327 W OF GRANT HULR D 31.7 YOU FOR STATUR ST	GEHRING ROAD	2974 GRANT HILL RD	600' W OF GRANT HILL RD	79	599	14.383 Local- Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	32,44	
Generalization 4388 123/W OF GRAAT HILL RD 4384 VOR SCHAT HILL RD 66 502 12,110 Coach Thu Steed Shin & Ownerly 75,353 GERMING RADD 12,020 AND STACK Dia Markow RD AND STACK Shin & Ownerly	GEHRING ROAD	3573.3 600' W OF GRANT HILL RD	1329' W OF GRANT HILL RD	81	730	17,513 Local- Thru Street	Shim & Overlav	39.50	
Generalized RADA 4807 & Edit V OF GRANT HILL RD OLD SKIT RD SQUTH 82 12.02 24.727 Cecility To Street Shin & Avering* SS. GOODEL ANE 0 MERROW RD AUDERSON RD TWAN HILE 80 45.31 12.35.2 74.840 18.32 74.30 82.32 74.30 82.32 74.30 82.32 74.30 82.32 74.30 82.32 74.30 82.32 74.32 74.34 16.35 13.77 14.35 16.35 16.37 17.37 14.35 16.37 17.37 14.35 16.35 17.37 14.35 16.35 16.37 17.37 14.35 16.35 16.37 17.37 14.35 16.35	GEHRING ROAD	4303 1329' W OF GRANT HILL RD	1834' W OF GRANT HILL RD -	66	505	12.110 Local-Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	27.31	
GOODE LANK 9 MARROW RD AND RESON RD 77 31.25 74.40 Malp/Miner Collector Coll State State <th< td=""><td>GEHRING ROAD</td><td>4807.6 1834' W OF GRANT HILL RD</td><td>OLD KENT RD SOUTH</td><td>82</td><td>1.030</td><td>24.727 Local- Thru Street</td><td>Shim & Overlay</td><td>55.77</td></th<>	GEHRING ROAD	4807.6 1834' W OF GRANT HILL RD	OLD KENT RD SOUTH	82	1.030	24.727 Local- Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	55.77	
GOOD LANK 312.47 ANDERSON RO TOWN LINK BO BO (2011) BO (2012) BO (20	GOOSE LANE	0 MERROW RD	ANDERSON RD	77	3,125	73,430 Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	37.53	
GRAM IF ILL ROAD 0 (DER MILL RD MEYCLAF RD 61 1,553 37.371 Major (Name Collector - Thin Overlay 25.3 TMMER TRUL 2.402 F 4/25 N OF STAC'UN BAADESN NY 38 1,653 37.371 Major (Name Collector - Thin Overlay 22.2 CARLES SALING, FARKING LOS, and NEGELGONDO DO ROADS Standard Standard Standard Standard Standard Standard 22.2 CARLES SALING, FARKING LOS, and NEGELGONDO DO STAC 'UN BRANDESN NY 38 3.825 51.975 Local- Thru Street Thin Overlay 22.2 ANDERSON ROAD 2 50.01 GODES FLAW MEYCLAF RD 64 3.925 51.976 Local- Thru Street Thin Overlay 63.0 ANDERSON ROAD 0 LOID STAFFORD RD TOWN INVEL 7 2.446 Staff 20.253 Local- Thru Street Thin Overlay 63.0 COCK ROAD 0 LOID STAFFORD RD TOWN INVEL NOT RAW RAW RDS 8.862 102.353 Local- Thru Street Thin Overlay 63.0 COCK ROAD 0 LOID STAFFORD RD TOWN RIVER RD 1.864 3.664 3.664 3.662 1.663 <td>GOOSE LANE</td> <td>3124.7 ANDERSON RD</td> <td>TOWN LINE</td> <td>80</td> <td>6,981</td> <td>160,556 Major/Minor Collector</td> <td>Chip Seal</td> <td>82.00</td>	GOOSE LANE	3124.7 ANDERSON RD	TOWN LINE	80	6,981	160,556 Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	82.00	
TIMER TRAIL 0 & 620 PD 4.37 N OF STACY (N 39 2,400 40,822 Local: Thru Street Reclaim or Cold in Pace (Local) 92,233 TMMER TRAIL 40,867 ALS / N OF STACY (N BBANDEN WY 31 35 35,357 Local: Thru Street Reclaim or Cold in Pace (Local) 33,422 TMMER TRAIL 40,867 ALS / N OF STACY (N BLAD STACK (N) 31 2,305 53,327 Local: Thru Street Reclaim or Cold in Pace (Local) 33,42 TMMER TRAIL 40,867 ALS / N OF STACY (N BLAD STACK (N) 31 2,305 53,327 Local: Thru Street Thru Orefrag 35,300 TMMER TRAIL 0.00 STAFCORD RD TOWN LINE FS 2,425 Sold 21 Sold	GRANT HILL ROAD	0 CIDER MILL RD	METCALF RD	81	1,651	37,971 Major/Minor Collector	Thin Overlay	25,31	
Timeter TRAL 1408 7.415 NO FSTACY IN PRANDER VAY 38 3.830 50.327 Local-Thm Street Reclaim or Gold in Pace (Local) 133.222 CRACK SKAUNE, PARKING LODS ARADS S 1.000. 2242.222 S 2242.222 S 2242.222 S 2242.222 S 5 1.000. 2242.223 S 1.000. S 1.000.0	TIMBER TRAIL	0 REED RD	415' N OF STACY LN	39	1,409	40,852 Local- Thru Street	Reclaim or Cold in Place (Local)	92,14	
CRACK SELUNG, PARKING LOTS, and NEGR BORHOOD RGADS 51.0000 ANDERSON ROAD 226.0.1 GOOSE LANE METCALF RD 64 3.825 91.795 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 65.1 ANDERSON ROAD 0 DERSON ROAD 0.000 FARMOR DO THIN DVERTAGE Scient Thin Street Thin Overlay 65.0 ANDERSON ROAD 0.000 FARMOR DO TOWAND MOLINARI DD Scient Thin Street Thin A Vertay 85.0 COXE ROAD 0.000 FARMOR DD TOWAND MOLINTARI DD Scient Thin Street Thin Dverlay 60.7 COXE ROAD 0.000 FARMOR DD TOWAND FARE RD 51 540 50.58 Local-Thin Street Thin Dverlay 163.5 GERBER DRIVE 0 NOUSTRIAL PARK RD WEST 52 82.78 Scient Deed Find Thin Dverlay 156.5 GERBER DRIVE 1.644 AND WEST 1.644 AND WEST 1.288 AND WEST 1.	TIMBER TRAIL	1408.7 415' N OF STACY LN	BRANDEN WY	38	1,830	50,317 Local-Thru Street	Reclaim or Cold in Place (Local)	113.4	
S1 LOBAL METCALF RD G4 3255 Lobal-Thru Street Thin Overlay G2. AMTICION ROAD 0 MERKOW RD FRIGGES RD 62 2,715 65,172 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 63. BORT COP ROAD MO 2 0 DID STAFFCRD RD TOWN UNE 70. 72.444 95,129 Migr Alma Collector Chip Seal 33.0 CODE ROAD 9.519 Set ST	CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS	5, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS						242,48	
INDESCON IROAD 280.1 200.5 24.1 25.5 24.2 91.7 55.5 24.6 91.7 55.2 24.6 91.7 55.2 24.6 91.7 55.2 24.6 91.7 55.2 24.6 91.7 55.2 24.6 91.2 55.2 24.6 91.2 35.2 Mile A centry 95.2 BUFF CAP BOAD MO 2 0.10.0 57.4 76.6 57.2 44.6 93.12 Mile A centry 68.3 COOR ROAD 30.00 57.6 76.0 10.00 76.0 77.0 76.0 76.0	2020						·····	\$ 1,000,00	
