PUBLIC HEARING SUBJECT MATTER:
Consideration of an appropriation of $7,068,000 for
The design, acquisition and construction of a
permanent pool enclosure at the community pool
and an authorization for the issuance of $7,068,000
bonds of the Town to meet said appropriation and,
pending the issuance thereof, the making of
temporary borrowings for such purpose.

1. ROLL CALL
The clerk called the roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. EXPLANATION OF HEARING PROCEDURE AND AGENDA
Chairman Slocum explained the procedures for a public hearing of the Town
Council.

Chairman Slocum stated that there has been discussion and review of a
permanent pool enclosure with the process starting in January 2010 and
preliminary meetings in 2009. A special committee was formed under the PBC
and its Chairman, Mr. Purtill, to receive input and data, with public information
sessions for public input. This public hearing is the first opportunity for a
presentation by the selected company, G.F. Rhode and Open Air (builder, design
team, architects) and for questions and comments from the public on the pool
enclosure.

3. READING OF THE LEGAL NOTICE
The clerk read the legal notice into the record of the public hearing.

4. PRESENTATION ON HEARING SUBJECT
John Purtill, PBC Chairman, informed those present at the hearing that the
Town Council made a decision about who will build the permanent enclosure,
and said he would give a brief presentation and make clear some of the
economies of the project. The members of the subcommittee included Energy
Commission and Public Building Commission members, Town Councilors, Public
Works Department staff and users and operators of the pool. Mr. Purtill pointed
out that this effort was free work from many people experienced in construction, energy and finance. The approach was to look at user needs, administration needs, and the needs of the taxpayers. The Council requested the subcommittee to look at two permanent pool enclosures, one from KBE and one from G.F. Rhode/Open Aire. Mr. Purtill said that G.F.Rhode/Open Aire was selected as the general contractor for the project. One of the most important criteria for this project was energy savings and the committee looked at whatever else was appropriate to inform the Council on making its choice. The committee had a good idea of the economics of the project by March 15\textsuperscript{th}, as well as the differences between the two proposals.

The committee members took two field trips to facilities of the YMCA in Milford CT and the Jewish Community Center in West Hartford CT to view examples of both types of enclosures. They talked to the users, administrators, and operators of the two sites and inspected the sites in detail. Committee members also went on individual site visits to other facilities built by the two companies, and made a listing of what they wanted in the proposals. Two presentations followed by each of the companies with what they proposed and details of their proposals.

Mr. Purtill stated that the committee stopped at this point, listed all the specifics which each proposal must meet, and the two companies returned with resubmission of proposals with information for fair comparison. The cost of the two proposals increased, but came closer to what the users needed. The committee spent time looking at the energy consumption, met with energy representatives from each contractor and received information from them on their energy proposals. The committee looked at each structure, energy needs and consumption, and ended up with a fair evaluation of each proposal. The life cycle costs were used as an evaluation factor.

After a review of the proposals the Town Council selected the Open Aire structure, which is a large, open, glass, polycarbonate structure, with moveable roof which can be opened to about 50\% of its size, giving an outdoor feeling to the pool. The bid quote from the contractor was $6 million; this was the starting point because other things increased the cost by $1 million, and $500,000 for contingency. Throughout the project there will be an independent owner supervisor who will represent the Town at all meetings with the architect and contractor to insure the Town is protected. The total cost of the Open Aire structure would be $7.1 million. Mr. Purtill explained that with a design/build contract there is less risk of overruns with the architect and the contractor on the same team. If the contingency funds are not used they would be returned to the Town to pay down the debt.

Mr. Purtill stated that the new enclosure will be all glass sides and polycarbonate roof (Lexam). The polycarbonate material will need to be replaced periodically, but does not have to be recoated, and will last 20 years, and sometimes up to 25
to 30 years. Originally, the manufacturer guaranteed a 10 year life for this roof, and then gave the Town 15 year guarantee, but the committee is comfortable that this roof will last +20 years. The ventilation will be unique because of the moveable roof panels and moveable perimeter panels for adequate ventilation. It was stated by Mr. Purtill that everyone is comfortable with the contractor's capabilities. G.F. Rhode has been in business for 30 years, and Open Aire builds only this type of enclosure for the past 20 years, specializing in this type of enclosure all over the world. Both companies have clean records with no complaints. Open Air is a Canadian company with a clean record in Canadian construction and consumer protection.

