

**GLASTONBURY BOARD OF FINANCE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2026**

The Glastonbury Board of Finance, along with Finance Director, Keri Rowley, and Town Manager, Jonathan Luiz, held a regular meeting at 4:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers of Town Hall at 2155 Main Street, with an option for Zoom video conferencing. Controller, Chris Liebel, was also present.

Roll Call

Members

Mr. Constantine “Gus” Constantine, Chairman {arrived at 4:17 p.m.}
Mr. Jared Soper, Vice Chairman
Mr. James Zeller
Mr. Robert Lynn
Ms. Susan Karp
Mr. Kevin Graff {participated via Zoom}

1. Public Comment Session: Comments pertaining to the call. *None.*

2. Communication.

- a. Minutes of March 18, 2026 –BOF Regular Meeting

Minutes approved as presented.

- b. Minutes of March 26, 2026 – BOF Special Meeting (Mill Rate Setting)

Ms. Karp pointed out that the minutes stated that the Council’s revisions included an additional \$500,000 reduction to the Board of Education budget, and questioned whether this was accurate. Ms. Karp clarified that the Town Council had actually restored \$500,000, rather than reduced it further, based on the change from a \$3 million recommended reduction to a \$2.5 million approved reduction. The Board agreed that the wording should be corrected and revised to reflect that the Council restored \$500,000.

Minutes accepted as revised.

3. Communication.

- a. Pension Report – February 2026

Mr. Soper requested that Ms. Rowley return to this item number once Chairman Constantine arrived so that he could be part of the communication.

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated March 31, 2026.

b. Pension, New Hire and OPEB Flash Report - March 2026

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report.

Mr. Lynn noted that the funds look good and requested that Causeway International should get a closer look.

c. Update on April 21st meeting with Town Council Chairman Turner and Councilor Osgood regarding pension plan roles and responsibilities

Mr. Soper reported on a recent meeting with members of the Town Council to discuss the structure of the pension system and the role of trustee. Mr. Soper stated that several legal questions were identified, including what responsibilities fall under the trustee role and whether “Town employees” includes Board of Education employees, and noted that the Town Attorney will provide clarification. Mr. Soper explained that Mr. Luiz and the Town Council indicated they do not have the capacity or expertise to manage the pension on an ongoing basis, and that the proposed approach would designate the Board of Finance as trustee, subject to Town Council approval and with limitations on certain decisions, such as changes to the amortization schedule. Ms. Rowley was going to check and see if there are any other major changes that could affect the pension, excluding any advice from the actuaries.

Mr. Soper suggested that an advisory committee could be established to support the Board of Finance, consisting of two or three individuals with financial expertise who would attend meetings and provide input during pension-related discussions. Mr. Soper also stated that the Board of Finance or its Chairman would report on pension performance to the Town Council at least annually, with a preference for biannual updates, and that the trustee would oversee the pension while relying on Town staff for day-to-day administration. Mr. Lynn asked whether the Board of Finance would serve as fiduciaries in the trustee role, and Mr. Soper confirmed that they would. Mr. Lynn expressed support for including volunteer citizens with relevant expertise, and Mr. Soper responded that the advisory group would be formally established for a set term and would participate in Board of Finance meetings rather than operating independently. Mr. Lynn also asked about the potential for granting discretionary investment authority, and Mr. Luiz responded that this topic is expected to be discussed at an upcoming Town Council meeting. Mr. Luiz said he supports the plan so long as the volunteer citizens are only discussing and meeting on the topic when organized by the Board of Finance and Town Council. Ms. Karp stated that the discussion was helpful and requested a written summary of the proposal for further review. Mr. Luiz responded that, following additional meetings and once a resolution is reached, a summary will be prepared and shared with both the Town Council and the Board of Finance. Mr. Zeller asked for clarification regarding the status of Board of Education employees under the pension system, and Ms. Rowley responded that, based on the governing language, they are included. Mr. Soper indicated agreement with that interpretation, and the Board concurred.