AMTIONY ROAD 0 MERIOW RD PHOORS RD 62 2.7.16 65.172 Local: Third Street Stim & Constay 65.2 BUFF CAP ROAD NO 2 0 DID STAFEDR RD TWM UNE 75.2 46.44 53.13 Local: Third Street Third Downlay 69.0 56.2 20.2333 Local: Third Street Third Downlay 69.0 56.2 20.2333 Local: Third Street Third Downlay 69.0 56.2 20.2333 Local: Third Street Third Downlay 69.0 56.2 20.02 Third Downlay 69.0 56.2 20.02 Third Downlay 19.7 20.01 MERION 60.00 56.2 20.64 56.1 20.64 Fild Street 70.00 10.00 57.2 20.75 Local: Third Street 70.00 10.00 56.2 56.2 56.2 56.2 56.2 56.2 56.2 56.2 58.4 58.2 72.1 46.4 Local: Third Street 70.00 10.4 10.4 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00 10.00	ANDERSON ROAD	2360 1 GOOSE LANE	METCALE RD	64	3 975	91 795 Local Thru Street	Thin Overlay	61.10	
International Control 0.005 TAFFGDB DB TOWN UNE 72 2.464 53.13 Major Minar Collector Coll Start FGDB DB 949 25.01 Major Minar Collector Coll Start FGDB DB 949 25.53 Log Thrus Street Thin Overlay 93.03 COOK ROAD 0 0.015 TAFFGDB DB 949 25.535 Log Thrus Street Thin Overlay 93.03 COOK ROAD 0 0.015 TAFFGDB DB TOUNN UNE 549 126.535 Log Thrus Street Thin Overlay 93.03 COOK ROAD 0.010 STRAL PARK RD WEST 720.5 0 F NOUSTRAL PARK RD WEST 720.5 0 F NOUSTRAL PARK RD WEST 250.5 780 ° ST NOUSTRAL PARK RD WEST 250.5 780 ° C NOUSTRAL PARK RD WEST 26.88 28.271 Cuci- Dess End 100 Averlay (Log) 48.85 CERBER DRIVE 0 NARTFORD TUMPIKE CULD ESAC 55 15.50 42.890 Local- Thou Street Thin Overlay 15.0 RINOSTRIAL PARK RD WEST 0.10 STAFFGDB RD KARTFORD TUMPIKE 100.11 AVERS AVERA LOCAL- DESAC 56 15.350 46.43 Local- Thou Street Thin Overlay 10.2	ANTHONY ROAD	0 MERROW RD		67	3,823	51,755 Local They Street	Chim & Quarter	01,1:	
COOK ROAD 0 OLD STAFFORD RD 949" SOF KENDALL MOUNTAIN RD 850, 2502 202333 Bioar-Thron Student Thin Overlay 202 COOK ROAD 3619 54F SOF KENDALL MOUNTAIN RD REVEL Thin Overlay 27 DUNN HILL ROAD 0 OLD STAFFORD RD TOLLAND STAGE RD See Kendal Luceu Thron Street Overlay 27 DUNN HILL ROAD 0 OLD STAFFORD RD TOLLAND STAGE RD See Kendal Luceu Thron Street Overlay 27 GERBEE DEVE 0 DUNSTRAL PARK RD WEST 250 SC INDUSTRAL PARK RD WEST 267 267 27,57 14,44 ALGOL Dead End Thin Overlay 289 GERDEE DEVE 1544 1643 TOLMAND TAKE RD WEST 261 268 27,77 144 480 Coal-Dead End Thin Overlay 289 INDUSTRIAL PARK RDAD WEST 0 HAATFORD TURNPIKE 100 SC INDUSTRIAL PARK RDAWEST 261 263 267 263 267 267 27,87 1444 160 ALGO-Thru Street Thin Overlay 262 INDUSBURY AVENUE 100 ALMAN STAGE RD	BLIFF CAP BOAD NO 2		TOWNLINE	75	2,710	59,172 Local- Hird Street	Chin Soal	00,00	
CODE ROAD 3661 9 SAF SOF ERROAL MOUNTAIN RD PERROAL MOUNTAIN RD 26.9 Safe All 22.5 Usafe That State This Underlay 20.7 Safe Sofe Sofe Sofe Sofe Sofe Sofe Sofe So	COOK ROAD		949'S OF KENDALL MOUNTAIN PD	75	2,404	102 522 Local Thru Streat	This Overlaw	50,2	
DUM HILL ROAD COLD STAFECTION DUM	COOK BOAD	3661 9 949'S OF KENDALL MOUNTAIN PD	VENDALL MOUNTAIN PD	00.	3,002	102,555 Local- fillo Street	Thin Overlay	100,3	
CEREBER DRIVE DINUSTRIAL PARK RD WEST LSG SG PROJERNAL PARK RD WEST Disk SG Project Disk Project <thdisk project<="" th=""> Disk Project Disk P</thdisk>	DUNN HILL ROAD		TOU AND STAGE PD	51	1 0047	20,558 Lucal- nitu Sueet	O (orlay)		
TERRINE 250.5 250.7 <	GERBER DRIVE		TEO'S OF INDUSTRIAL DADY DD WEST	20	1,004	30,498 Local- Intu Street	This Querlay	34,74	
CEREMENT 1264	GERBER DRIVE	750 5 750' S OF INDUSTRIAL PARK PD WEST	1624'S OF INDUSTRIAL PARK ND WEST		751	24,767 Local-Dead End	This Overlay	10,5	
INDUSTRIANT COM Com <th< td=""><td>GERBER DRIVE</td><td>1624 1624'S OF INDUSTRIAL PARK NO VIEST</td><td>CUL DE SAC</td><td>- 02</td><td>1 1 4 4</td><td>26,272 Local Dead Enu</td><td>This Overlay</td><td>10,0</td></th<>	GERBER DRIVE	1624 1624'S OF INDUSTRIAL PARK NO VIEST	CUL DE SAC	- 02	1 1 4 4	26,272 Local Dead Enu	This Overlay	10,0	
Initiality Avenue O HARTORO TUMPIRE CULP SAL See 1,538 2,538 2,538 Curp Sale Collary Collary <td>INDUSTRIAL PARK POAD WEST</td> <td></td> <td>CUE DE SAC</td> <td></td> <td>1,144</td> <td>44,880 Local-Dead End</td> <td></td> <td>29,9</td>	INDUSTRIAL PARK POAD WEST		CUE DE SAC		1,144	44,880 Local-Dead End		29,9	
Initiation Dirakt Proof Dampile Dirakt Proof Dampile Toler ND Frakt Proof Toler Proof Toler ND Frakt Proof <thtoler< td=""><td>VINCERTIDY AVENUE</td><td></td><td>CULIDE SAC</td><td>56</td><td>1,598</td><td>62,039 Local-Dead End</td><td>Overlay (Local)</td><td>64,7</td></thtoler<>	VINCERTIDY AVENUE		CULIDE SAC	56	1,598	62,039 Local-Dead End	Overlay (Local)	64,7	
Initiation Analysis Datability Datability <thdatability< th=""> Datability <th< td=""><td></td><td>0 HARTFORD TURNPIKE</td><td>1010'N OF HARTFORD TURNPIKE</td><td>76</td><td>1,011</td><td>24,254 Local- Thru Street</td><td>Thin Overlay</td><td>16,1</td></th<></thdatability<>		0 HARTFORD TURNPIKE	1010'N OF HARTFORD TURNPIKE	76	1,011	24,254 Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	16,1	