According to Mr. Purtill the energy systems and energy construction of the enclosure will provide great savings. The largest savings will be in the energy used to get the bubble inflated by a blower going all the time. With a permanent structure there are no inflation needs; there will be natural ventilation and lighting; there will be no dehumidification required; and, heating the facility will cost less.

Regarding cogeneration, Mr. Purtill said that it is a means to achieve major energy savings, cutting energy costs in half with a permanent structure, and these savings will pay for some of the costs of the structure.

User needs were a major consideration of the committee, knowing that Cheshire has two excellent swim teams, with large competitive meets held at the pool facility. The users stated that the pool enclosure meets all of their needs; it will be an enjoyable place to swim; and there will be energy savings. The committee liked the idea of getting an increase in membership and pool usage which will improve the budget and help pay for the new structure.

The negatives with the existing bubble include closing down the pool for four weeks each year. This will no longer be necessary, and the pool will be a 12 month facility.

Mr. Purtill discussed the costs including evaluation of the project on a life cycle basis using a design/build contractor. The committee is already working with the contractor on the cost factors, which include an estimate of 4% inflation. The largest cost is energy, with 4% interest on the debt included in the costs.

Bubble – existing costs - $0; energy costs of $257,792 annually; replacement every 9 years $500,000 each year; annual maintenance $64,100.

G.F. Rhode/Open Aire - Cost is $7.1 million; energy costs of $128,367; replacement of roof panels every 20 years $164,000; annual inspection after 15 years $3,500.

Over 40 years the existing bubble will cost $.12 million; the Open Aire structure will cost $600,000.
Open Aire energy savings is about $350,000 per year.

Finance costs – paying for the bond issue with a small payout in 2012, $750,000 in the 2nd year, and the number each year of the 20 year bond issue drops of with the payoff. The savings for the bond issue hits the break even point at 9 years with savings in energy and maintenance of the permanent structure.

Subsidy – this will be different with a permanent structure. The current subsidy for the pool is $359,000, and with the new structure the subsidy would be $109,000.

Summary – the Open Aire proposal gives an improved pool enclosure, saves energy, reduces the subsidy, provides a more pleasant place to swim, has natural light and ventilation, has lower operating costs and dehumidification costs, has lower carbon footprint versus the bubble.

Judith Katz, Marketing Director, G.F. Rhode Construction, Inc. stated that the company has been in business since 1982, with most of its work in the northeast. Ms. Katz thanked the Public Building Commission, Energy Commission, and the Pool Subcommittee for the opportunity to prepare a proposal for the Cheshire Community Pool enclosure, and the Town Council for selecting their proposal for the project. Ms. Katz explained that there will be a core team of G.F. Rhode Contractors, Meyer & Meyer Architecture and Interiors, GGCC, LLC Consulting Engineers and Open Aire Inc., builder of natatorium structures. The members of this team have worked together on past projects. Ms. Katz reassured the Town Council and the community that all the contractors hired will be from Connecticut because this is a local project.

John Meyer, Meyer & Meyer Architecture and Interiors, stated that this has 15 architects working with G. F. Rhode to provide full architectural support for the pool enclosure. The firm will be responsible for coordination of the structural and mechanical components to bring pieces of the building together, with many consultants working on the project. The firm will do complete and detailed drawings and specifications, and during construction will be on site weekly to inspect and assure everything agrees with the plans and schedule.

Mr. Meyer advised that the firm has been in business for 30 years, working with G. F. Rhode for the last 10 years on various projects. His firm has designed many swimming facilities (like Open Aire) and has done two projects with Open Aire. They have been working on the Cheshire project for a year, and Mr. Meyer said the project will be a wonderful asset to the Town, will be energy efficient, reliable, comfortable structure, and provide a delightful experience for users.

Lou Grant, GGCC, LLC Consulting Engineers, commented on energy being a big factor with the community pool project in light of what the Town has had in high energy costs. His firm came up with three units mounted on the grade, using a
similar material to that of the Milford YMCA pool. Each unit has the ability to have heat recovery and during dry months this air will be used to dehumidify the space when the enclosure is closed. Each unit has a heating coil for the winter; there is solar energy with sun through the walls and roof; and some of the heating coils will be operating in conjunction with the cogeneration system, with 25% less gas used. The fresh air code requirement will be provided by these units. There is a fire protection system covering the area above the deck. There will be integration of the lighting for night events. His firm has worked long and hard to nail down energy costs.