- d. Discussion on interest rate assumption for the pension plan (requested by Chair Constantine & continued from March 18th, 2026 meeting)

Mr. Zeller noted that the average return appeared to be approximately 7.37%, but that the data did not include the 2008-2009 market downturn. Mr. Zeller stated that additional historical context may be needed to fully evaluate the assumption. Mr. Lynn asked whether that information was available, and Mr. Soper responded that the current flash report provides some historical data, though not extending fully back to that period. Ms. Rowley stated that she had compiled data as far back as available records allowed and could research further if the Board believed it would add value, though it would require additional time. Mr. Zeller responded that, based on the current information, he was not inclined to recommend a change to the assumption. Mr. Soper noted that recent return data varies depending on the timeframe, citing approximately 5.3% over five years and 7.1% over a longer period, and suggested that a reasonable assumption may fall between 6.25% and 6.5%. Chairman Constantine asked whether the Town Council had previously weighed in on setting the rate, and Mr. Soper explained that historically the rate was set under the Town Manager's authority and incorporated into the budget presented to the Council. Ms. Karp stated that she was not inclined to make any changes at this time, particularly given current market volatility, and expressed support for revisiting the topic in the future. The Board agreed that the topic should be revisited periodically, potentially in the fall.

4. Communication: Month End Investments – February 2026.

Mr. Lynn estimated that investment returns could exceed the budget by approximately \$350,000 based on an average of returns over the prior eight months and asked whether that projection was accurate. Mr. Liebel responded that the estimate was likely somewhat overstated due to stronger revenue collection months occurring later in the fiscal year, particularly from tax collections. Mr. Liebel indicated that a more realistic projection would place investment earnings between \$200,000 and \$300,000 over budget, and Mr. Lynn acknowledged this revised estimate.

5. Communication: Financial Summary (Revenue and Expenditures) for 9 months - March 2026

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated April 16, 2026.

6. Communication: Special Revenue Funds Q3-2025 **a. Sewer Operating and Sewer Sinking Funds**

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated April 17, 2026.

b. Recreation Activities and Police Private Duty Funds

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated April 17, 2026.

7. Communication: Capital Projects – March 2026

Ms. Karp asked about Fund 318 for library renovations, noting that the report showed a remaining balance and questioning whether additional work was still planned. Mr. Luiz explained that funds had remained in the account following the departure of the previous library director and that the current director has since reviewed priorities and begun allocating the remaining funds. Mr. Luiz stated that several improvements are actively being pursued, including redesigning the main circulation desk for better functionality, making HVAC improvements in meeting rooms, and reconfiguring the rear parking lot to address traffic flow and congestion issues. Mr. Zeller inquired about the “Renovation and Site Restoration” account under Physical Services, which showed a balance of approximately \$186,000 and dated back to an original budget in July 2008. Mr. Luiz indicated that the funds are associated with the Matson Hill property, also known as the historic Slocum’s Mill site. Mr. Zeller referenced prior discussions regarding sluiceway concerns at the location. Mr. Luiz confirmed that recent efforts have included hiring an engineering firm to evaluate structural issues, including deterioration of the smokestack and erosion along the waterway following the removal of a dam. Mr. Luiz explained that the Town is working with engineers to design a cost-effective solution to stabilize the area, particularly to prevent further erosion and protect remaining structures at the site.

8. Communication: Nye Road Expenditure Summary report

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated April 17, 2026.

Mr. Zeller asked for clarification on the “Grant or Rental Income” category, specifically inquiring about how much revenue had been collected. Ms. Rowley reported that approximately \$590,000 had been collected, with about \$574,000 expended. Mr. Luiz explained that when the Town acquired the properties, there were multiple tenants, and the Town functioned as a commercial landlord, using rental income to cover utilities, maintenance, and repairs; these expenses continued as tenants gradually vacated the buildings. Mr. Zeller observed that total project expenditures appeared to be approximately \$4.1 million after accounting for grants. Ms. Rowley clarified that the Town’s direct contribution to date was approximately \$2.8 million when isolating Town funds from grant and rental income sources. Mr. Soper asked whether the ARPA funds used for the project could have been allocated elsewhere, and Ms. Rowley confirmed that ARPA funds could be used for other eligible purposes. Ms. Karp noted that the decision to allocate those funds to the project was made by the Town Council. Mr. Soper further inquired about specific grant items, and Ms. Rowley explained that certain funds were ARPA pass-through grants administered through the state. Mr. Luiz added that, in practice, it was unlikely the Town would have received those particular funds for a different purpose. Mr. Soper stated that, from a financial perspective, the portion of ARPA funds directly received by the Town could be viewed as discretionary spending, while other grant funds were more project-specific. Mr. Soper also confirmed that the parking-related grant was designated specifically for the project, which Mr. Luiz affirmed. Based on this interpretation, Mr. Soper estimated that the total project cost was approximately \$5.6 million when considering all funding sources. Ms. Karp asked whether the remaining balances in the various accounts were expected to be fully expended on the project, and Mr. Luiz confirmed that the expectation is that those funds will be used.