NO.DET O. U.O.D. DESTIVEW TER 76 1,950 48,473 Local: Thru Street Thin Overlay 32,4 INCRLEY ROAD 3705 WILLIAMS WAY PETER GREEN RD 77 3,776 94,404 Local: Thru Street Thin Overlay 62,3 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 3700 WILLIAMS WAY PETER GREEN RD 77 3,776 94,404 Local: Thru Street Thin Overlay 62,3 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 37013 1408' S OF CERVENS RD CERVENS RD 81 1,468 33,802 Local: Thru Street Thin Overlay 22,5 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 5109.7 CERVENS RD HURLBUT ROAD 76 2,976 71,412 Local: Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 33,3 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 8229.8 EATON RD EATON RD 64 482 11,566 Local: Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SOUTT RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250 YO FWOODHENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local: Thru Street Thin Overlay 3,2 SOUTT RIV	KONEY ROAD	1010.6 1010 N OF HARTFORD TURNPIKE	TOWNLINE	63	766	15,316 Local-Thru Street	Thin Overlay	10,21	
NOTICE ROAD 1949.7 EAST VIEW VIEW WILLIAMS WAY 81 1,755 38,617 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 25,7 SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250° S OF GOTTIER ND 74 1,457 34,968 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 23,3 SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 370.13 1408 SOE CREWENS RD 81 1,408 33,802 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 22,57 SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 5109.7 CERVENS RD HURIBUT ROAD 76 2,976 71,412 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 8025.2 HURISUT ROAD EATON RD E4 42 1,156 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250° N OF WOODENENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 3,3 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 3927 3,213 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,33 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS	KOZLEY ROAD	U OLD STAFFORD RD	EASTVIEW TER	76	1,950	48,743 Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	32,49	
NOZEY ROAD 3/76 94,404 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 62,9 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250 SOF GOTTIER RD 74 1,457 34,968 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 22,5 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 3109.7 CERVENS RD CERVENS RD 81 1,408 33,802 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 22,5 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 8108.7 CERVENS RD MURLBUT ROAD 76 2,976 71,412 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 13,4 SHENIPST LAKE ROAD 805.2 HUIKLBUT ROAD ELLINGTON RD 64 482 11,565 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 2,1 SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 O TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 2,1,5 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 2,1,5 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Majo	KOZLET RUAD	1949.7 EASIVIEW TER	WILLIAMS WAY	81	1,755	38,617 Local-Thru Street	Thin Overlay	25,74	
SHERINGT LAKE ROAD 0 0 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	KUZLET KUAD	3705 WILLIAMS WAY	PETER GREEN RD		3,776	94,404 Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	62,93	
SHEMI-SH LAKE ROAD 3701.3 1408 S OF CERVENS RD CERVENS RD 81 1,408 33,802 Local-Thru Street Thin Overlay 22,5 SHEMI-SH LAKE ROAD 500,97 CERVENS RD HURLBUT ROAD 76 7,976 71,412 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 13,4 SHEMIPST LAKE ROAD 8025,2 HURLBUT ROAD EATON RD EATON RD 63 745 17,870 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SOUTTI RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250'N OF WOODDENEGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Noverlay 55,4 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 21,6 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 926.6 OLD POST RD CIDER MILL RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 24,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 LAWUOR ROAD 0 GEANT HILL ROAD 16	SHENIPSIT LAKE KOAD	0 TOLLAND STAGE RD	250' S OF GOTTIER RD	74	1,457	34,968 Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	23,31	
SHENNPSTI LAKE ROAD 5109.7 CERVENS RD HURLBUT ROAD 76 2,976 71,412 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 13,4 SHENNPSTI LAKE ROAD 8829.8 EATON RD ELLINGTON RD 63 745 17,870 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SHENNPSTI LAKE ROAD 8829.8 EATON RD ELLINGTON RD 64 482 11,566 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 2,1 SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250' N OF WOODHENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local-Thru Street Shen & Overlay 55,4 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD CIDER MILL RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 2,1,5 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 255,7 31,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRAIN HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 LAWUOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412<	SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD	3701.3 1408' S OF CERVENS RD	CERVENS RD	81	1,408	33,802 Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	22,53	
SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 8085.2 HURLBUT ROAD EATON RD 63 745 17,870 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 3,3 SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD 8829.8 EATON RD ELLINGTON RDD 64 482 11,566 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 2,1 SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250'N OF WOODHENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local-Thru Street Shim & Overlay 53,6 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,3 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 73 5,699 131,064 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 1550.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,064 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 7350.2 NEW RD TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 44,6 LAWLOR ROAD 0 GEARAT SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 53 3,4	SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD	5109.7 CERVENS RD	HURLBUT ROAD	76	2,976	71,412 Local-Thru Street	Crack Seal and Patch	13,48	
SHEMIPSIT LAKE ROAD 8829.8 EATON RD ELLINGTON RD 64 482 11,566 Local-Thru Street Crack Seal and Patch 2,1 SDUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250' N OF WOODHENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local-Thru Street Shim & Overlay 55,4 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 2,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 21,6 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 926.6 OLD POST RD CIDER MILL RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 23,5 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS S 25,7 S 31,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBOR PROD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 44,6 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBOR NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, AND 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL R	SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD	8085.2 HURLBUT ROAD	EATON RD	63	745	17,870 Local- Thru Street	Crack Seal and Patch	3,37	
SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD 250° N OF WOODHENGE DR 47 2,123 42,468 Local- Thru Street Shim & Overlay 55,4 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 21,6 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 926.6 OLD POST RD CIDER MILL RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,3 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 255,7 31,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,3 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 5 1,000.0 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 44,6 LAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR WAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 80,72 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,6 NEW ROAD 0 CEDAR WAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 2,412	SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD	8829.8 EATON RD	ELLINGTON RD	64	482	11,566 Local- Thru Street	Crack Seal and Patch	2,18	
TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD OLD POST RD 63 927 32,431 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 21,6 TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 926.6 OLD POST RD CIDER MILL RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,3 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 255,7 255,7 255,7 255,7 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 7350.2 NEW RD TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 LAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 53,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 05,9 NEW ROAD 0 GRANT HILL RD APPLE RD 51,300 52,627 Major/Minor C	SOUTH RIVER ROAD NO 1	0 TOLLAND STAGE RD	250' N OF WOODHENGE DR	47	2,123	42,468 Local- Thru Street	Shim & Overlay	55,44	
TOLLAND GREEN NO 2 926.6 OLD POST RD CIDER MILL RD 69 399 13,972 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 9,3 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 255,7 25,639 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,66 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,639 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,66 LAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,66 NEW ROAD 2744.3 APPLE RD GERRING RD 45 2,680 69,677 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 157,1 0LD POST ROAD 0 OLIAND GREEN	TOLLAND GREEN NO 2	0 TOLLAND STAGE RD	OLD POST RD	63	927	32,431 Major/Minor Collector	Thin Overlay	21.62	
CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 257.7 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 257.7 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS \$ 1,000.0 State 257.7 State 257.7 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,599 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,68 NEW ROAD O CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 5 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 0,659.77 NEW ROAD O COLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Local) <th co<="" td=""><td>TOLLAND GREEN NO 2</td><td>926.6 OLD POST RD</td><td>CIDER MILL RD</td><td>69</td><td>399</td><td>13.972 Major/Minor Collector</td><td>Thin Overlay</td><td>9.31</td></th>	<td>TOLLAND GREEN NO 2</td> <td>926.6 OLD POST RD</td> <td>CIDER MILL RD</td> <td>69</td> <td>399</td> <td>13.972 Major/Minor Collector</td> <td>Thin Overlay</td> <td>9.31</td>	TOLLAND GREEN NO 2	926.6 OLD POST RD	CIDER MILL RD	69	399	13.972 Major/Minor Collector	Thin Overlay	9.31