Mr. Grant reviewed the slide depicting the cogeneration system, and he said it is the simultaneous production of electricity and heat at the same time. The system will be monitored by a control system. For the pool system, there is natural gas coming in to drive an engine; the engine operates a generator; and that puts electricity back into the complex. In this system the gas works twice, using the engine to make electricity, and the heat from the engine jacket is captured. As the exhaust goes up from the engine the heat from the exhaust is captured, squeezing the heat out of the waste stream. Mr. Grant said this has operated successfully on other jobs with cogeneration working in conjunction with pools. There is another bonus point thrown in with this project with the domestic hot water for the showers being heated with an overlay so the cogeneration is able to reach into the hot water, producing electricity when the engine is running, making full use of the heat produced. The pool will be heated just by tapping into the loop in the building now; there will be hot water for the showers; and each unit has its own heating coils. As a standby there will be some natural gas reaching into each unit. The systems are reliable, and Mr. Grant is working with one now with a 98% payback. The cogeneration unit is a generator and engine in a cabinet inside the building.

Dave Bolwerk, Vice President of Sales, Open Aire, thanked the PBC and the Pool Committee for its intensive research into Open Aire. Mr. Bolwerk stated that the benefit of the Open Aire structure is that the roof opens up, giving natural ventilation and natural light, making a great environment for swimming, and appeals to the human senses. The Open Aire structure will reduce energy costs, and with the roof open this is an outdoor pool, with no need for air-conditioning or dehumidification. When the roof is closed there will be a lot of solar energy gain in the winter time which offsets some of the heating.

Mr. Bolwerk explained that with an all glaze building there is no need to turn on lights throughout the summer, and in the daylight winter hours. This is, basically, a maintenance free building. It is an aluminum building, will not rust like steel or rot like wood, and is painted with a baked on finish without a need to repaint it. Each panel has its own 24 volt dc low voltage motor, and they are sealed without need to maintain them. There will be increased use of the facility due to the year round atmosphere of an outdoor feeling.
Revenue flow – Mr. Bolwerk commented on the guaranteed revenue flow regardless of the weather. He said high visibility attracts patrons, and the Milford Y lights up at night, and membership increased with this visibility.

Open Aire constructs pools all over the world. The Cheshire pool is an outdoor pool in nice weather and an indoor pool in bad weather. Mr. Bolwerk stated that the pool is a Town asset which protects property values. Open Aire is looking for a long lasting relationship with the Town of Cheshire, and will be in this together with the Town. Open Aire has a good relationship with the Milford Y facility, which has been in operation for 6 years, and any tweaking to be done was done at no cost to the Town, and it will be the same relationship with Cheshire.

Chairman Slocum thanked everyone for their informative presentations and opened the public hearing to the public.

5. QUESTIONS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR.

Derf Kleist, 251 Lancaster Way, asked the following questions.
How long will the pool be closed for construction?
How will the bubble be disposed of, who will do it and the cost?
How long does it take to close the roof in a thunderstorm?
How many degrees Fahrenheit does the interior of the structure elevate to in the summer…will it be warmer than the exterior air, how much warmer, how can the air be cooled, and cost to cool the interior air?
Is the mechanical equipment guaranteed 15 years.?

Mr. Purtill replied that the construction is about one year, starting in August with the pool back in operation July of the next year, so usage of the pool is lost for about a year.

The disposal of the bubble is not in the cost of construction and Mr. Purtill said it is the Town's responsibility through the Public Works Department.

Mr. Bolwerk said it takes about 5 to 10 minutes to close the roof. The inside temperature is about the same as outside. With roof and doors open and the air flowing through, and with one panel retracted over the bottom panel there will a shading effect so it will be like sitting under a tree. There is the same 15 year guarantee with the mechanical equipment.

Mr. Kleist asked how the 4% inflation rate was arrived at...a 20 year look back on inflation comparison, and said 3% inflation could have the numbers off.

In reply, Mr. Purtill said information was received from energy experts and the committee was told to plan on a 4% inflation, that energy costs were based on petrochemicals. Inflation will vary with the economy, and there is no way to look back or at the present to determine anything.
Mr. Kleist asked about the pool enclosure, BOE rebate or full payment of their fee, severance for the pool director and staff, where the swim teams will go to swim and costs for an alternate location, and if the BOE will pay these costs.