9. Communication: Self Insurance Reserve Fund – March 2026

Ms. Rowley reviewed the report dated April 2, 2026.

Mr. Lynn asked whether the Town and Board of Education share the same experience rating or are priced separately. Ms. Rowley confirmed that the experience ratings are handled separately. Ms. Karp asked whether Board of Education employees make contributions during July and August, and Ms. Rowley clarified that employees do not make contributions during that period.

10. Communication: Transfers \$5,000 or under

- a. Police: \$1,100 to increase uniform budget
- b. Youth & Family: \$3,076 to increase facilities maintenance line for repairs and upgrades to panic button

11. Action: Transfers over \$5,000 –

- a. Physical Services- Fleet: \$9,540 to cover the additional cost of the latest salt delivery

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance approves a transfer of \$9,540 from Fleet – Contractual Services to Highway – Snow, and Ice Materials.

Discussion: Mr. Zeller stated he was happy that the salt expenses were less than \$10,000. Mr. Luiz explained that the Town began the season with its storage barn fully stocked, but demand was high and suppliers experienced delays, requiring the Town to closely monitor and follow up on deliveries to maintain supply levels. Mr. Luiz added that the current figures reflect the Town catching up on expenses and noted that further discussion may be needed in the coming months as the Town evaluates how much additional salt may need to be purchased to restock for the next winter season. Mr. Luiz stated that this evaluation will be part of a broader departmental review of year-end balances. Mr. Zeller acknowledged the effort, noting that managing costs during a difficult winter was not an easy task.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

- b. Senior Services: \$34,728 for the match portion of a 16-passenger van

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance approves a transfer of \$34,728 from Senior Services – Part Time to Senior Services – Capital Outlay Vehicles.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

- c. Information Technology: \$15,950 to cover fiber optic repair job on Hebron Ave

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance approves a transfer in Administrative Services \$2,450 from Technology Use Charges and \$13,500 from Data Processing to Equipment Maintenance for \$15,950.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

- d. CIP – Boat Ramp Improvements \$660,000- awarded grant of \$330K that will be reimbursed when project is complete

Mr. Lynn asked for clarification regarding the use of existing Riverfront project funds, and Ms. Rowley confirmed that those funds are not designated for other purposes and are being reallocated within related projects. Mr. Zeller asked whether the proposed work would serve as a long-term solution to ongoing sediment and dredging issues. Mr. Luiz responded that while the goal is to achieve a long-term solution, the nature of the river makes it difficult to guarantee longevity or predict outcomes with certainty. Mr. Zeller also asked about prior maintenance practices, and Mr. Luiz explained that the Town removes sediment from the boat launch area when water levels are low, but is not permitted to conduct dredging within the water without proper approvals. Mr. Luiz added that the Town is working with engineers and regulatory agencies to secure necessary permits and design a more sustainable solution. Mr. Zeller suggested that ongoing maintenance funding could be incorporated into future Capital Improvement Planning, and Mr. Luiz noted that annual maintenance does occur to the extent permitted. Mr. Soper asked whether establishing a reserve for future maintenance would be appropriate if long-term uncertainties remain, and Mr. Luiz agreed that creating such a reserve could be a reasonable approach if financially feasible. Ms. Karp asked about the timing of reimbursement for the Naubuc School renovation project, and Ms. Rowley indicated that the Town expects to receive the reimbursement by June 30, and that it will be recognized in the current fiscal year for accounting purposes even if received slightly later.