D21 S 1,000.0 GRANT HILL ROAD 1650.9 METCALF RD NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 GRANT HILL ROAD 7350.2 NEW RD TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,6 IAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,6 NEW ROAD 0 GRANT HILL RD APPLE RD 52 2,744 63,119 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 65,9,9 NEW ROAD 2744.3 APPLE RD GEHRING RD 45 2,680 69,677 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 157,1 OLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD TOLLAND GREEN 57 1,306 35,267 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 61,55 PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 57 1,306 35,267 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 16,9 PINE HILL ROAD	CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS	and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS						255.78	
D21 NEW RD 73 5,699 131,084 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,66 GRANT HILL ROAD 7350.2 NEW RD TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 43,66 GRANT HILL ROAD 7350.2 NEW RD TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 44,6 LAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 65,9 NEW ROAD 0 GRANT HILL RD APPLE RD 52 2,744 63,19 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 65,9 NEW ROAD 2744.3 APPLE RD GEHRINS RD 45 2,680 69,677 Local- Thru Street Reclaim or Cold In Place (Local) 157,1 OLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD TOLLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 615,5 OLD POST ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 57 1,306 35,267		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					······································	\$ 1,000,00	
Bit Ant Hill ROAD1650.5 METCALP RDNEW RD735,659131,084Major/Minor CollectorThin Overlay43,6GRANT HILL ROAD7350.2 NEW RDTOWN LINE752,91467,024Major/Minor CollectorThin Overlay44,6LAWLOR ROAD0CEDAR SWAMP RDPINE HILL RD553,41288,722Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)90,6NEW ROAD0GRANT HILL RDAPPLE RD522,74463,119Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)65,9NEW ROAD2744.3 APPLE RDGEHRING RD452,68069,677Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)157,11OLD POST ROAD0TOLLAND STAGE RDTOLLAND GREEN571,30635,267Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)61,55OLD POST ROAD0NEW RDI306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN731,96262,771Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)109,55PINE HILL ROAD0NEW RDIAUREL RIDGE RD5960115,030Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)16,9PINE HILL ROAD0NEW RDIAUREL RIDGE RD5745113,530Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)12,74PINE HILL ROAD0.12AUREL RIDGE RDWHITE BIRCH DR5745113,530Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)12,74PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Thru Stre	CRANT HILL BOAD	1650 0 METONIC DD							
ORIGINATION 7350.2 NEW RU TOWN LINE 75 2,914 67,024 Major/Minor Collector Thin Overlay 44,6 LAWLOR ROAD 0 CEDAR SWAMP RD PINE HILL RD 55 3,412 88,722 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,6 NEW ROAD 0 GRANT HILL RD APPLE RD 52 2,744 63,119 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 90,6 NEW ROAD 2744.3 APPLE RD GEHRING RD 45 2,680 69,677 Local- Thru Street Rectain or Cold In Place (Local) 157,1 OLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD TOLLAND GREEN 57 1,306 35,267 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 61,5 OLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND GREEN 1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 109,5 PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 L AUREL RIDGE RD WHITE BIRCH DR<	GRANT DILL ROAD	TOOUS MEICALE KU	NEW RU	73	5,699	131,084 Major/Minor Collector	Thin Overlay	43,69	
LAWLUK KUAU0 CEDAR SWAMP RDPINE HILL RD553,41288,722Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)90,6NEW ROAD0 GRANT HILL RDAPPLE RD522,74463,119Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)65,9NEW ROAD2744.3 APPLE RDGEHRING RD452,68069,677Local- Thru StreetReclaim or Cold In Place (Local)157,1OLD POST ROAD0 TOLLAND STAGE RDTOLLAND GREEN571,30635,267Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)61,5OLD POST ROAD1306.2 TOLLAND GREEN1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN731,96262,771Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)109,5PINE HILL ROAD0 NEW RDLAUREL RIDGE RD5960115,030Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)16,9PINE HILL ROAD601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RDWHITE BIRCH DR5745113,530Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)12,7PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Dead EndMill & Overlay (Local)12,7PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Dead EndMill & Overlay (Local)12,7PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Dead EndMill & Overlay (Local)12,7PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Dead EndMi	GRANT HILL KUAD	7350.2 NEW RD	TOWN LINE	75	2,914	67,024 Major/Minor Collector	Thin Overlay	44,68	