Chairman Slocum stated that with the school swim teams not using the pool the BOE would not pay the fees, but would use another facility.

Sheila Adams, Pool Director, said the BOE would not pay use of the Cheshire facility, but pay for another facility, plus transportation costs. The BOE is aware that there may be more expenses next year.

Mr. Slocum stated that a severance package has not been discussed.

Ray Ragazzino, 1313 Avon Boulevard, asked about pool fees for Town residents, whether they would increase or remain the same for the next 10 to 20 years.

Chairman Slocum advised that fees have not been discussed, but the experience of raising fees has not been beneficial for the operation of the pool. He does not foresee raising fees, but could not speak to it honestly.

With increased fees, Mr. Ragazzino said current memberships may decline future membership, and others may not use the pool anyway.

Kevin Wetmore, 21 Colonial Court, Pool Subcommittee member, reported that various revenue scenarios were looked at, and the 4 weeks missing out each year for the pool usage is 9% of the total time. Season ticket holders are not impacted by this, but daily passes and parties are impacted. Based on discussions with the Milford Y staff, they saw a significant increase in activities along with a fee increase, with value added. It is expected there will be a 10% increase in Cheshire’s pool fees and activity, with another month available for using the pool, with revenue of about $65,000. Regarding activities, other pool facilities have seen large increases, with Milford having a 100% membership increase with exercise rooms, day care center, and a monthly fee of $65 to $70. For Cheshire a day pass would go from $6 to $6.60, with out of town fees higher.

Mr. Ragazzino questioned the fact that there are only two alternatives to the pool solution, permanent or bubble, and he would like to see the cost for a summer only pool, and said this should be considered if the permanent structure is voted down.

In terms of a summer only pool, Mr. Wetmore said that preliminary information was looked at, and it actually costs more for a summer only pool in terms of a subsidy. This is due to the lost revenue from three swim teams giving significant revenue, plus the expenses of paying higher fees for use of another facility and transportation costs. There would be loss of revenue from seasonal and annual
passes, swim lessons, parties, swim meets, various programs, resulting in $100,000 more in costs to operate a summer only pool than a year round pool.

Mr. Wetmore asked about the actual Open Aire structure construction time being December for in the ground work since this makes a difference for the lost revenue to the pool.

Ms. Katz stated that the schedule was put together with the assumption that the bubble would be put up after Labor Day, and the pool closed after Thanksgiving. This is when site work and fabrication would have started. In recent discussions it sound like the bubble will not be put back up after Labor Day. The schedule has not been revised yet, but the thinking is that some of the work will start sooner for site work to start in September or October. The completion time is July 2011 but a more detailed schedule is being done now.

According to Mr. Wetmore the pool was open into October, and if there is a possibility to save the CHS girls’ swim season, that would be more revenue for the Town. Although Open Aire is from Canada, Mr. Wetmore informed everyone that all the polycarbonate is produced in Wallingford CT. Regarding savings, Mr. Wetmore explained that referendum votes are done with the head and the heart, and it is $14 million less costly to go with the permanent building than the bubble. The subsidy drops by $250,000; and for the average taxpayer this is about $11 in annual costs; and people of all ages use the pool, plus three swim teams. Mr. Wetmore commented on the safety issues with people learning how to swim which is a life saving skill.

Irwin Dressel, 1476 Highland Avenue, asked about the cogeneration and whether it is diesel, electric or steam engine.

In response, Mr. Gavin said it is a large engine running on natural gas.

Linda Sparks, 59 Troutbrook Drive, noted that all the facilities cited have water park, athletic clubs, etc. and she asked how many taxpayer facilities have been done by Open Aire.

Mr. Bolwerk reported that the firm has done 10 municipal facilities.

Mark Albertin, President, Open Aire, said the firm has worked with private and public partnerships, cities and towns, and in Europe worked with private investors and the town. In Canada and the United States the client is still a private facility or a town. This year the firm finished three public projects in California.

Ms. Sparks noted that the Milford Y is not a town facility but paid for by the YMCA. She agreed that swim lessons are important, and supported a private citizens request to give lessons at her pool, which was denied by the zoning board. A concern was cited by Ms. Sparks from the BOE meetings when it was
stated there was no money; the town will be in dire straits; there will be no more money for schools. And, now it seems $7 million is not a lot of money, and with a much worse situation next year, Ms. Sparks asked why $7 million is not a big deal.