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance approves and recommends to the Town Council the appropriation and transfer of \$660,000 to the Capital Improvement Project Fund – Boat Ramp Project funded by a transfer from the Capital Improvement Project Fund – Riverfront Park and Boathouse Project of \$267,488, a transfer from the Capital Improvement Project Fund – Riverfront Park Extension Project of \$26,950 and a transfer from the Capital Reserve Fund Balance of \$365,562 as described in a report by the Director of Finance and Administrative Services dated April 15, 2026.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

12. Action: Recommend to Town Council Auditor for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2026

Mr. Soper asked Ms. Rowley for her assessment of the auditors' performance and overall comfort level with their work. Ms. Rowley responded that King & King has performed very well, noting that while larger audit firms often experience significant staff turnover, King & King has provided strong consistency in staffing and service. Ms. Rowley added that this consistency has been particularly valuable compared to prior experience with larger firms and stated that the Town has been very satisfied with their work.

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance recommends to the Town Council the appointment of King & King Associates as the Town auditors for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (6-0-0).

13. Action: Action on waiver of Competitive Bid Process – 50 Nye Road Interior Renovations

Mr. Lynn asked for clarification on the meaning of "Construction Administration", and Mr. Luiz explained that it involves overseeing construction through regular site meetings, coordinating with contractors, reviewing progress, identifying issues against plans, and approving items such as change orders and invoices prior to payment. Mr. Luiz noted that for this project the Town is also evaluating a more hands-on and potentially cost-saving approach, including dividing work among multiple contractors and handling some coordination internally where feasible. Mr. Lynn asked whether the Town has the capacity to manage aspects of general contracting, and Mr. Luiz responded that the Town has already completed significant demolition work internally with guidance from Silver Petrucelli and will continue assessing what additional responsibilities can be managed in-house to control costs. Mr. Zeller asked whether the Town would consider using a separate construction manager, as had been done on prior school projects. Mr. Luiz responded that approach would not be used for this project. Mr. Zeller also asked about a previously approved bid waiver for the firm, and Mr. Luiz explained that a waiver had been granted due to procurement thresholds, allowing the firm to continue work up to approximately \$49,500. Mr. Zeller stated he would not support the bid waiver, citing concerns about the firm's prior performance on the Naubuc project and cost overruns. Mr. Zeller referenced past budget issues and expressed concern about continuing without additional assurance of accuracy. Mr. Luiz responded that a different estimator was used for this project and that the firm's existing drawings and familiarity with the work were important to maintaining schedule and avoiding delays, noting that rebidding could add several weeks to the timeline. Mr. Soper asked whether the work could be competitively bid for completion of design and construction administration instead of continuing with the firm. Mr. Luiz responded that it was possible but would introduce delays and risk losing continuity with a team already familiar with the project. Mr. Zeller reiterated concerns about prior performance, while Mr. Soper emphasized the importance of considering bid processes and prior experiences with similar projects. Mr. Lynn asked about the Town's broader experience with other firms, and Mr. Luiz noted that different architects have

been used on projects such as Williams Memorial and the animal shelter, and that the Town has generally worked with a limited number of engineering and design firms across recent capital projects. Ms. Karp noted the importance of timing and project continuity, and Mr. Lynn stated support for moving forward given schedule constraints and the need to proceed with the work.

Motion by: Ms. Karp

Seconded by: Mr. Zeller

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance hereby recommends to the Town Council a waiver of the competitive bid process for Silver Petrucelli & Associates to perform Design Scope Changes, Bid Assistance, and Construction Administration as specified in a proposal by Silver Petrucelli & Associates dated April 9, 2026, and as described in a report by the Town Manager dated April 17, 2026.

Result: Motion passed (5-1-0) with Mr. Zeller voting no.

14. Board of Finance Committee Reports, comments, and remarks (no action to be taken)

15. Adjournment.

Motion by: Mr. Zeller

Seconded by: Ms. Karp

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Glastonbury Board of Finance hereby adjourns the meeting of March 18, 2026 at 5:19 p.m.

Result: Motion passed (5-0-0) Mr. Graff no longer present.

Respectfully submitted,

Julia MacLean

**Julia MacLean
Recording Clerk**

For anyone seeking more information about this meeting, a video on demand is available at www.glastonbury-ct.gov/video. Click link to access the Town's "Video OnDemand" platform.