NEW ROAD0 GRANT HILL RDAPPLE RD522,74463,119Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)65,9NEW ROAD2744.3 APPLE RDGEHRING RD452,68069,677Local- Thru StreetRectaim or Cold In Place (Local)157,1OLD POST ROAD0 TOLLAND STAGE RDTOLLAND GREEN571,30635,267Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)61,5OLD POST ROAD0 TOLLAND GREEN1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN731,96262,771Major/Minor CollectorOverlay (Art/Coll)109,5PINE HILL ROAD0 NEW RDLAUREL RIDGE RD5960115,030Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)16,9PINE HILL ROAD601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RDWHITE BIRCH DR5745113,530Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)12,7PINE HILL ROAD1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DRCUL DE SAC473,20988,688Local- Dead EndMill & Overlay (Local)12,7OLD CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS5745113,530Local- Thru StreetMill & Overlay (Local)12,7010250000500005000050000500005745113,530Local- Dead EndMill & Overlay (Local)12,701035030050000500005000050000500005000050000050000050000050000050000000104500005000050000050000050000007214,542319,928Ma		0 CEDAR SWAMP RD	PINE HILL RD	55	3,412	88,722 Local- Thru Street	Mill & Overlay (Local)	90,69	
INEW ROAD 2744.3 APPLE RD GEHRING RD 45 2,680 69,677 Local- Thru Street Rectaim or Cold in Place (Local) 157,1 IOLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD TOLLAND GREEN 57 1,306 35,267 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 61,5 OLD POST ROAD 1306.2 TOLLAND GREEN 1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 109,5 PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Art/Coll) 16,9 PINE HILL ROAD 0.NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 20,00 0222	NEW ROAD	0 GRANT HILL RD	APPLE RD	52	2,744	63,119 Local- Thru Street	Mill & Overlay (Local)	65,92	
OLD POST ROAD 0 TOLLAND STAGE RD TOLLAND GREEN 57 1,365 35,257 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 61,55 OLD POST ROAD 1306.2 TOLLAND GREEN 1306 W OF TOLLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 109,55 PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Art/Coll) 16,9 PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS	NEW ROAD	2744.3 APPLE RD	GEHRING RD	45	2,680	69,677 Local- Thru Street	Reclaim or Cold In Place (Local)	157,16	
OLD POST ROAD 1306.2 TOLLAND GREEN 1306 W OF TOLLAND GREEN 73 1,962 62,771 Major/Minor Collector Overlay (Art/Coll) 109,57 PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 16,97 PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,77 PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD WHITE BIRCH DR 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,77 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 2 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 0102 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 2 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 106,97 0102 STAFFOR	OLD POST ROAD	0 TOLLAND STAGE RD	TOLLAND GREEN	57	1,306	35,267 Major/Minor Collector	Overlay (Art/Coll)	61,56	
PINE HILL ROAD 0 NEW RD LAUREL RIDGE RD 59 601 15,030 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 16,9 PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD WHITE BIRCH DR 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 022 BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 0 NORTH RIVER RD OLD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191,50	OLD POST ROAD	1306.2 TOLLAND GREEN	1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN	73	1,962	62,771 Major/Minor Collector	Overlay (Art/Coll)	109,57	
PINE HILL ROAD 601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD WHITE BIRCH DR 57 451 13,530 Local- Thru Street Mill & Overlay (Local) 12,7 PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR 72 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 196,93 196,93 196,93 1000,00 022 BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 0 NORTH RIVER RD 0LD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191,50	PINE HILL ROAD	0 NEW RD	LAUREL RIDGE RD	59	601	15,030 Local- Thru Street	Mill & Overlay (Local)	16,97	
PINE HILL ROAD 1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR CUL DE SAC 47 3,209 88,688 Local- Dead End Mill & Overlay (Local) 200,0 CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 196,93 196,93 196,93 196,93 1000,00 022	PINE HILL ROAD	601.2 LAUREL RIDGE RD	WHITE BIRCH DR	57	451	13,530 Local- Thru Street	Mill & Overlay (Local)	12.74	
CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS 196,93 022 \$ 1,000,00 BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 0 NORTH RIVER RD 0LD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191,50	PINE HILL ROAD	1052.2 WHITE BIRCH DR	CUL DE SAC	47	3,209	88.688 Local- Dead End	Mill & Overlay (Local)	200.04	
0022 BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 0 NORTH RIVER RD 0LD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191.50	CRACK SEALING, PARKING LOTS.	, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS						196.93	
BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 D NORTH RIVER RD OLD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191.50			······································			······································		\$ 1,000.00	
BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1 0 NORTH RIVER RD OLD STAFFORD RD 72 14,542 319,928 Major/Minor Collector Chip Seal 191.50	.022		····			······································		. ,,	
	BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1	0 NORTH RIVER RD	OLD STAFFORD RD	72	14,542	319,928 Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	191,50	

BUFF CAP ROAD NO 1	0 NORTH RIVER RD	OLD STAFFORD RD	72	14,542	319,928	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal		191,500	5
GRAHABER ROAD	O SHENIPSIT LAKE RD	1520' W OF SHENIPSIT LAKE RD	73	1,520	39,507	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal		23.648	<u>.</u>
GRAHABER ROAD	1519.5 1520' W OF SHENIPSIT LAKE RD	BONAIR HILL RD	81	2,572	66,862	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	· · · ·	40.02**	and the second s
GRAHABER ROAD	4091.1 BONAIR HILL RD	TOWN LINE	71	3,849	115,457	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal			

DRAFT FY2019-2023 Town of Tolland Pavement Plan

Year	Name	Station From	10	PCI	Length	Area	Functional Class	Treatment	Cost
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	0 TOLLAND STAGE RD	150' N OF TOLLAND GREEN NO 1	48	744	17,112	Major/Minor Collector	Rectaim or Cold in Place (Art/Coll)	57,226
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	744 150' N OF TOLLAND GREEN NO 1	DUNN HILL RD	53	544	15,779	Major/Minor Collector	Reclaim or Cold in Place (Art/Coll)	52,768
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	1288.1 DUNN HILL RD	535' N OF SAGE MEADOW DR	79	4,292	141,643	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	84,783
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	5580.3 535' N OF SAGE MEADOW DR	1253' N OF SUSAN DR	80	1,943	64,116	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	38,378
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	7523.2 1253'N OF SUSAN DR	SLATER RD	74	4,555	113,875	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	68,162
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	12078.2 SLATER RD	CURTIS RD	74	1,467	35,201	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	21,070
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	13544.9 CURTIS RD	BUFF CAP RD NO 2	72	6,431	154,339	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	92,383
	OLD STAFFORD ROAD	19975.7 BUFF CAP RD NO 2	TOWN LINE	75	2,532	60,763	Major/Minor Collector	Chip Seal	34,973
	CRACK SEALING, PARKING LO	OTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS	· · · ·					······	225,980
									\$ 1,000,000

2023

~** <u></u>										
HUNTER ROAD	2850.9 OLD ORCHARD WAY	TOWN LINE		73	7,741	178,041	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay		144,560
OLD POST ROAD	3267.8 1306' W OF TOLLAND GREEN	OLD KENT RD N		67	7,511	202,784	Major/Minor Collector	Overlay (Art/Coll)		353,998
OLD POST ROAD	10778.3 OLD KENT RD N	WONDERVIEW DR	•	67	3,092	83,489	Major/Minor Collector	Overlay (Art/Coll)		145,747
OLD POST ROAD	13870.5 WONDERVIEW DR	HARTFORD TURNPIKE	· · ·	72	2,912	72,788	Major/Minor Collector	Overlay (Art/Coll)		127,065
CRACK SEALING, PARKING L	OTS, and NEIGHBORHOOD ROADS		-						-	228,629
										\$ 1,000,000

 $\widehat{}$

Other Projects

.

APPLE ROAD	0 GEHRING RD	NEW RD	49	3,619	108,567	Local- Thru Street	Reclaim or Cold in Place (Local)	310,199
BEECH ROAD	0 HOLLY ROAD	APPLE ROAD	48	1,507	45,213	Local- Thru Street	Reclaim or Cold in Place (Local)	129,183
CHARTER ROAD	5081.1 1309' S OF OLD STAFFORD RD	OLD STAFFORD RD	80	1,310	32,747	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	26,589
ELIZABETH LANE	0 MOUNTAIN SPRING ROAD	VALLEY VIEW DR	57	1,195	35,838	Local- Thru Street	Mill & Overlay (Local)	46,406
HURLBUT ROAD	0 CRYSTAL LAKE RD	SHENIPSIT LAKE RD	61	4,730	104,069	Local-Thru Street	Overlay (Local)	137,688
KATE LANE	0 ANTHONY RD	115' N OF RUOPS RD	78	5,302	135,201	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	114,177
KENDALL MOUNTAIN ROAD	0 COOK RD	WILDWOOD RD	80	369	10,343	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	8,398
MOUNTAIN SPRING ROAD	4160 OLD POST RD	84 OVERPASS	80	2,475	64,353	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	54,346
OLD KENT ROAD NORTH	1152.3 GARNET RIDGE DR	HIDDEN VALLEY	46	294	8,805	Local- Dead End	Overlay (Local)	10,770
SHENIPSIT LAKE ROAD	16714 BROWNS BRIDGE RD	700' N OF BROWNS BRIDGE RD	78	704	16,901	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	14,273
SUGAR HILL ROAD	8466.5 BAKOS RD	TOWN LINE	71	7,129	185,346	Local- Thru Street	Thin Overlay	156,524

TOWN OF TOLLAND

TOWN COUNCIL

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN APPROPRIATION OF \$5,000,000 FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND THE FINANCING OF SAID APPROPRIATION BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE TOWN AND NOTES IN ANTICIPATION OF SUCH BONDS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000,000, OR SO MUCH AS MAY BE NECESSARY AFTER DEDUCTING GRANTS THEREFOR, AS WELL AS ESTABLISHING A DATE FOR A REFERENDUM

RESOLVED, (1) That the Town of Tolland (the "Town") appropriate the sum of \$5,000,000 for the cost of the pavement resurfacing, sealing, overlay, drainage improvements, repair and/or reconstruction of, and repair and improvements to, all or portions of certain town roads in accordance with the Town's automated pavement management system recommendations (the "Project"). The appropriation may be spent for design and construction costs, equipment, materials, site improvements, architects' fees, engineering fees, legal fees, net interest on borrowings and other financing costs, and other expenses related to the Project or its financing. The Town Council is authorized to determine the scope and particulars of the Project. The Town Council may reduce or modify the scope of the Project if funds are insufficient to complete the Project, and the appropriation authorized hereby may be spent on the Project as so reduced or modified.

(2) That to finance said appropriation for the Project, the Town issue bonds, notes or other obligations in an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000 (or so much thereof as may be necessary after deducting grants or other sources of funds received by the Town for said Project). The bonds, notes or other obligations shall be issued pursuant to Chapter 109 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Revision of 1958, as amended (the "Connecticut General Statutes"), including, without limitation, Section 7-369 of the Connecticut General Statutes, and any other enabling acts.