In response, Mr. Slocum said the reason is the Town does not lay out $7 million this year or next year, but borrows that money and it is leveraged over time. There are operational savings per year in the budget, and they could and should translate to other areas of improvements to the budget. Problems with the BOE and Town budget are not going away and this is the conundrum which people will face when voting on the referendum. Mr. Slocum said the Council is offering a solution to a problem with the pool bubble, which many believe must be fixed. The Council’s decision is reasonable, yet expensive, solution to a Town investment, and making it an asset which lasts longer.

Ms. Sparks commented on people hearing over and over that things are dire, and now there is a $7 million project which needs to be on the November ballot, not in June. On June 22nd school is over, people start vacations, and with a big election year in Connecticut people will vote in November. She understands there is a schedule to be started, but to make this referendum fair for all sides to be heard, the referendum should be in November, not in June.

Stating that was a fair comment, Mr. Slocum stated there is a sense of urgency with this pool project, and people should come to the polls in June. He noted that many people are still in Town at that time, and they should vote.

Ms. Sparks stated that if this is that critical then it should be a November ballot item for $7 million. The company assumed the bubble would be going back up, and she asked why the bubble cannot go back up, put the referendum on the November ballot, and then make a decision.

In that regard, Mr. Slocum said that is spending money to put up the bubble and take it down 2 months later. If the referendum does not succeed, the pool will remain as it has, to the consternation of many and satisfaction of a few.

Ms. Sparks said it looks like this is going through the back door.

Mr. Sima said it is not going through the back door, and informed everyone that this was all thought out long and hard for the June referendum decision. Most of the pool revenue is in the summer months; people do not think about membership in December; and the target was to open the pool back up in the next summer for revenue. The project starts in the Fall to get the pool reopened in Summer 2011, and fit the summer schedule for the pool.

The highlights of the process were cited by Mr. Sima, with 6 proposals received last year with a time line to construct the project. The new Council brought it
down to 2 proposals, with G. F. Rhode having the longest time to reopen the pool in Summer 2011, fit the swim schedules of the following year and maintain revenues.

Mr. Wetmore commented on the commodity market changes. In November the project may not be practical and the metal markets are increasing. He said we want to keep the project going with lower interest rates and lower commodity markets.

Chris Brown, 170 Buttonwood Drive, asked about the referendum being a “yes or no” vote on the allocation of $7 million.

Mr. Slocum said voters will be asked to approve the appropriation, so it is an up or down vote.

If the vote is no, Mr. Brown asked what will happen with the pool.

The pool will open this summer and Mr. Slocum said there may have to be a referendum for the bubble replacement in 2 to 2 ½ years.

Mr. Brown commented on the concerns that the $7 million is a lot to vote for, and asked if there were other options, and asked if there are more options for the referendum question.

Mr. Slocum advised that KBE had a proposal of $6 million but the life cycle costs were lower. By Town Charter, the referendum question is yes or no.

Noting that the Council has debated the pool for many years, Mr. Brown asked if there is a reason why this year the Council is giving up its responsibility to make a decision and sending this to referendum.

It was explained by Mr. Slocum that the Council made a decision, and the decision requires public support because the Council cannot spend this amount of money without voter support.

Mark Ciampi, 707 Andrea Court, thanked the Council and the committee for their work. He enjoys the pool, and asked about leaving the pool summer only with higher costs, and asked for an understanding of this.

Mr. Slocum said there are assumptions of maintaining swim teams in the school programs, and with a summer pool there would be rental fees to other facilities plus transportation costs. The Y teams would not be able to use the pool and there would be limited use of the pool, yet there would still be costs for winterizing the pool, staffing costs, and needed protection of the facility.
Bernie Wirkus, 279 Oak Avenue, asked about the contingency plans and worries that once the builder starts construction the pool could be damaged.

Ms. Katz stated that it is assumed the pool will not be impacted; work will be at the edge of the pool; and, any protection to be put up for the pool is included.

Mr. Wirkus wants this project to be successful, but if there were a referendum tonight this could be voted down due to misinformation and negative publicity about the pool since it opened. This is not justified, and he asked if there are plans to educate and communicate to the public the advantages of the pool. Mr. Wirkus said the proposal is a no brainer, but it could be voted down because of the misinformation out there.

Stating this is one of the problems, Mr. Slocum said this is the reason for the public forum this evening, with the Council making information available. However, the Council cannot advocate for anything with taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Wirkus said the Cheshire Herald should have information to educate the public and put articles in the newspaper about the pool.

With the referendum question there is an explanatory text on why the money is being spent, and Mr. Slocum said the Council and Town Government must be careful about wording information without advocating a yes or no vote. Everyone in Town will receive a mailing and be noticed on the referendum vote on the appropriation. The user groups are also getting the word out to the public.

6. PROPOUNENTS AND OPPONENTS STATEMENTS ALTERNATELY EXPRESSED.

Mary Rydzewski, 405 Sheridan Drive, said there needs to be positive publicity about the pool project. She has been involved in classes at the pool, lost 35 pounds, has increased her strength, stamina and mobility. Due to her health issues she can only swim, and not do other activities or sports. Ms. Rydzewski said she does not use the Senior Center but would not want it closed. And, for $11 a year the price is cheap for such a terrific facility.

Walter DeAndrade, 349 Towpath Lane, questioned the rush to judgment for a June 22nd referendum when there is a November election coming. He noted that in the past a special referendum has been won by the people who support it because others do not get out to vote on the issue. Mr. DeAndrade said there is no rush to spend $7 million no matter how it is spent.

Jerry Brittingham, 164 No. Brooksvale Road, asked about how much time is left on the current bonding for the pool. With the new bonding, the Town would have
two bonds running at the same time for the same facility, and he questioned the legality of this.

Mr. Slocum responded that it is legal to have two bonds on one facility.

Mr. Brittingham said he was touched to listen to people and Councilors advocating spending $7 million on a structure to help the Cheshire High School swim teams. He asked, again, when there will be a full accounting to the taxpayers for all the money that has been spent on the pool to date, i.e. PW labor, materials, overages, repairs, etc. This is fair when asking the people to invest another $7 million, and they should know where all the money has gone in the last 6 years. With this information, people can make a value judgment on the new facility and savings to be achieved. Mr. Brittingham noted that with the new structure there would still be a subsidy, but a lesser one.

In response to questions raised, Mr. Milone said there are 15 years on the repayment of the original debt, about $500,000 a year.

Stating he knows the pool committee worked hard, Mr. Brittingham thanked them for their work, and said he is glad the matter goes to the voters in June. Then, the Town can put this all behind us and do what is best for the future of the Town.

Joe LeMain 340 South Rolling Acres Road, thanked the pool committee members for their hours of work on this project. He uses the pool daily, and stated that, due to exercise in swimming, he no longer needs all his medications. The facility being chosen is phenomenal without worry about air quality. Mr. LeMain commented on the better health of people who exercise and swim, and the many physically challenged people who use the pool facility. As a fiscal conservative, Republican, Tea Party member, he supports the pool structure at a cost of $11 a year to the taxpayers. Mr. LeMain said the main thing is to talk about the benefits of the pool and this proposed structure is the best thing to be done.

Mary DeLeo 441 Patton Drive, likes and uses the pool, but does not understand why the matter is being talked about. In April she was at meetings and watched the BOE and Council cut about $1.3 million from the school budget because the economy was terrible, times are tough, and more than taxpayers could bear. This was done despite overwhelming comments from the citizens wanting to spend more on education. The night the budget was adopted she watched an alternative budget from the Council minority, increasing funding of $500,000 to the BOE, get knocked down because it was more than taxpayers could bear, $25 per year for the average household. Now, it is the end of May, and we are on the verge of laying off teachers in Cheshire, and the Council wants to spend $7 million on the pool. Ms. DeLeo said she understands the bubble is reaching the end of its life span, and something must be done. She asked for an explanation
on how the Town could not afford $1.3 million for the schools last month, and why the Town can afford $7 million for a pool this month. This does not make sense. The cost of the pool structure will be bonded, the same as putting it on the credit card, and it must be paid back. If the referendum were held today, Ms. DeLeo would vote no, because she cannot support this money when teachers are being laid off and education is not being sufficiently funded. If there is $7 million which the Town can afford to spend, Ms. DeLeo said it should go to Dr. Florio because he could do a lot with that money.