(3) That the Town issue and renew temporary notes from time to time in anticipation of the receipt of the proceeds from the sale of the bonds or notes for the Project or the receipt of grants for the Project. The amount of the notes outstanding at any time shall not exceed \$5,000,000. The notes shall be issued pursuant to Section 7-378 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Town shall comply with the provisions of Section 7-378a of the Connecticut General Statutes with respect to any notes that do not mature within the time permitted by said Section 7-378.

(4) That the Town Manager and the Treasurer of the Town (the "Officials") be authorized to sign said bonds, notes or other obligations of the Town by their manual or facsimile signatures and to determine the amounts, rates of interest, dates, maturities, dates of principal and interest payments on such bonds, notes or other obligations, the form of such bonds, notes or other obligations, the provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and

remedies of the holders of such bonds or notes and all other terms, conditions and particular matters regarding the issuance and securing of such bonds, notes or other obligations, and to execute, sell and deliver the same and all other documents, agreements and certificates related to the sale, issuance or delivery of said bonds, notes or other obligations, and to provide all supporting documentation as may be necessary or desirable to accomplish such purposes and to comply with the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12, and in accordance with the Connecticut General Statutes and any other applicable provision of law thereto enabling. The bonds, notes and other obligations authorized hereby shall be general obligations of the Town secured by the full faith and credit of the Town.

(5) That the Officials are hereby authorized to designate a bank or trust company to be the certifying bank, registrar, transfer agent and paying agent for such bonds, notes and other obligations; to provide for the keeping of a record of the bonds, notes or other obligations; to designate a financial advisor to the Town in connection with the sale of the bonds, notes or other obligations; that the law firm of Updike, Kelly & Spellacy, P.C., Hartford, Connecticut, is designated as the attorneys at law to render an opinion approving the legality of such bond or note issue or issues.

(6) That the Officials are authorized to sell the bonds, notes or other obligations at public or private sale; to deliver the bonds, notes or other obligations; and to perform all other acts which are necessary or appropriate to issue the bonds, notes or other obligations, including, but not limited to, entering into a continuing disclosure agreement pursuant to Securities and Exchange Commission Rule 15c2-12. If the bonds, notes or other obligations authorized by this resolution are issued on a tax-exempt basis, the Officials are authorized to bind the Town pursuant to such representations and covenants as they deem necessary or advisable in order to maintain the continued exemption from federal income taxation of interest on the bonds, notes or other obligations, including covenants to pay rebates of investment earnings to the United States in future years.

(7) That the Town hereby declares its official intent under Federal Income Tax Regulation Section 1.150-2 that project costs may be paid from temporary advances of available funds and that (except to the extent reimbursed from grant moneys) the Town reasonably expects to reimburse any such advances from the proceeds of borrowings in an aggregate principal amount not in excess of the amount of borrowing authorized above for the Project. The Officials are authorized to amend such declaration of official intent as they deem necessary or advisable and to bind the Town pursuant to such representations and covenants as they deem necessary or advisable in order to maintain the continued exemption from federal income taxation of interest on the bonds, notes or other obligations authorized by this resolution, if issued on a tax-exempt basis, including covenants to pay rebates of investment earnings to the United States in future years.

(8) That the Town Manager is hereby authorized, on behalf of the Town, to execute any contracts with engineers, contractors, architects and other persons for the Project, to apply for and accept state or other grants to finance the appropriation for the Project, and to execute and file any application or enter into any grant agreement prescribed by the State of

Connecticut or other relevant governmental authority. The Officials are authorized to execute and deliver any obligations arising under such grant agreement.

(9) That the Officials and other proper officers of the Town are authorized to take all other actions which are necessary or desirable to complete the Project consistent with the foregoing and to issue bonds, notes or other obligations to finance the aforesaid appropriation.

(10) That this resolution shall become effective after approval at referendum vote.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

(1) That should the Town Council adopt the foregoing resolution, pursuant to Sections C9-16 and C10-3 of the Town Charter, said resolution shall be submitted to the voters at referendum to be held on Tuesday, November 6, 2018, between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., for yes or no vote, in the designated voting locations in the manner provided by said Charter and the Connecticut General Statutes, Revision of 1958, as amended, and that the Town Clerk is directed to post and publish notice of such referendum in accordance with the provisions of said Charter and the Connecticut General Statutes, which notice shall state the question to be voted on as follows:

"Shall the resolution entitled, 'RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN APPROPRIATION OF \$5,000,000 FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS AND THE FINANCING OF SAID APPROPRIATION BY THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE TOWN AND NOTES IN ANTICIPATION OF SUCH BONDS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000,000, OR SO MUCH AS MAY BE NECESSARY AFTER DEDUCTING GRANTS THEREFOR,' be approved? Yes _____ No _____"

The ballot label for said question shall read as follows:

"Shall the Town of Tolland appropriate \$5,000,000 for road improvements and authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds and notes in the same amount to finance said appropriation? Yes <u>No</u> <u>"</u>"

- (2)
- That the Town Council hereby authorizes the preparation and printing of explanatory text by the Town Clerk in accordance with Section 9-369b of the Connecticut General Statutes for the question to be voted upon on November 6, 2018 approved above. Subject to

the approval of the Town Attorney, the Town Council further authorizes the preparation and printing of materials concerning the question to be voted upon on November 6, 2018 approved above in addition to the explanatory text in accordance with Section 9-369b of the Connecticut General Statutes.