Beth Tannenbaum, 285 Cornwall Avenue, tried to educate the public at the health and wellness fair this past weekend. Stating she is on her own agenda, she swims every day since the pool opened, and it is the only thing she can do. The pool is great for special needs children, cancer patients, people with challenges and others. Without the pool many lives in Town will be different.

Diane Visconti, 795 Dogwood Drive, thanked everyone for the presentations, and stated that support of the pool or the school is a false choice. The whole picture must be looked at, and putting money into the pool will increase property values. As a swim team parent, Ms. Visconti said she knows the memories her family has made. One of her favorite Cheshire moments was when the swim team broke the national record with the alumni and team members together for the event. She said the coaches do a good job with the team members, help them achieve their goals, be strong mentally, physically and emotionally.

Rich Ogurick, 20 Melissa Court, member of the Energy Commission, worked with many people who served on the pool subcommittee which has done a fantastic job coming up with an objective, thorough analysis of the options. The cost is less than $1 a month. The problem is the bubble. He commented on the misinformation and marking of the pool proposal, and not talking about spending $7 million instead of investing in education. It is $7 million plus carrying costs over 20 years versus paying $60 million a year on education, which is $1.2 billion over the same period of time. This is a capital expenditure versus an operating expense. Cheshire values education, spends a lot of money on education, and the pool will afford those students in Town the opportunity to swim in a world class facility. It will draw swimmers from other towns and the pool will be something the Town will be proud of. The problem is the bubble and doing nothing is not an option, and something must be done. The options were evaluated thoroughly and we need to show the public that the proposal saves money in the long run, over a 40 year life cycle, and saves money versus the existing situation.

William Moore, 45 Sorghum Mill Road, agreed that the referendum should be held in November. He asked about the cost of the referendum, noting there is a cost, ¼ of what it would cost to put the bubble up again. Mr. Moore asked if the cost of the project includes the cost of borrowing or if the 4% is added onto the $7 million number.
Chairman Slocum said that the $7 million is the principal amount to be borrowed, and costs have been built into the life cycle.

It was stated by Mr. Moore that the honest answer is that the cost will be more than $7 million being talked about. He said the full cost needs to be presented to everyone so it is understood what the full true cost would be for the project.

It was pointed out by Mr. Purtill that between this presentation and the last one he left out the numbers of the total cost of the proposal. The total cost of leaving the bubble in place over 40 years is $37 million. The total cost of buying and maintaining, including interest, the Open Aire structure is $22 million. By using the Open Aire structure as opposed to the existing bubble there is a savings, over 40 years, of $15 million.

Mr. Moore asked about savings to the Town if the pool hole is filled in. He said this is an option and questioned if was considered. There has been talk about a summer pool, half year pool, and asked if anyone made the business decision. The pool came in at twice the original cost along with ancillary costs which drove up the costs, and now we are looking at another $7 million into the pool. We should consider backing out now. In the past, before the pool, the Y was on its own and the schools rented facilities. Mr. Moore asked about options being presented to the taxpayers, and said they should be so taxpayers have the opportunity to decide whether or not to make a business decision to close the pool before spending another $14 million. When talking about a summer only pool costing more, Mr. Moore asked if this is factored against the cost of the $7 million and how this number was derived.

This is operating costs, and Mr. Slocum pointed out that with filling in the pool the debt must still be paid over the next 15 years, and he is not sure this is a fiduciary responsibility this Council would want to take on. Mr. Slocum reiterated that people must show up at the pools in June for the referendum vote.

Town Manager Milone advised that the cost of a referendum is about $6,000 to $10,000, and the Town is looking at one polling place. The November election will cost about $12,000 to $14,000 because there will be multiple polling places. The final numbers will be coming from the Registrars of Voters office.

Mario Pelletier, 1292 Peck Lane, resident for over 60 years, said that the BOE is using the tactic of laying off teachers to scare people and to get what they want. He said it is time to stop giving taxpayers everything they want. He is opposed to the money for the pool and spending millions of dollars each year on the pool. We are in a depression for 4 years now and people do not have the money to spend. He asked how the $7 million will be paid for. The pool enclosure is a good construction, and Mr. Pelletier said the people should vote, and we must think about the money we are spending and where it is coming from. He commented on people losing tax credits and relief.
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Town Manager Milone informed the people that the tax credit and relief programs have been maintained by the Town, and there are no cuts in the programs.

Doug Leven, 72 Chipman Drive, talked about the impact of the $7 million, the net increase to taxpayers of $11 a year, and asked about its effect on the overall debt service of the Town.

Mr. Schrumm reported that the bottom line is that debt service is trending down, and will continue to do so. The community has matured with its infrastructure over the last 25 years; roads and bridges have been rebuilt; police department and library have been expanded; and schools have been added onto. We are at the point where debt service is down with the exception of two projects – the $7 million for the pool structure and $33 to $35 million for the treatment plant. The general overall tide is going out on the debt service. The $7 million will be financed at 4% over 20 years, and with the treatment plant at $35 million, factoring in the debt service reserve fund (CRRA money), the bottom line debt line will continue to go down for the next 10 years. The money must still be paid but it will not have a dramatic adverse impact on the 10 year debt service line. We are replacing old debt with new debt. The projections are done annually during the capital budget process.

On the operating side of the pool there is the $359,000 subsidy, and Mr. Schrumm stated that the pool is not costing millions of dollars a year. This year it will cost less to operate the pool than it will cost to operate the Senior Center. With reductions in energy and maintenance and ancillary expenses, more money is freed up in the operating budget.

Renee Cohen, 190 Hotchkiss Road, addressed the Council stating that her children went through the school system and she is proud of them. She commented on the fact that Cheshire had the fantastic boys and girls swim teams without a pool, renting facilities to swim. Cheshire has a good education system, people want to live in Cheshire and the pool with the bubble was not done by people who really cared for the right type of facility for swimming all year round. The recommended pool is not going to cost a lot of money, and $7 million is over a long period of time. Ms. Cohen said her grandchildren both swim at the pool for social activity, take swimming lessons, and enjoy the pool. She commented on the nonsense going on in the schools. She said we have a fantastic pool and she does not understand why people want the referendum in November. With a June referendum the extra months are not wasted, and the schedule allows use of the new structure next summer.

Dave Gavin said he sees a sense of division between education and the pool. The subcommittee was asked to solve a problem and offered a solution which will save money. He is a strong supporter of education, and never argued with the school budgets. This pool project should allow retention of teachers with saving money in the long run, and doing so more cost effectively. In the next two
years the operating budget will be reduced because of being in the construction phase, and teachers could be retained with this savings. This is what the education people should be thinking about, saving $15 million over a period of time, and directing some of those dollars to education.

Joe LeMain said this pool is supervised, and many quadriplegics use the pool under the direction of Ms. Adams. He reported that above ground pools generate 600 quadriplegics a year. The community pool is worth everything being talked about. He commented on the psychological and emotional well being of people who use the pool, and his concerns are the health and well being of the people who use the pool.

Paul Mikalowski asked about the referendum in June or November, and whether Cheshire must have a minimum number of voters to make a legal referendum. He has concerns about what the Charter says about the percentage of registered voters to make a legal referendum.

Chairman Slocum replied that only a simple majority of those voting is needed to pass the referendum.

Kathy Ardesia, Cheshire Street, commented on her agreement with Mr. Gavin’s statement about saving money in the long run. She said the challenge to the Council is to take these savings and put them back into education to better the community. Ms. Ardesia is in support of anything making the Town better, but she wants any savings put back into education.

Cheryl Guetens, Rustic Lane, said people should understand this is not about teachers versus the pool. She is against what is happening with teachers and would put $200 more in her taxes to support teachers. The citizens can vote on the pool referendum. Ms. Guetens has a daughter on the swim team and the pool is used by many, from babies to senior citizens. It is $11 a year to support the pool, and this will keep the handicapped people using the pool, and continue swim lessons for kids. We spend $359,000 for the pool and $394,000 for the Senior Center, and Ms. Guetens questioned how many people use the pool versus use the Center. With savings of money on the pool, the money can go into the budget for the teachers.

Derf Kleist stated that government should be run like a business, and he cited Kurtz Farms not using plastic on greenhouses anymore when they were told they would not have any more taxes on permanent structures. He would think they would have permanent structures on their greenhouses because it is more cost effective.

7. REBUTTAL AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIR.
8. ADJOURNMENT

Before adjourning the public hearing, Chairman Slocum thanked everyone who participated in the public hearing, and to the committee which spent many hours and time and service to the Town on this project. He also thanked the representatives from Open Aire for attending the meeting and making things clear with their comments and presentation.

Chairman Slocum closed the public hearing at 10:12 p.m.

Attest:

______________________________
Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk